This document was created from the closed caption transcript of the March 3, 2026 City Council Regular Meeting and Work Study Session has not been checked for completeness or accuracy of content.

A copy of the agenda for this meeting, including a summary of the action taken on each agenda item, can be accessed through the City Clerk Archived Documents Search at:

https://eservices.scottsdaleaz.gov/cityclerk/DocumentSearch

An unedited digital video recording of the meeting, which can be used in conjunction with the transcript, is available online at:

https://ww2.scottsdaleaz.gov/scottsdale-video-network/Council-video-archives/2026-archives

For ease of reference, included throughout the transcript are bracketed "time stamps" [Time: 00:00:00] that correspond to digital video recording time.

For more information about this transcript, please contact the City Clerk's Office at 480-312-2411.

CALL TO ORDER

[Time: 00:00:03]

Mayor Borowsky: I would now like to call the March 3, 2026. We will wait for Ben Lane to get back there. The March 3, 2026 City Council Regular Meeting and Work Study Session to order. City Clerk Ben Lane, may I please have a roll call.

ROLL CALL

[Time: 00:00:17]

City Clerk Ben Lane: Thank you, Mayor. Mayor Lisa Borowsky.

Mayor Borowsky: Present.

Ben Lane: Vice Mayor Adam Kwasman.

Vice Mayor Kwasman: Here.

Ben Lane: Councilmembers Jan Dubauskas.

Councilwoman Dubauskas: Here.

Ben Lane: Barry Graham.

Councilman Graham: Here.

Ben Lane: Kathy Littlefield.

Councilwoman Littlefield: Here.

Ben Lane: Maryann McAllen.

Councilwoman McAllen: Present.

Ben Lane: And Solange Whitehead.

Councilwoman Whitehead: Here.

Ben Lane: City Manager Greg Caton.

City Manager Greg Caton: Here.

Ben Lane: Interim City Attorney Luis Santaella.

Interim City Attorney Luis Santaella: Here.

Ben Lane: City Treasurer Sonia Andrews.

City Treasurer Sonia Andrew: Here.

Ben Lane: Acting City Auditor Lai Cluff.

Acting City Auditor Lai Cluff: Here.

Ben Lane: And the Clerk is Present. Thank you, Mayor.

[Time: 00:00:42]

Mayor Borowsky: Thank you very much. This evening, we have Scottsdale Police Officers Sergeant Eric Bowles and Officers Kyle Shollack and Ray Wilburn as well as Firefighter Ray Igliani. I hope I'm saying that right. If anyone requires their assistance, please let a member of our staff know.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

[Time: 00:01:01]

For the Pledge of Allegiance, I will ask Councilwoman Jan Dubauskas to lead us in that.

Councilwoman Dubauskas: I pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands: One nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

Mayor Borowsky: Thank you. And for the invocation, I will turn it over to Councilwoman MaryAnn McAllen.

INVOCATION

[Time: 00:1:27]

Councilwoman McAllen: Thank you, Mayor. Welcome to the City Council Meeting this March 3rd. I'm sure you all realize how blessed we are as a nation and as a city. With that in mind, I I want to read this prayer that was offered up actually on the Senate floor two days ago. Monday, yesterday. So, with that, if you would please bow your head.

Almighty God, we lift up our military troops, asking for your divine protection for them, strength and wisdom as they serve on land, sea and air. Surround them with the shield of safety. Grant them courage in danger and comfort their families bringing them home to us safely. May they find peace, hope and guidance in your presence, and we ask you to be with those families who have already lost loved ones. We do not take our freedom for granted. Again, we ask for your guidance and strength at this time, protecting our democracy and our freedoms here and abroad. Amen.

Mayor Borowsky: Thank you very much.

MAYOR'S REPORT

[Time: 00:3:00]

As for the Mayor's Report tonight, I want to let you all know that this coming weekend is the 73rd annual Rodeo Scottsdale, also, known as the Parada Del So, and that celebrates our western heritage here in Scottsdale and it will take center stage out at WestWorld, it's a PRCA sanctioned event. And it runs March 5th through the 8th at WestWorld and so, center stage. Widely regarded as one of the most respected professional rodeos in the country, Rodeo Scottsdale showcases classic events, including saddle bronc riding, steer wrestling, team roping, barrel racing, breakaway roping and bull riding and I know where I will be this weekend for sure. It's a fun event. So, go check it out.

And moving right along, we have, am I on wrong page here? I think I might be. One second here. Oh, presentations. We already did that. So, we will pass that. We had our 20-year plus employees that were here and we celebrated them.

POSSIBLE EXECUTIVE SESSION

As is always the case, possible Executive Session announcement, we may recess into an Executive Session if the Council approves such action, and that would be only to obtain legal advice on an applicable item on the agenda if authorized by Council, the Executive Session would be held immediately and will not be open to the public. The public meeting, however, would resume following that Executive Session.

MINUTES

[Time: 00:04:53]

Next on to the Meeting Minutes. We have the approval the Minutes involving Special Meeting Minutes of January 7, 2026, Executive Session Meeting Minutes of January 7, 2026, Regular Meeting and Work Study Session Minutes of January 13, 2026. Do I have a motion to approve those?

Councilwoman Littlefield: So, moved.

Councilman Graham: Second.

Mayor Borowsky: Please indicate your vote. All right. On to the Work Study Session.

WORK STUDY SESSION

[Time: 00:05:34]

We received I don't think there's any comments on this. Is there Ben? Tonight, we have one item for Work Study Session, presentation and discussion. And this is the CIP plan item which was continued from our February 24th meeting, and we'll ask Scott Selin, Budget Department Director and Allison Tymkiw and the Transportation and Infrastructure Senior Director and they will give us a presentation so, that we can provide possible direction on the city treasurer's quarterly financial presentation and on the city engineer's quarterly CIP presentation as of December 2025. Thank you. Welcome, Scott.

Budget Director Scott Selin: Thank you. Good evening, Madam Mayor, members of the City Council, very happy to be here tonight to present the second quarter, general fund financial update. The information you will see in this presentation reflects actuals through December 31, 2025. And as usual, we will take a look at revenue collections to date, as well as budget to actual variances on the expenditure side.

This slide has some high-level takeaways, overall general fund revenues are 5% above budget as of December 31, 2025. Sales tax and interest earnings are both performing favorably. State shared income tax was showing a very large positive variance, because December was showing seven months of revenue rather than six. This issue has been resolved, and you will see that in the January report. When it comes out.

On the expenditure side, the city is 4% below budget due to a combination of personnel savings and also timing of expenditures for commodities and capital outlays.

This slide looks at revenues by category. I will start at the total row at the very bottom, through December, the city had collected $230.9 million in the general fund versus a the budgeted revenue of $219.6 million for a 5% positive variance. Looking at some of the most significant individual categories on that table, local taxes was a total of $3.7 million over budget, higher than budget. And about $3.2 million of that was due to the local sales tax. And the electric franchise tax accounts for the remaining positive variance.

[Time: 00:08:15]

Interest earnings came in significantly higher than expected. And the state share was higher than expected about state shared income taxes and again that issue has been resolved. Charges for services is also showing a positive variance, due to the issues listed on the slide, higher cell phone lease payments and WestWorld facility fees.

Looking at the sales tax down to the individual category, there are a few categories that are performing fairly significantly above budget. First, the other activity category that's about three-fourths of the way down on that table there. It's showing a positive variance of $2.7 million, which equates to 24%. Within that other activity category, most notably services with retail and wholesale are driving that $2.7 million positive variance.

Construction is performing better than budgeted, higher than anticipated, as is dining and entertainment, about 700,000 higher than anticipated in the budget originally. The automotive category has performed relatively poorly through the first half of the fiscal year. That appears to be due to a combination of technical reasons and decreased base activity. Some car dealerships have reported decreases in sales, but we'll continue to monitor that category as the year goes on.

This slide shows a 12-month rolling total of the 1% general fund sales tax, we include this to give a big picture of trends that are occurring over the last three years or so. You see that line is remaining just under $180 million under the last 18 months or so.

Looking at state shared revenues we already discussed the state shared income tax issue earlier. In Q3, that has been corrected. That $4.8 million positive variance should have been about $800,000 for six months of revenue, had it shown six months instead of seven.

State shared sales tax showed a fairly significant forecast loss last month. The previous report was 6% positive variance and now a negative 2% variance. The reason for that is the Department of Revenue started dispersing state shared sales tax to San Tan Valley and that began in December and not only that, it went back and corrected for, I believe, three previous months that San Tan Valley was entitled to upon its incorporation. That's what caused that to change significantly from November to December. And then finally auto lieu tax is showing a healthy balance as well.

The personnel services is a 2% positive variance side, due to a combination of vacancy savings and salary savings. The contractual services category, the second category on the table there, is positive due to some delays in receiving invoices for some software that was purchased, as well as some training that will take place later than originally anticipated. Commodities and capital outlays is a similar story. We have been delayed in receiving equipment and invoices for purchases that we have made. We think it will decrease over the remainder of the fiscal year.

The contracts payable category it's a small amount but I did want to address it briefly. The variance here is due to a timing difference between when a payment to the Bureau of Reclamation was budgeted versus when it was paid. I believe originally it was budgeted in December. I believe we expected that to take place in February.

This table breaks up the expenditures for the year by department. I do want to call out so, the Police Department there, the last time I was up here this was a question, I believe from Councilman Graham about why the actuals for the current year are significantly higher than the previous year, you see the police $103.4 million versus $71 million last fiscal year. The reason for that is the $50 million PSPRS payment. Through December $25 million had been paid out and those expenditures show up in the police department budget. That's the main driver of that.

With that I'm happy to entertain any questions.

Mayor Borowsky: Councilman Graham.

[Time: 00:12:58]

Councilman Graham: Mayor, thank you. Good presentation. I'm going to give you my standard pep talk about underestimating revenues. When we underestimate revenues and by the way, let me step back. Revenues are way higher than what we expected. When I think of the health of Scottsdale, I think about various metrics. I think about house prices and the strength of the economy. But one of the measures I look at, I track is sales tax revenues and so, we should be you know, maybe the press will cover, I think Scottsdale is on fire based on these sales tax collection. We were supposed to be in a recession. I guess they canceled the recession again, didn't they? Hopefully. I was very happy about that.

But when we so sharply and I got a Budget Review Commissioner in the audience. So, he's going to give me the side eye if I get this wrong. But when we so sharply underestimate revenues, we can miss opportunities to deliver services and deliver on projects. When we know the revenues that are coming in, we can plan our capital projects better. We may end up needlessly raising fees and taxes because we're underestimating revenues. We could we could have inefficient resource allocation because we have also, what I'm looking at here is significant under expenditure of budgeted expenditures or under yeah, under disbursements and there's a massive delta there where we cut way less checks than we expected to and we collected way more than we expected to. So, what's that money doing? It's just sitting in a is it just sitting in a pot? We have to scramble and do something with it. And so, now I get it. Okay. That's I'm being tough on you. I understand 3, 4%, 2 to 4%, like there's going to be there's going to be you can't nobody can guess it perfectly. But I just want to as much as we feel good, oh, we didn't write as many checks as we thought, and we collected way more than expected but there is still a cost to the taxpayers. And so, something to think about and consider, not to be too conservative when we put these projections. Thank you, Mayor.

Mayor Borowsky: Thank you. Councilwoman Whitehead.

[Time: 00:15:39]

Councilwoman Whitehead: Thanks, Scott. And also, thanks for coming back. That was awful, you stayed until 9:30 at night and then we canceled your presentation. What is the cost of San Tan? What will be the kind of average cost to the city?

Scott Selin: Madam Mayor, Councilwoman Whitehead, may I are you speaking about the state shared sales tax or the state shared income tax or everything together? Because San Tan…

Councilwoman Whitehead: Kind of everything together. What is the cost of adding that to the small pie. If you don't know, you can follow up.

Scott Selin: Mayor, Councilwoman Whitehead, I don't have those numbers in front of me right now and I would be happy to get them to you.

Councilwoman Whitehead: Okay, and just another observation, the aberration with the auto sales that was quite steep. Do we see that because auto sales are happening elsewhere in the valley or is it just auto sales, do you know offhand generally in the state and the country, what is going on there? Any insights?

Scott Selin: Madam Mayor and Councilwoman Whitehead, I need to speak to some experts about what might be going on there. All I've known so far is that it appears to be a combination of technical reasons and decrease base activity. I can seek to get more information about that.

Councilwoman Whitehead: Okay. Those don't mean anything to me. I look forward to follow-up and anyway, thank you so much Scott.

Mayor Borowsky: Thank you. I don't see any more comments. So, thank you very much. Now, we'll hear from Allison Tymkiw.

[Time: 00:17:12]

City Engineer and Transportation and Infrastructure Senior Director Alison Tymkiw: Thank you. Good evening, Mayor, members of the Council. First, I have a short video and then a few slides.

Okay. Thank you. So, then I just wanted to quickly go over the project budget overview for these projects. So, the first project is 62 build a bridge on Thompson Peak Parkway over Reata Wash and the total project budget currently is $6.3 million with .5 spent and the remaining budget of 5.8 and this is Bond 2019 funding. The water campus connections deep well recovery and recharge project, total project budget 55.8 with 36 million spent and 19.8 remaining, funded through water rates, grant and MPC bonds.

And Scottsdale Road, Jomax to Dixileta total project budget of $43.7 million, 20.4 spent to date, 23.3 remaining, funded by transportation sales tax, regional sales tax and grant funding, and then renovate Fire Station 606, total project budget of 7.2 million and 1.1 spent and 6.1 remaining and that was funded by the general fund.

And then I do have a couple of slides to go over an update with where we are with the Scottsdale Road, Jomax to Dixileta Road project. So, I wanted to review, again, the total project funding and what that actually means. So, total project funding includes many elements including design, right-of-way, utilities, construction, construction administrative services, and then contingency, which is usually estimated at about 10% at the start of construction. So, I think sometimes it's confusing that people get the total project budget confused with the actual construction budget, but there's a lot more that goes into the project than just construction.

And as you recall with this project, pre-December 3rd, we had the federal grant that was surface transportation block grant of $29.2 million which was federally funded through that program. M.A.G. was able to get that approved that we swapped that federal funding to regional sales tax with Prop 400 funding. So, we were able to switch the $29 million that was previously federally funded to $29 million that's M.A.G. regional funded. So, that was great when that happened.

If you recall back in April of 2025, I explained that the HSIP grant was another federal fund and it was forfeited when we changed the project from the roundabout to the traffic signal because that grant was specific for the roundabout, but at that time, we noted that we would be replacing that with transportation sales tax, locally funded and that will come to you in the future in the form of a future Council action, because that requires Council action to do that. And then the remainder of the project is funded as it was with the transportation sales tax. So, our total project budget before December 3rd was the $43.7 million, and then after the funding swap, on December 3rd, it's still $43.7 million.

And then this slide shows basically the breakdown of the funds on the project. So, the first item is the $29.9 million that's representative of the construction for the project. And our new costs we're anticipating $32.9 million and that includes the change order to the contractor, for the change from the roundabout to the traffic signal.

The next item is design and previous costs for that were coming in at $2.7 million. New costs projected are $3 million. And that also includes the change order to the designer, to the engineer to change the design from the roundabout to the traffic signal. And the construction administration costs. So, because it was previously federally funded, we had construction administration costs of $1.45 million. We were able to save some money there by changing it to regional funding. We didn't have to meet all the requirements of the federal funding. We were able to decrease that contract, so we are at .89 million for construction administration.

Utility relocation, we had paid A.P.S. $2.47 million to relocate their facilities. And then with the change from the roundabout to the signal, we did have some additional utility costs that had to be relocated with the new design for the traffic signal. And then right-of-way acquisition originally came in at $2.19 million, and we had about $40,000 of right-of-way that we needed to acquire with the new design. And then administrative costs stayed the same. And then here it shows when we went into the project, we're estimating about a 10% contingency of $4.4 million and then with the additional costs we're looking at just under a million dollars in contingency to date. So, what we're showing here with this slide is it was a $43.7 million project. As it was approved by City Council in September of 2024 and it's still a $43.7 million project and we are able to accommodate all the changes within the existing budget. And with that, I'm happy to answer any questions.

Mayor Borowsky: Councilman Graham.

[Time: 00:29:32]

Councilman Graham: I didn't expect such an in-depth conversation about that project. But it's very illustrative and I appreciate you going through it Ms. Tymkiw. I want to call out for the D. C. Ranch Bridge; I want to call out our voters for supporting Bond 2019 for that project. I think a special recognition belongs to Chris Irish at D. C. Community Ranch, am I saying that right?

Councilwoman Dubauskas: D.C. Ranch.

Councilman Graham: D.C. Ranch, I don’t want to misspeak there and her advocacy for that entire community to make sure that that project was kept on on pace. I also want to call out for that project, Representative Joseph Chaplik, that's an important project for him and he's also been an advocate to keep it on pace and I think it will be a great addition to that area. Scottsdale Road, you are getting some complaints, aren’t you?

Alison Tymkiw: Yeah, the construction is pretty impactful.

Councilman Graham: Yeah, you know it’s just the lack of east-west I think in a couple places. My coworkers come in and they say Barry, what are you doing on Scottsdale Road? Exactly, I know I brought this issue up with City Manager Caton and he added a temporary stoplight there and work through that and I'm excited about Fire Station 606. That was deplorable the conditions they were subjected to. Scottsdale Road that grant exchange. When I bumped into Nathan Domme in Target the other day, I reminded him he did a good job on that. Remember that, Nathan? And you played a big role in it, Ms. Tymkiw. Thank you. Thank you, Mayor.

Mayor Borowsky: Thank you. Councilwoman McAllen.

[Time: 00:31:38]

Councilwoman McAllen: Thank you, Mayor. Allison, I wanted to also, comment. I'm very glad that the D.C. Ranch bridge is being built. They have been waiting a really long time for us to do our side of the bargain, when we negotiated that with them and I'm grateful that it's being completed. So, thank you for all of your efforts on that.

Mayor Borowsky: All right. I don't see any other questions. I have a quick question about the project that was rescoped, the roundabout to light. What made the contingency, it went from $4.4 million to under $1 million. So, how does that how does that work out?

Alison Tymkiw: So, with the changes, Mayor, members of Council, with the changes to both the construction contract, the design contract, the utilities and the right-of-way, that basically dropped the contingency down, because we used contingency to pay for them.

Mayor Borowsky: Okay. All right. I don't see any other questions or comments. And thank you very much. Thank you for the presentation. Appreciate both of you. Moving on to the Consent Agenda.

CONSENT AGENDA

We have items 1 through 4A. Do any members have any questions about any items on the Consent Agenda? I don't see any. I have a question. It's the TDC, the Bike Week funding. Can someone is someone available to talk to us about that? Hi, there. What number is that?

Councilman Graham: Four.

Mayor Borowsky: Four there we go. Hi there. So, my questions pertain to and this has come up a couple of times before. I know Bike Week has been going on for what, 15 years?

Senior Director Economic Development and Tourism Kevin Burke: At least. I think 17.

Mayor Borowsky: And it's Kevin, right?

Kevin Burke: Kevin Burke, yes Senior Director Economic Development and Tourism.

Mayor Borowsky: Yes, thank you. It's been going on for about 15 years. I'm supportive of the event, but I know that we have a three-year maximum, I think, for event funding and that begins to run on the inception of the event, when it's a new event. We have seen this happen a couple of times. I really I would like to hear what the justification is for doing this now 15 years or whatever it's been later.

Kevin Burke: Madam Mayor.

Mayor Borowsky: And it's $75,000.

Kevin Burke: Madam Mayor, thank you for the question. My understanding, Bike Week has been going on for about 17 years in the community. The current request is for $75,000 from our event development bucket. We have several different programs that run through the TDC that are all using tourism dollars. Prior to the three years of event development funding, they were using the marketing funding bucket. And so, it was a separate program that they were eligible to use before they switched over to this program. So, this would be the third and final year of this particular event's eligibility under the event development bucket.

Mayor Borowsky: So, the three years, they can shift around to different sources of funding? Is that what you are saying?

[Time: 00:35:01]

Kevin Burke: Madam Mayor, two separate programs. So, for the earliest years they weren't using this event development program. It was a different program, right? And they are eligible to apply for funding through this other program, the event development program, for only three years and this is third of those three years.

Mayor Borowsky: Okay. I would really like to have a discussion about that funding and how that works at some point in the near future. So, I can get some clarity on that. So, thank you very much. That's all the questions I had. I don't see anyone else that wants to speak and we'll leave that on Consent Agenda item. So, I should note that item number 1 was pulled by staff and will be continued to a later date. So, that leaves us with items 2 through 4A.

Ben Lane: Mayor, I apologize, item 4A was also pulled by staff and will be considered at a later date as well.

Mayor Borowsky: Okay. So, that leaves two. Two, three, and four, excuse me. And I see that now Councilman Graham you want to talk.

Councilman Graham: I was going to move to accept the Consent Agenda items. Do I need to enumerate them, Consent Agenda items two through four.

Councilwoman Whitehead: Second.

Mayor Borowsky: All right. All those in favor, please indicate your vote. Thank you. I should note, I think I already did this, we didn't have any public comment on the Consent Agenda items.

REGULAR AGENDA

[Time: 00:36:31]

Moving on to the Regular Agenda, item number 5, it's a presentation, discussion and possible direction to city staff regarding the city's proposed rates and fees. And for the presentation, we'll invite Scott Selin, who of course is the Budget Director back up, and David Walby, Interim Water and Resources Senior Director and are we going to have all you come up right now? Do you want all these people up here with you right now?

City Manager Greg Caton: Madam Mayor, if I may, we'll start off with Scott and then we'll rotate through as we go through the presentation. Thank you, Madam Mayor.

Mayor Borowsky: Sounds good, let’s do that. Thank you, Scott. Please proceed.

Scott Selin: Thank you, Madam Mayor, members of the Council. For the record, Scott Selin, happy to be here to kick off tonight’s agenda item, rates and fees. This slide that you are looking at, excuse me, is just a reminder of the process that must be followed in order to enact rate and fee changes. First, the proposed rate and fee changes must be presented in detail before you. That's what's happening this evening. After tonight, there will be a 60-day posting compliance period that must be observed. After that period has run, there will be a public hearing and adoption of proposed rate and fee changes. That is scheduled for the May 19th meeting.

Speaking first about the enterprise funds. Per policy, the rates and fees must be reviewed annually and developed pursuant to a multi-year plan. Rates and fees for enterprise funds are intended to recover all direct and indirect costs of service, including debt service and also to provide for future capital needs. Tonight, water resources and solid waste will be presenting fee change proposals to you. For non-enterprise fees, rates and fees per policy, these must be reviewed periodically and should be based on an acceptable recovery rate for direct and indirect costs of service. And each department has its own methodology for doing that.

Tonight, we will hear fee and rate change proposals from Planning and Development Services, Parks and Recreation, Scottsdale Stadium, Tourism and Events, Library, and Human Services and Police. This slide summarizes the anticipated revenue changes that will be realized with the rate and fee changes. Starting on the left-hand side, we anticipate that the proposed rate and fee changes will generate about $118,000 to the general fund. About $79,000 to the special programs fund for parks and recreation and Preserve. Approximately $90,000 to the stadium facility fund, and then moving over to the enterprise side, we anticipate that between water and solid waste, about 9.2 million dollars in total revenue increased revenue, I should say as a result of the proposed rate and fee changes that will be presented tonight. And with that, I will hand the presentation over to my colleague David Walby. Thank you.

Mayor Borowsky: Thank you very much, Scott.

Interim Director Water Resources David Walby: Thank you Mayor Borowsky, members of Council. My name is David Walby, I'm the Interim Director for Water Resources. The proposed rates for FY26/27 is a flexible model and cost recovery for robust water utility. Increases to the base fees are proposed to better reflect the recovery, affix operating cost adjusted to capture the demand availability designed into the system. Increases to commodity rates are proposed to generate sufficient revenues to maintain the water fund and sewer fund as a self-sustaining enterprise, while encouraging efficient water use and urge conservation. The city believes that a strategy for annual marginal rate increases is to smooth out the long-term revenue requirements produced for an affordable and predictable rate for its customers.

What we are looking at is the proposed rates for both water and sewer on the water side. It captures an operating and maintenance cost of 3.5 and one for assist to funding additional water sources and supply. On the sewer side, looking at 3.5%, I will jump back to the water rate fees increase are effective November 1, 2026, and on the sewer effective July 1st. I want to make that distinguish there.

[Time: 00:41:17]

For operating, we look at significant cost drivers as it relates to our rates and we have seen over the last four years these rate increases for the top four significant drivers for us. Raw water costs have increased 6%. Personnel services 8% increase over the last four years. On the electricity side, a big jump there, 34%, and chemicals 8%. Again, over the last four years increase.

Looking at our CIP or significant drivers for next fiscal year, I pulled a few in here to make some points too. The first is the drought-driven improvements and we are looking at additional ASR well aquifer storage and recovery well approximately $9 million for the CIP. Continuation of operation of our automated meter program and that's an AMI, advanced metering infrastructure and this is going to allow customers, the end users near real time to read consumption patterns and better detect leaks in a faster manner. For lift stations we have a number of lift stations. The two I wanted to make a reference to was both lift station 52 and across roads lift stations each approximately $9 million, excuse me, for next fiscal year. And finally, another driver for capital is booster pump stations improvements and that's approximately $17.1 million.

Looking at rates, water rates, base fees, we separate base fees, volumetric fees, the base fees, the current look at rates through our different meter sizes. I want to point to the 1-inch meter, it's our benchmark as we look at this across water and sewer utilities. Our current rate is 31.45 and with the proposed increase of 4.5%, we are looking at 32.87. That's for a base fee. That's an increase of $1.42.

For volumetric components, separate from the base fee, again, applying a 4.5% increase, we have separating out different tiers. And that determines that's determined by how much volume of water the end user is using. So, that first 0 to 5,000 gallons that rate would move from a current $1.72 to $1.80, for example.

On the commercial side, very similar with our tier structure to help drive and encourage conservation. The more volume of water an end user is using, the proposed increase as you can see there across the different tiers increases, but again, it's supplied at a 4.5% rate increase and we standardized that across all tiers for this year.

On the sewer rates similarly we have a base fee and volumetric fee. I wanted to touch on the base fee. It establishes fees for fixed operating costs and provides access into the city infrastructure. The rates of 3.5% equals or allows for on the one-inch meter $8.20 current base fee to $8.49. And I will need some assistance. Thank you very much. Back one. Thank you.

Looking at miscellaneous service charges. We have our meter and service line. This is a straight cost recovery for us. And the cost drivers there are labor and raw material costs, either brass or copper. You see the rates currently in FY25/26 fee ranging from $2,400 to $4,079 dollars. Moving up to $2,790 to just under $5,000. $4,960 and on the far right an estimated revenue increase of $64,783. Looking at the one-inch meter size. Again, as I pointed out earlier, it's our benchmark and how do we compare as a utility providing cost of services for our end users. And this graph shows where we compare to other large combined water utility users here in the valley. Combined there is highlighted in red, combined for a one-inch meter, using 16,000 gallons, the end user would see a $5.21 increase on their bill.

That was the last slide that I had. I will take any questions.

Mayor Borowsky: Councilwoman Whitehead.

Councilwoman Whitehead: Mayor, are there public speakers on this item?

Mayor Borowsky: There are. It's not arranged according to topic so, I'm just going to take them all at the end.

[Time: 00:46:58]

Councilwoman Whitehead: Okay. Yeah, so, thank you. Thank you for the presentation. I would like to speak to my colleagues which we don't get to do unless it's a public meeting and also, to the public on these rates. I mean, it's very important that it delivers all that we need and desire, which is water security. And I think it's evident in this presentation that the water rate increase is very low, 4.5% sounds scary. I mean, it really does, in an inflationary time, but decades of leaders that came before us made big investments that have enabled us to keep water flowing and keep rates down. So, I just want to it will be up to this Council to decide what the rates are and what you get with those rates. You know, I want to say nobody chooses Scottsdale because it's the cheapest community. We choose Scottsdale because it's a world-class community that we can depend on to conservatively use our resources and whether it's tax dollars or water and ensure that we remain prosperous. Obviously, we live in the desert, and that scares a lot of people. That's actually our strength.

Living in a desert for generations makes sure that Scottsdale does not take water for granted and doesn't politicize water. We work together for water. And we have been very successful at that. There's many success stories. What is concern and I will take one other thing, is the situation we're in is not unexpected. We have been planning for this also, at least for 25 years. But it is much more severe than perhaps we had hoped or even planned for.

Let's just talk about some of those costs. The 34% increase in utility costs, that's carrying your water uphill whether you live in Desert Mountain or you are carrying it from the Colorado River. Those are electricity costs. Well, our water department is the biggest electricity user in Scottsdale. Our bills are anywhere from $10 to $16 million a year. When you talk about a 34% increase, that's that's a big number. We also know that water costs are going up. Water certainty of new water is going down. It's more difficult, and we're seeing drastic cuts in the Colorado River. 57% was the number that was given to us and that's 70% of our water.

So, what I'm going to be communicating with the public and with our staff and hopefully we'll be having healthy conversations up here is what are we going to fund and with these water rates? And right now, in the preliminary budget, the most certain new water source we have are advanced purified recycled water, something we have invested in for 25 years. It's zeroed out. It's not in the budget. Again, we're losing water, but we have planned for 25 years to replace that water with new water sources. So, this is not an approval of a rate, but this is my opportunity to say that the rates have to deliver that which we want, which is water security. And we're going to have to look really hard. There are four new sources of water to replace the cap, and this is long-term planning. Two of those are removed from the preliminary budget. But that's that's why it's preliminary. This Council is going to have to work together to probably fund those projects and make sure that water keeps flowing and that our rates stay low. So, I think Gilbert is the cautionary tale. I'm grateful we never went that path and I want to keep us off that path. So, thank you.

Thank you. Thank you, Councilwoman Dubauskas.

[Time: 00:51:33]

Councilwoman Dubauskas: Thank you, Mr. Walby, that was a great presentation. I appreciate the opportunity to hear from you. In your last slide with the bar graphs, you are comparing the cities and look at Chandler! Now, we've all heard what's been going on Gilbert and that their numbers are going up. What is going on in Chandler? Have they just not taken rate increases? They are significantly lower than their competitors. Can you give me a little background on that?

David Walby: Thank you, Madam Mayor and members of Council and Councilwoman Dubauskas. Yes, every utility is a little bit different and unique in terms of how they approach their water service, and I know for Scottsdale, one the things we don't get into great detail, but I think Councilwoman, you hit on it a little bit there. Water is very heavy to move uphill. And with our rate elevation changes throughout the city, we move a lot of water uphill. That being said, we have 18 major pressure zones, about 400 pressure reducing valves. Once we get that uphill, we have to lower the water pressure and make it usable in a residential or commercial business or home. That being said, Chandler has three pressure zones. They just don't have the infrastructure. They are very flat. So, from that standpoint, they don't have the same challenges in terms of cost drivers as we do, particularly looking at electricity. So, I would say that's the answer for very simplistically as to the why in respects to moving water is the reason their rates are lower, potentially.

Councilwoman Dubauskas: Thank you.

Mayor Borowsky: I see the city manager would like to say a few words.

[Time: 00:53:21]

City Manager Greg Caton: Thank you, Madam Mayor. I just wanted to add a little bit of additional context to how some other municipalities treat enterprise operations. So, the way we treat enterprise operations here, just for the audience's purposes, that's government's way of saying it operates with a business. So, with that, it doesn't receive any taxing dollars, any property tax, any sales tax, anything of that nature, and so, as the stand-alone enterprise operation fees. They actually pay into the general fund. And this is where maybe there's some differences with our counterparts across the valley. For example, we have direct costs, indirect costs that they pay into the general fund. In addition, franchise fees. The franchise fees for right-of-way and things of that nature, it's not an insignificant number for the water utility. So, that's something that our counterparts across the valley may not contribute into.

I also wanted to take the opportunity to highlight the way we do our rate increases here, particularly on the water side is we don't it's been historical that we don't want to have an increase when there's potentially higher utilization in the summer. On the wastewater side we start on July 1st which is the beginning of our fiscal year because that is a high utilization for some outdoor use on the water side, it's been practiced to delay that. And so, we delay that implementation date or effective date until November. And those of you, all of us good with math, well, then you only have two-thirds of the year. So, the rate actually for the first year will seem like a higher number because of what we actually have to capture over eight months versus 12 months. I just wanted to add that in the flavor, particularly for the water discussion, different than the wastewater discussion.

The other thing that I just want to emphasize from what my colleague presented was on the water side, 3.5% which really captures operating the operating impacts from fixed costs of utilities and other utilities that are passing on their rate increases to us. And then we've introduced this one point or one percentage increase for new source and supply as referenced from the cap reductions. We don't know what that is at this point in time, but really planning for that, for the new source and supply. Really meaning if we didn't have the cap change or the central Arizona project modification, so, we wouldn't need that. So, I thought for transparency purposes it might be helpful to separate that out.

In addition, I would briefly comment of the advanced water purification, the AWP, ADEQ, sorry, there's a couple of acronyms there, the Arizona Department of Environmental Quality added some regulations in the spring of last year. As soon as we received that information, we outsourced to an engineering contractor to understand what the capital investment costs would be for AWP and operating costs. This came up through the Budget Review Commission, recognized that we had historically budgeted this project from 15 to $20 million and escalated up to $100 million. Recognizing that was a different scenario for the capital project and so we endeavored on a yearlong process here. We will finish up this spring to present information to our policymakers to make this decision of this source and supply of the AWP. What will this cost us not only on a capital basis but ongoing expense, the operating side. So, a capital expenditure which has increased significantly from what we had originally planned and also, an operating expense. We didn't feel comfortable in this year's budget to present to kind of put a question mark or a guesstimate in the budget. So, we removed it until we have a solid number and then we're able to present that for City Council consideration. We believe that is a significant modification in our operations and want to bring that forward for consideration at a policy level before we start to introduce that into the budget process. Thank you, Madam Mayor. That completes my comments.

Mayor Borowsky: Thank you. Thank you for expanding on that. Councilwoman McAllen.

[Time: 00:57:56]

Councilwoman McAllen: Thank you, Mayor. Thank you, city manager for that. Thank you, David, our new Interim Water Director. Thank you so much. I know you have been here a very long time. Your knowledge surpasses the amount of time you have been in your current job. So, we're grateful for you.

We know this is going to literally be an uphill situation with water finding out the cuts to CAP and with the city of Scottsdale having 70% of their water portfolio in the Central Arizona Water Project, causes huge concerns if they're talking a 30, 35% or greater cut. So, it's very important that our citizens our residents understand that if their rates go up, it's because the cost of doing business and water is going up. These are things that like, Councilwoman Whitehead said that we prepared for. There are things that supersede preparedness sometimes. Like 50% of the Colorado River water not going to Phoenix or going to Arizona.

So, that being said, I know that this is just proposed ideas, but how we process our water currently and the advanced water purification and I know our city manager just explained that it's kind of in flux right now, our investment into it. Needing water and using water, especially water we already own by over purifying and the advanced water purification, it's water we already have that we don't need to purchase more of. We’ve already invested into it. I would urge us to continue that process and stay the course and keep everything on the table at this point. So, we're not losing ground, literally, groundwater and that we're at least staying even keel. Because if the cost of water is going up, then our rates are going to be going up and that's just the facts, but I don't envy your position right now. But I appreciate how much time and effort you , your department and the city manager has put into this. So, thank you.

David Walby: Thank you, Councilwoman Whitehead.

[Time: 01:00:22]

Councilwoman Whitehead: I just will add one more comment to that it's our job, again, to conservatively plan for water that we know we will need and no ratepayer will be mad if we end up with a surplus of water and end up in a situation where we can reduce costs or not raise costs in the future. But it would be very reckless to not tap an opportunity that is totally within our local control and actually not that expensive. So, I think a government's job is to deliver water and a government's job is to plan for the worst-case scenario and work diligently to deliver the best case. And so that's why it will be important. We have four new water sources, and we better make sure that we have access to all four in time and adjust our rates. Again, our rates, this is not a Gilbert scenario. We kept our rates low, especially we keep our rates for the water you need low. So, those lower tiers, we always keep those affordable. And you saw we're the third lowest in the valley. So, thank you.

Mayor Borowsky: Thank you. I don't see any other questions or comments. I will be supporting this and it's important for the public to know, as has been discussed in enterprise fund. It's not a revenue generator. These are absolute necessary costs to provide water to residents and businesses. So, and I think we have done a really good job of keeping rates down and we will continue to do that. The only discretionary amount in there is 1% for future sourcing of water and that will be necessary as well. So, thank you very much for that. Good job.

Davi Walby: Madam Mayor, Councilmembers being thank you very much.

Mayor Borowsky: Of course. Now we have Dave Bennett from Solid Waste. And he is the department director. Welcome.

[Time: 01:02:11]

Solid Waste Services Director Dave Bennett: Good evening, Madam Mayor and Councilmembers.
Yes, Dave Bennett Solid Waste Services Director. I'm here to speak about the proposed solid waste rates and fees for fiscal year '26/27. This year we once again hired an outside firm, Burns and McDowell, to perform a rate analysis. The objectives of the rate analysis were to identify the total costs of providing solid waste services and solid waste and recycling services to our customers. The analysis validated that costs were being accurately allocated to the correct customer classes. This step is crucial in ensuring that our residential ratepayers are not inadvertently subsidizing any portion of our commercial services program. And most importantly design rates that protect the financial integrity of our operation.

So, for our 85,000 plus single-family residential customers that receive weekly trash and recycling service, monthly brush and bulk collection and a host of other services, we are proposing a 2% increase. A 4% increase for 1,100 plus special refuse customers and our on-demand roll-off customers as well. And lastly, a 4% increase for commercial customers that utilize the various container sizes for their recycling needs.

This slide shows the estimated revenue each service program would generate from the proposed rate increase. In previous Council presentations, I shared this graft that illustrates the volatility we have seen in the recycling markets over the past three years. The next slide I'm going to present will give you a clearer picture on yearly recycling costs.

So, if you could, could you focus your attention on the bottom row, those three boxes going from left to right. So, the bottom left box on this slide illustrates or represents the manage cost for a ton of refuse and recycle for fiscal year '24/25. For FY 24/25, the average cost was $6.21 compared to $32.15 for every refuse ton. The bottom middle box represents the average cost for this fiscal year. This year the average cost to manage a ton of recycling has increased to $38 compared to $32.02 for every refuse ton. And the bottom right box represents the average cost over the last five years to manage a ton of recycling a ton of refuse and recycling. So, during this five-year period, our costs per ton for recycling averaged $9.40 lower than the cost to bury a refuse ton.

And if you don't mind, Mayor and Council, I want to give a quick shoutout to our residents. This year, around November, we perform an audit at our MRF, our residents did a great job, we're at a little over 11% - 11.5% contamination rate. So, that's important. Our IGA states if we if our threshold exceeds 15%, then we have to pay residual costs. So, the 24,000 tons that we bring there annually, approximately 25% or 2,400 tons is actually contaminated. So, if we had to pay that $35, residue charge, that would significantly impact our costs. So, a big shout out to our amazing residents and our outreach team that helps to keep that contamination rate low.

In regard to comparing our monthly rate to other valley cities we once again fall right in the middle of the pack. I will, once again, state as always, the level of service and the number of service we provide to our residential customers far exceeds most of the other valley cities on this list.

With that, Mayor and Council, I would be happy to answer any questions you may have.

Mayor Borowsky: Thank you so much, that was an interesting point. I didn't realize that, that we get penalized for contamination. That's good. We should spread the word a little bit louder. Councilwoman McAllen.

[Time: 01:07:22]

Councilwoman McAllen: Thank you, Mayor, thank you Dave. I love that you shouted out to our residents, and you explained why. The education, from your team, and from our city's information team, that the residents understand that their actions affect others. But with that, I have a question. If you can go back to the chart that lists out the very first chart, it lists out residential commercial front load roll off. Right there. My question for you is Holiday Park, that area of housing. Why is that singled out?

Dave Bennett: So, Madam Mayor, Councilwoman McAllen I want to say approximately in 2016, or '17, to give you a background about Holiday Park. I believe the borders are Osborn to Avalon Road, 68th Street to 64th Street. Very unique community. Back in 2016 or '17, we established this rate. I have been here for 32 years. Prior to, like, 2012 or '13, we lost a significant amount of business in that area. And so, the privates were running that. They came to find out due to the wires that are overhead and all that, there are a lot of accidents in that area, so they stopped providing services over there. We decided we will create a Holiday Park rate. We will pick them up commercial. We will also provide to eliminate blight that's in that area. We created special Holiday Park rate. So, what you are seeing on that rate, most of them are most of the properties in there are fourplexes. So, that rate typically is divided by four and passed on to the people in those the occupants and those businesses.

Councilwoman McAllen: Okay. Thank you. So, that makes sense then. So, you are using basically doing what commercial entity would have done and it's not a commercial rate. Equivalent for being residential.

Dave Bennett: Correct, Madam Mayor and Councilwoman, that is correct.

Councilwoman McAllen: Thank you for that explanation. I knew there had to be an explanation, because I thought, why would one of the poorer areas in Scottsdale be charged more. I wanted to make sure this was a reason and obviously it's safety and the overhead lines all of that. So, thank you for explaining and that actually gets divided up because it's a four-plex, one person would not be paying a greater amount, they'd be paying a dividend of it I guess or a division of it. So, thank you, Dave.

Dave Bennett: You're welcome.

Mayor Borowsky: Councilwoman Whitehead.

[Time: 01:10:17]

Councilwoman Whitehead: Thank you. I can't believe that you have been there 32 years, thank you. When the private companies give up on an area, we always fill in. So, good job. I just have a question. The recycling markets are all over the place. Is there one product in particular is it like cardboard that the failing of the cardboard market today versus two years ago? Is that what we're seeing there?

Dave Bennett: Yeah, Madam Mayor, Councilwoman Whitehead. So, the composite of our recycling stream is basically three or four main things. So, it's our cardboard and mixed paper. So, our fibers and then you have the PET or plastics and aluminum and some other items in there. The majority of the impacts in our commodity markets are in the fiber markets and PET. During this year and last year, there's a lot of the fiber that gets cleaned up before going overseas to the Asian markets. They have facilities here in the United States. Some of those facilities shut down. And so that's kind of created a problem for that that specific area. And then the PET, I will say the Asian markets have been impacted by what China is doing in relation to kind of flooding the market with raw material in that.

So, a good example on the PET, there's high density I forget the name of the material, but it's a very valuable commodity. For example, just the previous year, our partners Republic Services who processes our material, then markets it they were getting around $1,000 a ton for that high density material. Now it's around $60 a ton.

Councilwoman Whitehead: Okay, yeah, I know it's a fluctuating market. I don't like the idea of flooding it with non-recycle. And one other question, so Phoenix, when we were sending it to the Phoenix probably around another time when we were paying more, they were recycling about 70%, I think, of what came in. Is the Republic Services MRF at that level.

Dave Bennett: Madam Mayor, Councilwoman Whitehead, we currently let me give you a quick background. In 2019, yeah, our MRF that we have at the Salt River landfill that's located there, that one burned down. And so, for a little bit, two or three years, we were utilizing the city of Phoenix to recycle all of our material. We are now since 2023, taking 100% of our material to the Salt River Community Landfill.

Councilwoman Whitehead: No, I know that. The public didn't know that. I guess my question was Phoenix was reporting over 70% of what came into their MRF as ending up in some sort of market. And maybe that's an off, I'll call you. So, I was wondering if Republic Services is keeping up with that ability to divert most of 70% to a market. To a you know, where they are at.

Dave Bennett: So, with regards to the city of Phoenix, they do have some challenges with contamination. I think what you may be talking about possibly, maybe, they have a high contamination rate, than Scottsdale, I will give you an example. We had a panel discussion in Flagstaff three or four years ago and a member from the city of Phoenix team was up there and approximately 45% of their material at that time was contaminated, overall recycling stream.

Councilwoman Whitehead: Okay. So, maybe I have bad data. We'll talk offline. Thank you. And thank you for everything you are doing.

Dave Bennett: You're welcome.

Mayor Borowsky: Thank you very much. I don't see any other questions. So, thanks for joining us here, Dave. Next, we have Erin Perreault.

[Time: 01:14:37]

Senior Director Planning and Development Services Erin Perreault: Good evening, Mayor and City Councilmembers. As you know, the city as you know the city regulates development and property improvement throughout the community. With regard to that we provide services to support the development community, in those efforts. We have a fee sheet that is associated with those services that we provide. With that fee sheet, we review it annually as we are doing this evening with you and for fiscal year '26/27, the Planning and Development Services Department proposes no increases to our existing rates and fees.

However, what we are doing, we do have to add a few new fees and modify some of our existing fees due to new state mandates that are not unfamiliar to you. In terms of the land division actions that the city provides services for, those actions have been adjusted so that we do not have a public hearing process associated with them. So, we need to adjust, eliminate some of those fees and adjust some other fees associated with that.

In addition, as we have been talking with the community over the last two years, as well as with City Council, we have some new state mandated case types that have been established and should sound very familiar to you ADUs, multifamily and middle housing. With those case types we now have to establish fees for the services that we will provide to review those case types.

And then in addition, as a department, we're taking an opportunity this year to remove some fees that are associated with cost recovery for antiquated requests that we have on our fee sheet still. For example, providing information to our customers on compact discs. I can't remember a time when I saw a compact disc floating around the department. So really those eliminations are just really clean up for our customers and the fee sheet itself.

So, what that looks like in terms of the new case types we established fees based on the estimated work that would go into providing those services. In terms of accessory dwelling units, that's more of a minor review from a staff standpoint so that proposed fee is similar to the administrative review that we already provide for other minor reviews.

In terms of multifamily and middle housing, that involves not only plan review but also, design review associated with those projects. So, those fees that were established are similar to our development review fees that we have for other projects currently.

[Time: 01:17:43]

In terms of the land division fees, as I mentioned before, we're eliminating some of those fees associated with predominantly with the review and public hearing processes that we will no longer be doing and then readjusting the preliminary plat, the final plat and the certification of correction fees as per the state mandates that we're now providing.

And then finally, again, again those compact discs and providing hard copies of our general plan and other ordinances. We have not had requests for those for years. Everything is provided easily online to our customers. Should anyone come in and really want a hard copy of those, we can certainly print that in house and then just charge them the graphic printing fee for that. So, again, that's just a cleanup for us.

With that, that's the proposal for our rates and fees for '26/27 and I'm happy to answer any questions.

Mayor Borowsky: That was easy. I don't see anyone. And we have some eliminated. So, yay! There we go.

Erin Perreault: Thank you.

Mayor Borowsky: Thank you, Erin. Appreciate it. Next, we have Kevin McKee, Deputy Parks and Recreation Director.

Deputy Parks and Recreation Director Kevin McKee: Good evening, Mayor, Councilmembers. Thank you for having us out this evening. We are proposing four sets of rates and fee changes for the Parks and

Recreation and Preserve Department. And we will really only see impacts for two of those four proposals which I will go through in just a moment. I will note that all of these fees were vetted and ultimately recommended for your approval by both our Parks and Recreation Commission and our McDowell Sonoran Preserve Commission.

So, first, we'll start with the parks and recreation side of the house, with our youth sports field allocation partner team rates. So, our parks and recreation division partners with several youth sports organizations that meet specific criteria spelled out in our youth field allocation policy. So, through that, these groups receive priority for field reservations, and they also have the benefit of a discounted field rental rate. We recently updated this policy to prioritize residency for for those organizations that are serving Scottsdale residents and through that almost three-year process, we developed some new criteria for that policy. And with those policy changes, we are now ready to roll those out next fiscal year. And have to update the fees that we are assessing for that. So, under the former policy, we had our youth sports partners paying 50% of resident field rental rates year-round. We are now introducing additional non-primary season rates that will have those groups paying 75% of those resident field rental rates during the non-primary season and that's really intended to help with our field prioritization. I will also note that these fees go back to a special revenue fund that ultimately funds improvements going back to the fields used by these partner groups. So, they are not only city of Scottsdale fields, but fields used through our intergovernmental agreements with the school districts. So, you can see these four different proposed rates here. And, again, those two non-primary season rates are the new rates that we're introducing. To add some context, that would come out to, for the partner primary season rates, at 50%, that would be $5 per hour during the daytime, and $12.50 an hour for the evening time and for non-primary season, that would be $7.50 an hour. During the daytime and $18.75 during evening hours.

[Time: 01:22:20]

Next, we want to formalize a fee that we've piloted for the new Roundhouse at the McCormick Stillman Railroad Park. If you are not familiar, this opened in August of 2025. It's our new indoor playground, which is just amazing and I know a lot of community members are very excited for that. We've had a pilot fee in place of $6 per entry for one hour. It's equivalent to two ride tickets at the park. And the first accompanying adult with a paid child is admitted for free. Those fees are very affordable, it doesn't get much cheaper than that. I have three small children. It doesn't get much cheaper than that and they have been well received by the community and also, aligned with the benchmarking that we have done. So, we are hoping to make that a permanent fee.

Next, over to the McDowell Sonoran Preserve side of the house. The Preserve has a single day commercial use and guiding permit per person fee. So, this fee applies to commercial activity within the Preserve. So, things like competitive trail runs, fundraisers, bus about tours bike rental drop-off, et cetera. This fee is charge in addition to daily commercial use and guiding permit fee of $50. That current fee is $5. We are proposing a modest increase to $7 and that will help us to achieve full cost recovery. And as well as it will align with fees assessed by the Maricopa County Park System. So, again, we're going from $5 to $7.

And the last proposal we are making is really more of a clerical change to make sure we're in line. We've gone through some reorganization over the last year. So, this is to help clean up our rates and fees. This is the annual professional photography permit, and this is adding a permit line to the permit fee schedule, again following those organizational changes. So, that is all I have for you. Happy to answer any questions that you have.

Mayor Borowsky: Thank you, Councilwoman McAllen.

[Time: 01:25:00]

Councilwoman McAllen: Thank you, Mayor. Thank you, Kevin, for the presentation. I'm really glad that you guys looked at the residential aspect of the youth sports and allocating those fields accordingly, because many of the sport activities that the teams that were happening, we know that there are a lot of people who aren't residents and they were getting the resident fee reduction that presented itself as a Scottsdale group. So, taking the time for the Parks and Recreation Commission and your department, looking at that, making sure that those youth sports teams are actually predominantly Scottsdale residents in order to get that break, is really great. So, thank you for doing that. And investing the time and for all the people on the Parks and Rec Commission that did that. I appreciate your work. Thank you.

Mayor Borowsky: Thank you. Councilwoman Whitehead.

Councilwoman Whitehead: Thanks Kevin looks great. I wanted to call out; Councilwoman Littlefield and I were involved in the round house discussion. It was so important that if he used the public dollars to make sure that pretty much it would be affordable for all kids. And so, I'm thrilled. I was thrilled when that $6 fee was tested out and I'm absolute supportive of keeping it at $6 so thank you and park staff committed to us then that yes, we will keep this affordable for all children. So, good job.

Kevin McKee: Thank you.

Mayor Borowsky: Thanks. Councilwoman Littlefield.

Councilwoman Littlefield: Thank you, Mayor. Yes, I will ditto what Solange just said. Thank you for doing that.

Mayor Borowsky: Councilwoman Dubauskas.

Councilwoman Dubauskas: Hi, Kevin, thank you so, much. On the single day commercial use guiding permit per person fee, going from $5 to $7, that doesn't feel like a big number, maybe achieving $1,000 difference. Is there any opportunity to keep it at $5? It seems like we are nickeling and diming a little bit here.

Kevin McKee: I'm going to, looking over at the experts on the Preserve.

Councilwoman Dubauskas: We want to urge people to come and keep it as low cost as possible. I don't care what Maricopa County costs. I want people to come to our Preserve right and come to Scottsdale and be motivated and think low dollars. Just like we were able to achieve the $6 for the Round House, you know, $5 here. That feels nice. That's a good number. And $1,000. Really? So, just to me, I was thinking that's one that could we potentially take a look at that? And the comments I had were on the stadium. So, they are not you. Thank you.

Kevin McKee: Thank you.

Mayor Borowsky: I also have a question about the photography, the professional photography fee. Can you talk about that a little bit more and where was it before? If it's just been moved or whatever you mentioned, the clerical update and why do we charge people to take pictures in the Preserve?

Kevin McKee: So, this this change yes to your point, Mayor Borowsky, was formerly listed under what was formerly community services division. And so, this this change is just reorganizing that under directly under the Preserve division. This is a fee that has been previously approved multiple times by the McDowell Sonoran Preserve Commission back in 2017 and 2020. And I could ask my colleagues in the Preserve Department to maybe expand on that a little more.

Mayor Borowsky: Because it doesn't seem like it would cost us anything to have professional photographers taking pictures. And it would be an advertisement for us potentially. Super curious about this.

[Time: 01:29:31]

Parks and Recreation Manager Kelsey Lamper: Mayor, members of the Council, Kelsey Lamper, Preserve Manager. This only applies to commercial photography, not personal photography.

Mayor Borowsky: Do we have someone checking at the gate. How does that get even get enforced?

Kelsey Lamper: No, we don't have someone checking at the gate. Those commercial photographers have to apply annually or in this case well, this is the annual permit, but there are also single day use permits for professional photography.

Mayor Borowsky: It seems like everyone could be a professional photographer with social media.

Kelsey Lamper: Yeah, enforcement is something that we can enforce 100%, but we do have success with ensuring that these commercial photographers are permitted.

Mayor Borowsky: Okay. And do you know how much revenue that generates per year?

Kelsy Lamper: Currently that generates I believe it's $3,500 a year, $3,900 per year.

Mayor Borowsky: Yeah, I don't like that one. I will let Councilwoman Whitehead.

Councilwoman Whitehead: Yeah, so I will weigh in on this. First of all, I want to make sure everybody knows I think they do. The Preserve is free, right? So, I agree with Councilwoman Dubauskas, we want everybody to have access. These are charges for commercial operations, and I really support that, and the reason I support that is because we do get, just like in our swimming pools, the same thing. We get complaints from the residents and visitors if you have huge commercial operations coming in with lots of people and sort of taking up space in the Preserve if you will. The photography, it's not person who wants to take picture of a bird but it's for a wedding photo-type situation. I think that's what I have always understood. So, I think it's just a delineation. It's not about revenue. It's just about balance, keeping the Preserve accessible to the public and not in the sense taken over by commercial entities. I think in the early discussions, gosh decades ago, that's really what we were trying to achieve and ensure that, in fact, it is free and accessible to any visitor or member of the public who wants to come by.

Mayor Borowsky: So, Councilwoman Whitehead just added a lot more color to that. Is that the criteria? What qualifies one as a commercial photographer? That is required to get a permit? How is that defined?

[Time: 01:32:33]

Greg Caton: Madam Mayor, I have my colleagues looking up some data there. I wanted to add a little more context. It's not uncommon for municipalities to charge when there's public space when there's commercial activity that is generating potential profit. And so, that is how many organizations look at it. But that's certainly up to the governing body. If someone utilizes something for personal utilization, personal use, if you will, then that feels different for a commercial activity that is likely charging someone else. So, that's it's not uncommon to look at public space through that lens, but that, again, is something up for Council consideration.

Mayor Borowsky: I was still looking for the answer on what qualifies someone for thank you for that, Greg. Commercial photographer.

Kelsey Lamper: Sure. Mayor, members of Council, commercial would be classified as someone who is charging a fee to others for those photographs.

Mayor Borowsky: So, like someone yeah, head shots. Okay. I will pass this along to Councilwoman McAllen.

Councilwoman McAllen: Thank you, Mayor. As the past Chair of the Parks and Recreation Commission, two times, actually being on staff when we originally wrote fees and charges way back in the '80s, the commercial aspect is really an important delineation because as taxpayers, you get everything for free. You go to your parks, you use all of that. But if you start going to your basketball, the basketball court at Indian School Park or at Mountain View Park where someone is holding their own aerobics class not paying the fees, they are using it, and so, the use of the facility gets worn down, but it's not by a taxpayer. It's by someone else, a business making money off residents' goods. So, that is really important to point out. In the Preserve, a professional photographer would also be possibly a class, someone teaching people to shoot wildlife, things of that nature where people are being charged to attend a class and then they come out and they are possibly, you know, louder, or may need a certain private area. So, that charge would also incur something like that. So, I know it seems nominal, but it's really important that our facilities, our Preserve, our parks are uses for our residents and people who visit Scottsdale, but that nobody is abusing that use to the expense of the taxpayer. Just a comment.

Mayor Borowsky: Vice Mayor Kwasman.

[Time: 01:35:24]

Vice Mayor Kwasman: This is the dumbest fee I have ever seen in my entire life. This raises no money, this is useless and this is about a principle of making sure that could you go free to a certain place but you can't charge money for a certain place. Nothing is free. There's public services. Nothing is free. It's taxpayer funded. Y'all are paying for it. You’re paying it, I’m paying it. I hate when I hear politicians tell me that something is free. It's not true. They are just not charging a surcharge. The purpose of a tax is to is to do two things, influence behavior and raise revenue. It is it is a legal form of pocketing other people's money. This does not work. Clearly this tax is inefficient. How people used this tax last year?

Mayor Borowsky: 13.

Vice Mayor Kwasman: 13 people. I think this is absolutely absurd. And if people are going to vote for a fee increase on principle or a keep a fee on principle because they love fees so, much, God bless 'em, right? But I'm not supporting this. This is raises no money and it's for 13 people. Get rid of it.

Mayor Borowsky: Well, and taking, going along the lines of what you just said, it's for the 13 people that were honest.

Vice Mayor Kwasman: Oh, right.

Mayor Borowsky: There's about 1,300 people that weren't.

Vice Mayor Kwasman: You're 100% right.

Mayor Borowsky: That's even more ridiculous. It's like unenforceable and the people that are just honest, it's kind of sad, which I'm proud of them for being honest, but so, all right. Enough of that. So, I don't know how we carve some things out, but it sounds like we want to I would agree with the $5 maintaining the $5 fee as well. I think seven is just awkward. Yeah. Councilman Graham.

Councilman Graham: So, is there a motion to take a sledgehammer to that fee?

Mayor Borowsky: It's direction. So…

Councilman Graham: My other question, my other suggestion is we should bring those 13 people in that paid and maybe do some sort of proclamation and do some sort of recognition, like that's the kind of honesty and integrity we want to celebrate in this city. Thank you.

Mayor Borowsky: All right. I think you do you have your direction. I think we some consensus on those items. Somebody wants to keep the fee, but we're moving right along. Thank you for your presentations. We appreciate it and keep up the good work.

Next, we have Kyle Urban, Stadium Operations Senior Manager who is probably very busy this time of the year. It's been beautiful out there.

[Time: 01:38:07]

Stadium Operations Senior Manager Kyle Urban: Pleasure to be with you, Madam Mayor, and City Council. Team U.S.A. was at the stadium, so it’s been quite a busy day for us. I’m here to talk about raising fees at Scottsdale Stadium. We are proposing a blanket fee increase of 5% across all of our rental areas. We have roughly 11 different areas that we have a fee for; those are broken down in the slides that will follow. We're proposing these changes because we haven't raised our rates since 2023. I've included some very generic information about the C.P.I. that I won't bore you with, but our goal is to cover some of the cost increases we have experienced, as the costs of doing business have gone up and the cost of custodial, which is our primary or I guess our largest expense on annual basis has gone up.

We will show you some of our fees here and I can talk about what's new and what is changed. With this 5%, we have done some rounding as well to make these numbers easy to sell in the public space. With that, you will see there were a couple of fees in the past that had 50 cents attached to them at the end. We made it round. So that when our events coordinator and our events team are going out in public, they have some easy and more sticky numbers to share with folks.

Additionally, I’ll speak to this one, you will see there are a number of new fees that are included. Among these fees, we have a fee for our first base patio. We came to get a pilot fee for that, when we were under Parks and Recreation and ran with that at the pilot fee rate. We would like to make that permanent. That matches the Charro Lodge. It's a similarly size and similarly populated area simply different part of the stadium. Along with that, we built a left field patio last year and our hope is that left field patio can also match those fees.

Having fees for each of these spaces allows us to rent out the facility to our maximum ability and having some consistency across those spaces helps when we are trying to sell to folks that are interested in renting multiple areas.

Let's see. And this is our last page here. And apologize to the folks in the audience. I know these are a lot of different fees but hey are 5% across the board without considering the ones I called out individually as new fees and I'm happy to take any questions.

Mayor Borowsky: Thank you. Councilwoman Dubauskas.

Councilwoman Dubauskas: thank you Madam Mayor. On the first slide that you showed us, that had the Field House on the yes. You zeroed the zero out for the Banyan Room half day. Was that on purpose?

Kyle Urban: It was indeed, and in fact, I forgot got to cover. That the reason we took that a wax the Banyan Room is a third-floor room and I believe many of you have met there before. It's incredibly difficult to get equipment in and out of, and very, very staff labor intensive. The half day fee actually hasn't been used very heavily, and for us, we feel that if we're going to use that space, it behooves us to have it be a full day rental.

Councilwoman Dubauskas: So, we won't offer it for the half day.

Kyle Urban: That is correct, we would still offer the full day.

Councilwoman Dubauskas: And then I wanted to understand with the remainder of the fees, like the left field and, you know, the locker room. Is that year-round? Is that during spring training? Like, do we have different fees for during spring training? Can you explain.

[Time: 01:42:06]

Kyle Urban: Yes, absolutely. Thank you, Councilwoman, with spring training, the Giants have exclusive use rights to Scottsdale Stadium in February and March. So, what they charge during that time, we don't have a say in. The other ten months of the year, we're looking to program those spaces as much as possible. So that the citizens of Scottsdale can use the facility and everyone in the community in Scottsdale can benefit from it.

Councilwoman Dubauskas: So, the idea is that during the off-baseball season, someone might want to rent the left berm patio for an event?

Kyle Urban: Exactly. And we actually have 22 different events that are booked for April at that stadium outside of that use period and year over year we continue to increase demand there and as we expand, we certainly want to keep you with the market. We did some venue analysis in 2019, when establishing these fees for the first time and also did some venue analysis in 2024 to look at what others are charging. And we're a little bit unique in that we have to compare not only to other ballparks but know where we are located compared to event venues in Old Town that we are competing against every day.

Councilwoman Dubauskas: This is helpful. Thank you.

Kyle Urban: You bet.

Mayor Borowsky: Councilwoman Whitehead.

Councilwoman Whitehead: Thank you, Mayor, and thank you Kyle. You guys are doing a great job. A bunch of us were at the stadium and you had the fire drill and up as calm as could be. So, good job on that. I was feeling for you. Those were good questions. So, we, this is still pretty new in that we didn't really I think when I first was elected, we didn't even have access to the stadium in the off-season. Were we charging? So, is this whole fee structure pretty new?

Kyle Urban: So, we did have fees in place before historically. I can give you just a snapshot of sort of where we're at for this year in the nonuse period or the non-Giants use period compared to '21/22.

Councilwoman Whitehead: That’s okay, no, I don't need that. I know, I just we built the extension of the stadium, but I thought that we the city did not have use the stadium or use the fields off season.

Kyle Urban: It's changed over time since the '90s, since the new version of the stadium was built. We used to have a Triple A team, we no longer have that. But we’ve gone from 33 event days in '21/22 to close to 100.

Councilwoman Whitehead: Good job.

Kyle Urban: And then we have four months of baseball at the baseball park so.

Councilwoman Whitehead: Good job and thanks for being here.

Mayor Borowsky: Thank you. I don't see any other questions. So, we appreciate you presenting to us tonight.

Kyle Urban: Thank you.

Mayor Borowsky: Next, we have Kevin Burke, Economic Development and Tourism Senior Director.

[Time: 01:44:47]

Economic Development and Tourism Senior Director Kevin Burke: Thank you, Madam Mayor, members of the Council finally the item you have all been waiting for, this is event banner fees. So, the city maintains 194 banners on light poles in the Old Town area, as well as provides ability for special event producers to use two banners overhead on Scottsdale Road.

What we are proposing is a phased in three-year cost recovery approach to begin to recoup some of the actual costs of the city's contract costs for the placement and the removal of these banners primarily that is associated with the vertical banners which are pictures here on those 194 light poles throughout Old Town. So, at present, the fees for the horizontal banners across the street are $150. We propose next year to increase that to $200. At the end of the three-year period it would be increased to $300.

For the vertical banners, our current fee is $25. So, we're proposing in the first year to increase those to $33. Those will be increased to $50 at the end of the three-year phased in cost recovery period.

I would be happy to answer any questions on that.

Mayor Borowsky: I just I have ask, why is it necessary to have costs gone up for us to to manage these? Or what's the basis for the increases?

Kevin Burke: Madam Mayor, members of the Council. Historically, my understanding is that city staff actually was responsible for putting up and taking down those banners. A number of years ago, we stopped doing that is was essentially overtime costs that the city was incurring to do that and so we moved to an outsourcing contractor model. We know very clearly what the cost is to actually put those banners up and put them down because we are paying a contractor to do it. In this current fiscal year, the city is effectively subsidizing the cost to place those banners and so this three-year cost recovery approach is intended to close that gap.

Mayor Borowsky: Thank you. That's helpful. I appreciate it. Thank you very much Kevin.

Kevin Burke: Thank you.

Mayor Borowsky: Next, we have Mike Beck, the Library Department Director.

[Time: 01:47:09]

Library Department Director Mike Beck: Okay, good evening, Mayor and Council. It's my pleasure to be with you tonight. I'm here to talk and represent the proposed library fees for '26/27. Next slide, please.

So, first, I'm requesting formal establishment of rental room rates for the designated Civic Center Library Platinum Room and the Arabian Branch Collaboration Room currently not on the meeting room schedule. So, the library regularly uses our rooms for programming. So when they are not in use, we rent these rooms. They are available for private and commercial rentals through facilities booking office. Reservations are managed centrally through, and the interested parties can book online through that office or by calling 480-312-7707. Currently the library has eight meeting rooms available. So, this would raise our total to ten.

So, what we're asking for is the formal approval to add these exiting meeting rooms to our rates and fees schedule. These rooms are already fully equipped and so with Council direction, these rooms can be made available almost immediately after July 1st pending your approval. There's clear demand for public facility meeting spaces. So, like HOAs, businesses and private people can rent these rooms. By adding these spaces, this will expand our availability and meet growing demand and generate additional revenue and the library will continue to look for ways in which we can generate additional revenue opportunities for rental rooms but also, we can market and promote the service as well.

Next, I'm proposing the reestablishment or the establishment of a $15 collection agency fee for long overdue materials. The library is utilized a collection agency since 1998, and many valley libraries use this same provider. This service has a strong return on investment. So, for every dollar we spend on invoicing, we get $6 in either financial restitution, or on materials returned back. So, for example in FY 24/25, we spent $14,000 on invoices and we recovered over $93,000 in either financial restitution or on our returned materials.

Prior to sending an account to a collection agency, patrons receive up to three notifications from the library to kind of give them a heads up and a warning that the items overdue. So, we do notices at three days, six days and ten days. So, this proposed $15 fee would only apply to those patrons who have ignored those notifications and only sent to the collection agency after 45 days after the last notice. So, at least 55 days' notice. So, after that we elicit these services of collection agency, and they do a gentle nudge process. Meaning that they further include up to three letters. They also do multiple emails, phone calls, and even do skip tracing if necessary to kind of help safeguard and protect our collection. Overdue accounts are updated daily. So, when a patron returns those materials and collection agency referrals are submitted weekly. When materials are not returned, they are marked lost. So, the $15 fee would cover approximately 128% of the average agency cost. So, we pay directly $11.73. So, we are proposing a $15 one-time flat fee that accounts for inflation postage increases because we work they work through the postal service.

But also, material replacement and staff time. So, this is a cost that the city currently absorbs and so, this proposal simply passes that cost to the small number of patrons that are having materials at least over 55 days overdue and who have not responded to repeated notices. Importantly to note is that since July 1, 2020, the library has not charged overdue fines.

[Time: 01:51:22]

So, library materials check out for free. Our goal is not to penalize patrons but help to ensure the timely return of the materials so that others can access and reserve them. The recovery reduces resource placement costs. So, almost invariably the items that are checked out are more likely the new materials and so, we also have to replace those materials. It helps to preserve the book budgets and if also, allows patrons to receive requested material more quickly. We are anticipating that this proposal would approximately be $9,000 in additional revenue.

Finally, I'm proposing a modest fee for a 3D printer usage. Earlier this year, this Mayor and Council approved the library's $25,000 Maker's grant. So, thank you for that. So, we are in the process of implementing that grant and we purchased new 3D printers. Currently the 3D print jobs are free during the grant term but after July 1, we are proposing a modest fee of 10 cents per gram per print job for each 3D printing job. So, the good news is the printer C.A.D. software tells us exactly how much it weighs and it makes pricing transparent and easy to calculate. Within a week and a half, if you go to the next slide, I put a modest $500 fee and I will humbly fall on the sword. Ina week and a half of launching, we already have 74 3D printing requests. I might be able to add a one or a zero on that $500 so, I think we have really hit on something big. It's a value-added resource and it's a new service and so, we're looking for opportunities to continue this service beyond the term of the grant. And so, with that, I will be happy to answer any questions you may have at this time.

Mayor Borowsky: Councilwoman Dubauskas.

[Time: 01:53:18]

Councilwoman Dubauskas: Mike, thank you so much. My little girls use the library. Recently we had a project on Marie Curie. And my daughter couldn't find the book. And so, I got several emails. Finally, we found it in the library bag of the third grader before she put it responsibly where it was supposed to go. We have been recipients of these emails, of course not to collections. I think it's really important that we maintain it enough in this kind of friendly, you know if you are overdue but, you know, there's no cost sometimes those things happen. So, I'm not really comfortable with the idea of having collection agency fees. I feel like we want to really encourage people I understand your point. Which is we want the books back so that other people can enjoy them as well. But I do feel like the system works really well today. I get emails. They let me know. And so, I would recommend that we take that fee out. It doesn't seem to bring enough revenue to be worth of irritation for me. You might then decide not to use the library because you are aggravated over $20 or something, the 15 bucks or something. So, I would recommend that we remove that.

I did see that the offer for the free 3D printing that came to residents. I received the email and I'm sure many of us did. I think that's really neat. Maybe you could come give us an update after a few months, how is that going? What are people, can you give us pictures of what people are building? I think that could be really fun.

Mike Beck: Fantastic. Thank you, Councilwoman Dubauskas.

Mayor Borowsky: Councilwoman McAllen.

Councilwoman McAllen: Thank you, Mayor. Mike, thank you for the presentation. I have a question about the room rental. Is this for Scottsdale residents only or can nonresidents reserve the room at a greater price?

Mike Beck: Yes, ma'am. Mayor, Councilwoman McAllen, that is correct. And so, the platinum room is the rectangular room on the basement level of Civic Center, and the collaboration room is the room directly behind the public service desk at Arabians. Yes.

Councilwoman McAllen: Is it reservable only for Scottsdale residents or can non-Scottsdale residents reserve it and be charged extra how we do all fees everywhere else?

Mike Beck: Yes, and so Mayor and Councilwoman McAllen. So, we would be adding the fees so that existing policy is still in place. So, what we would do is they would have a yes, we would have a commercial rate and then we also have a resident and nonresident rate, I believe.

Councilwoman McAllen: Thank you.

Mayor Borowsky: Thank you. Councilwoman Whitehead.

[Time: 01:56:09]

Councilwoman Whitehead: Thank you, Mayor. So, I will say using humor and logic I also no longer support the $3,000 revenue stream on the photography in the Preserve. Thank you, Mr. Kwasman and all. So, what was the fee go back to Councilwoman Dubauskas' comment on the service, whatever the debt collection. Can you show me where is that fee. How much are we collecting on that?

Mike Beck: It's about two-thirds down. Under miscellaneous. So, we pay this fee currently out of the library's operating budget so, it's about $11.73 right now. And so, the collection agency fee also helps us put some gravitas behind it. Typically, we have 360 and 16,000 books that go to lost status. We add 16,000 to 18,000 volumes a year. So, if you do some quick math, we are losing anywhere from 4,000 to 12,000 books and so, we've staff is recommending the collection agency fee so, instead of saying can you please bring our materials back, we say please don't bring it back pretty please. So, this gives us a little gravitas. We already, customers and residents are already able to check out the materials for free and we feel like this one small $15 fee was worth charging that as an offset to help balance out that fee. Because if they continue to if we continue to have materials that go to that lost rate, you know, we could actually almost break even on our print collection and so, like I said, in a typical year we add 16,000 to 18,000 new items. If we are running that gamut of having between 4,000 and 12,000 books lost a year, we are barely getting our collection ahead. That's why we're coming to Council this year to propose that fee and help stop that a little bit.

Councilwoman Whitehead: Yeah, I think it's a really friendly service. I certainly have spent many you know, many hours in the library with my three kids when they were kids. I kind of I feel like I want to leave that to your discretion. I want to support your advice on that, because libraries do struggle and we have done really well and keep our libraries clean, well-stocked and adding new services and the 3D printers are so cool. So, I think that's something that, yeah, it doesn't sound like something I would want to support, a collection service, but because we are so, resident oriented and so my son left a book in the desert so when I brought it back, it had tooth marks in the it because of the mice out there and it was rejected. I thought it was cute.

And then the room rental is huge. I get requests for room. I think that's really important and I'm the Makerspace, the 3D printer. We're just Scottsdale and this library is just one of the many reasons we fell in love with Scottsdale. So, I think if you are advising to keep that service, to add that gravitas and make sure that those people would really aren't going to return the books otherwise, I will support you on that. So thanks.

Mike Beck: Thank you, Mayor and Councilmen.

Mayor Borowsky: Vice Mayor Kwasman.

Vice Mayor Kwasman: I have a dumb question. Why don't we treat people like adults and if you don't return the book by a certain amount of time, it costs money to replace the book?

Mike Beck: Mayor, Councilmember Kwasman, and so, we do, that's what we do. When somebody has an item that's more than 45 days lost, they get charged or that book goes to lost status and they are charged the retail price for the book that we pay for. For example, if somebody checked out 30 overdue books and didn't bring them back, we are looking at anywhere between $500 to $800 for that. We hired the collection agency to get that whole entire $500 to $800 in materials returned.

Vice Mayor Kwasman: Right.

Mike Beck: And that's what we charge the collection agency fee. The library has done their due diligence, but they are not responding to us and therefore we have to respond and forward their account to the collection agency. We are talking about real numbers. For example, the collection agency from the last fiscal year was $93,000 in materials that we didn't have to buy back again. I hope I answered your question clearly. Thank you, Councilmember Kwasman.

Mayor Borowsky: All right, I don't see any other questions or comments, and I would support leaving that to your discretion too, for sure.

Mike Beck: Thank you.

Mayor Borowsky: All right. We will move along to Chief, last but not least, Chief LeDuc.

Mike Beck: Thank you and have a good evening.

Mayor Borowsky: Thank you so, much. Police Chief Joseph LeDuc.

[Time: 02:00:54]

Police Chief Joseph LeDuc: Good evening, everyone. Good evening, honorable Mayor, Councilmembers. Mine should be relatively quick. I'm covering two fee adjustments. As you know, as part of the service to our community, we provide safety and security to those who want to hire our officers in an off-duty capacity. And in addition to that, we sometimes do provide a vehicle for these services if it's a footprint that's large enough to patrol or if it's on a roadway and we need a vehicle with lights and what have you.

So, we have increased rates, ranging anywhere from 10.5% to about 13.5% as outlined on this table. What this does is it brings us directly back into the market in the valley where the police officers what they earn and any off-duty capacity. You will see a little bit of an increase in holiday pay because that's usually earned about double time and a half. So, that's why you see much bigger figures there, but it's pretty straightforward. The vehicle fee which we do collect to offset some of the costs of using the vehicle went up a dollar to get us back into market, so we weren't too far off. And that is all I have if you have any questions, I'm happy to answer them.

Mayor Borowsky: Great, I don't see any questions. The closer. All right. We do have two public comments and sorry to oh, city attorney.

Interim City Attorney Luis Santaella: Mayor and members of the City Council, we would ask that the Council do a motion regarding the suggested fees, just so, we're clear about the direction tonight.

Mayor Borowsky: Do you want to remind us? I think we took out the $7 one. Do you have a list?

Luis Santaella: Yes, so the guide fee is reduced from $7 to $5, and the commercial photography would be eliminated and then when we're not what we're not 100 clear on whether the Council supports the collection fee or not.

Mayor Borowsky: If he thinks it's the right way to go. That's a lot of books that are missing. That’s a lot of money.

Councilwoman McAllen: $93,000. I would make that motion that we proceed with the suggested fees and charges minus the making the one from 7 to five and excluding the $300 photography fee.

Councilwoman Whitehead: I think we should all nod or do we want to we're not really supposed to vote, I thought.

Luis Santaella: It's agendized for possible direction.

Councilwoman Whitehead: Okay, well, that's direction I support.

Mayor Borowsky: Let's hear from the speakers real quick. So, Ben Kauffman, are you still here? All right. Thanks for your patience.

[Time: 02:03:59]

Ben Kauffman: Hello, my name is Ben Kauffman, address 8007 East McClellan Boulevard. I have been a resident for 15 years, first time speaker. So, I wanted to talk about trash. So, really appreciate the city, you know, I think they have been doing a great job in the trash collection, pleasantly surprised about the 2% increase that was proposed. I do want to point out some alarming growth rate trends in the solid waste. Since 2017, to this proposed rate, trash has gone up 102%, compared to other cities which haven't seen such a drastic increase. So, Chandler has gone up 28%. Tempe has gone up 38%. Mesa has gone up 22% in that same period. It's pretty alarming that Scottsdale has gone up 102%, where other cities have managed, I think, a lower percent growth over that time period. And I recognize that service levels could change.

Other factors play into it, but I think having that detail in this presentation would be helpful for residents to understand the changing dynamic and budgetary factors. Being an enterprise fund, I do think it's important to have the budget to come along with the rate so we can understand the inputs that the rates are coming to. And so, I think there's a lot of gaps or things missing in the presentation for the rates if it is supposed to support the budget and the operations and the costs.

A couple factors I really want to highlight. So, the budget piece really would be helpful to have cost drivers, really historical and projected cost drivers in terms of gas, vehicle costs, the recycling cost usage and so, it's hard to pick out and paint the picture of really what's going on to really drive the cost growth to reflect the residency need. Also, really want to highlight over the past couple of years of the presentation, there's been items that have talked about in terms of ROI, a good idea is that alley conversion costs $1 million over 4 years and illusioned to cost savings I would be curious what we received in terms of savings on those investments.

An then Lastly, it is 2%, but what is the current fund balance of the Solid Waste Department, and could the fund balance be used to minimize or avoid a cost increase this year while we evaluate the cost in totality. Again, really move the service. I think they do a great job. I think having some transparency and just having a more lively discussion in terms of total program would be helpful for residents and the staff and the Council. Thank you.

Mayor Borowsky: Great, thank you very much. You raised some excellent points, and I see Dave Bennett Solid Waste Services Department Director is back to maybe speak to some of those. To thank you for coming to visit with us tonight.

[Time: 02:07:22]

Dave Bennett: Yeah, Madam Mayor, Councilmembers if I could if the gentleman could come back up to the mike. I want to make sure I address all of his points. Number one when we talk about our rates and fees, I want to say back in 2016, that's what when our rate was $16 for our residential monthly rate was $16. That year, we did a they had our rates and fees analysis. Hadn't been done for ten years and you had a markable change then. And then as we went into cost drivers going into subsequent years, one of our major cost drivers was related to operational costs during COVID and then we had cost drivers related to recyclables if you remember in I believe '21, fiscal year '21 when we had the lost of the MRF and we had to take our materials to recycling or to Phoenix. That I.G.A. with the community, with the public services who was the operator of that, they claimed force majeure. And we had to renegotiate a recycling agreement. The previous recycling agreement had a floor price of $5. No matter what the recycling markets were at that time. We always received $5. That completely changed after that. That was another cost driver.

And if you can remember and we're seeing this this year, previous to that, we didn't have the most stellar safety record. I believe 2021, 2022, we were paying out around 1,200,000 in property and liability claims. This year, or last year, I should say, fiscal '24/25, we paid out $48,000.

Some other decreased costs this year, that we that we're seeing is our fleet, that's fuel costs and M & R costs have been reduced and to speak about the alley conversion, the ROI, we did see that. So, in 2003, we had approximately, I want to say 70 some 6,000 residents. Right now, we have 85,000. Then at that time, we were hauling around 55,000 residential tons each year. We're doing that now. This past year, we hauled with 85,000 residents, we hauled away disposed of 55,000 residential tons and with that right there is a big impact of removing all of those extra recycling or excuse me, the extra refuse containers out of the alleys. And residents were forced to have curbside container service and pay for the extra tonnage that they were actually producing. So, I hope that helps you with some of the questions.

Ben Kauffman: No, I appreciate it. Yes, I appreciate it. I think it's just having the budget to go along with the rates to have a complete informed discussion for the residents to see, right, because I think you guys are probably efficient. It's just hard to understand. Thank you.

Mayor Borowsky: Thank you so, much. That was great response off the cuff there. So, thank you. Appreciate it. Let's see we're done. Linda, I'm sorry. Linda Milhaven.

[Time: 02:10:47]

Linda Milhaven: Thank you, Mayor and Council. My name is Linda Milhaven, I live here on Belgian Trail in Scottsdale. I would like to talk to you about water rates and fees. I'm glad to see from the discussion tonight, it looks as though you will plan on supporting the current rate increases. Because as we know, I applaud all of you for the work you do to try to keep the tax rates and fees as low as possible. But we know that we also need to blend that with quality. None of us chose to live in Scottsdale because it is the cheapest housing we can find. We all pay a premium to live here because of the quality. And so, I think the same thing should apply when it comes to water. It's not that we want the cheapest water but we need to be investing in quality and sustaining our water future. So, I'm glad to see that you are going to approve the increases.

As you know, the water rates pay for capital improvements and one of the things that is of great concern to me is the fact that you are planning to take out the Bartlett Dam expansion and the advanced water purification out of the five-year CIP. I have spoken with you and disagreed with a lot of actions this Council has taken, and nothing causes greater concern than to take the two water projects out of the long-term capital plan. I know it's been suggested that it's not a change in policy, but it in fact suggests a change in policy. We know that the water we will have to take water cuts, and we need to find additional sources of water. By leaving them in the CIP, we it stays as part of the plan, it's a place holder to say that we need to continue to investigate those options as additional sources of water to take them out is suggesting that those are projects we're not interested in. And I think that that would be folly without additional discussion. Also, three senior members of the water department have departed to make substantial changes in policy without new leadership in place, I think would also be folly.

And finally, the sustainability plan included a section that talked about conserving water and as we approach the drought we have to not only look for additional sources of water and inform our residents about how to conserve water. I would encourage you to also at least revisit the water conservation portion of the sustainability plan to help inform our residents.

And then interestingly enough, the solid waste conversation, maybe a few more comments, the solid waste conversation, the sustainability plan also, included sections about how to improve reuse and recycling, which as we saw recycling costs us a lot less than refuse and so, I think that would make common sense as well. So, I hope that you will love up to our long history of leadership in the water world, approve the rate increases today, leave the two projects in the five-year CIP, and revisit the sustainability plan to enhance water conservation. Thank you for your time.

Mayor Borowsky: Thank you very much, Linda. All right. That concludes our public comment period and so, that is closed, and so, we have a motion on the table, I think this was a second. Do we have the motion? You That was on the agenda it up, those comments. agenda item, those comments. Let's take a vote on that. All right.

Now we have public comment. All right. Which you will be up here shortly.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Public comment is reserved for Scottsdale citizens, business owners and/or property owners to comment on non-agendized items that are within the Council's jurisdiction. No official Council action can be taken on these items and speakers are limited to three minutes to address the Council. If you wish to speak and you haven't already signed up by this time at night, you can let the city clerk know, but I will start with Steve Sutton, followed by Melissa Kemp, Linda Milhaven, Yvonne Cahill and Crystal Carroll.

[Time: 02:15:25]

Steve Sutton: Good evening, Council. At last week's Council meeting, Adam Kwasman, in what can only be described as an emotional outburst, erroneously asserted that I made a threat and appeal to insight physical violence against the Council. He was referring to me saying the over 2,000-year-old phrase that today is a metaphor for an unwavering commitment to a cause and relentless advocacy for a single goal calling for the total defeat of something. The day after Mr. Kwasman's outburst, the Scottsdale city attorney asked me if I would be willing to meet to discuss to help with his goal that ensure residents staff and elected officials interact in a respectful and protective environment. My attorney and I met with the city attorney today. Today, it was made perfectly clear to the city attorney that I have not and am not threatening physical violence. I have never acted in a way that a reasonable person could interpret as a physical threat to the Council. I have always acted and will continue to act with the bounds of the law. It is very hypocritical for any Councilmember to imply that I'm a threat when since May 2025 through action and inaction, the Council has increased the probability I will be physically assaulted.

What some of you said inside and outside this chamber, which your surrogates have published for you on social media and said in person to disparage and harass me, Barry Graham's false and tailed attempt to use the police to intimidate and potentially arrest me, you have increased the probability that I will be physically attacked. None of you have publicly protested those actions toward me.

Now what was said at the February 24th Council meeting that should be most alarming to everyone was Adam Kwasman saying, quote, from language in German that did not start until there were Jews on the Council. Mr. Kwasman is insinuating I made anti-Semitic comments. On September 25, 2025, I used German words that do not have an English equivalent, the words (German word), which roughly translates attempting to make something better but making it worse, and (German word), which means pleasure from someone's misfortune. For the record, I'm not what Mr. Kwasman and Mr. Graham's supporters have said I am, I am not an anti-Semite, mentally ill or someone on a police watch list.

At the end of the same September 25th Council meeting, I asked Mr. Graham to pardon me, I asked Mr. Kwasman to ask Mr. Graham to intercede in stopping their supporters from calling me a skinhead which is coded language for Nazi. Mr. Kwasman refused to do so. Mr. Kwasman's comment insinuating the use of German language is anti-Semitic is an insult to all German-speaking people. Mr. Kwasman, have you and your supporters no decency, sir?

Mayor Borowsky: Thank you, Steve. Appreciate you coming down tonight. Melissa Kemp.

[Time: 02:18:55]

Melissa Kemp: We need a short-person mic. Hi Melissa Kemp. Address on record. Last week, I drew a bright line that listening here during active City Council meetings in City Hall on the record, has primacy. Anything else, any other conversations off site, they are just conversations but it's not verifiable, accountable listening as you would get in City Hall during a public session. Tonight is about the cost of treating that distinction like it doesn't matter.

On February 11, 2025, this Council voted to eliminate the office of diversity, equity and inclusion. That night, 47 people signed up to speak. And reporting shows that 45 of them spoke against eliminating the office. Only two spoke in favor of closing it. That's in addition to the multiple emails that you received ahead of time. When 45 residents warn you on the record and only two applaud, who exactly are you listening to? It's clearly not the residents who took the time to show up and speak on the record. Because the residents did the hard part. They signed up. They showed up. They followed the rules and they put their concerns, their thoughts and warnings into public record, but the four-member block voted to remove the office anyway. You could have paused and taken the matter under consideration and looked for alternatives, but you didn't.

If you are going to justify a decision like that, by alleging waste, inefficiency, discriminatory practices, the public should see the data behind those allegations on the record that supports that decision or action before you take it. Not ideology, not talking points, data, to date, I have seen no data that supports the position you took against the vocal present and active voices that were here in this room. Makes me mad. But now the city is absorbing the fallout from that decision. Controversy, mistrust, reputational damage, and the real resources that you have drained. We've had ethics complaints from the affordability and A.D.A. accessibility act of infrastructure that cost us hearings, judges and staff times and legal review.

In January of 2026, the NAACP publicly called for the city manager to resign over how their concerns and discussions were handled by our staff. Not diversity, equity, inclusion. What is the stewardship question that Scottsdale voters should hold on to as they move into election season? In a recent work study session, the Council spent extensive time discussing how to best use $100,000 of a budget line item in a Scottsdale tourism. The cost of the negative publicity alone and the headlines coming out of City Hall internal cleanup that follows these decisions, are easily more than $100,000. You cannot market your way out of a trust problem. In the future, stewardship isn't just what you choose to spend your revenue on. Understand that good stewardship is avoiding the predictable, needless mistakes and expenses from ignoring public comment and citizen complaints. Thank you.

Mayor Borowsky: Thank you. Linda Milhaven. No. Okay. Yvonne Cahill.

[Time: 02:22:42]

Yvonne Cahill: Good evening, Mayor and Council, I do agree we need a shorter person mic up. Here. Thank you for allowing me to speak. My address is on record. I just wanted to talk a little bit again tonight about a subject I have talked about for the past several months and that's about transparency. When it comes to the cancellation of the roundabout. It seems like we get the story if we ask about it, that we just swapped funds, everything just, you know, went away. Don't look here. Everything was just taken care of. This swap for this and that swap for that but there's some stuff that I believe that we haven't been told, and I really would like to get somebody on Council, please, give us a report on it. I know there was a cost to redesign the project from the roundabout to the signal. I know there was a cost for additional land for the intersection. I know there was a penalty for canceling the federal project. I heard it was 10%, but it may be more. I know this was a cost to relocate utilities that had already been moved and they had to move back again. And then you had to pay for penalties like I said on an existing contract. One of the people in this department that I have talked to that have since left the city also said there was close to a $2 million grant in there for the safety.

So, I was recently at a meeting, and somebody asked one of the Councilmembers, well, why did the prior Council even approve a roundabout. And they said, oh, I don't know. I guess it was ideology. I mean, that's totally a lie. It wasn't ideology and many people in this room that followed this, know that's a lie.

So, it was an F-rated intersection. Do any of you know the names of the people that died at that intersection? Do any of you know the names? Do any of you know the names of the three people that had life-altering injuries at that intersection? Probably not. So, to tell a constituent oh, it was ideology, the green new deal, we wanted to get rid of that, is just false and it's misleading and it really makes me angry. I'm not a fan of roundabouts. I hate them, but to lie about it is not correct and then to hide the fee is not correct.

Also, I heard that time meeting somebody made a flippant comment about well, can you imagine putting roundabouts where they have to haul horse trailers. And if you remember, a very distinguished citizen, resident of our community who lives right by there, Lee Courtney who is a very renowned in the

Arabian horse world and a realtor friend of mine came to testify that night. She came and she said she would much rather have the roundabout because she didn't want her horse trailers being t-boned and her horses being t-boned. And to say that it's ridiculous to put it there when people talk about it, it's just not fair. I hope that you start to get some reality in this, and I hope that you will be honest with why things were canceled. Yes, it could have been an A-rated intersection for safety with the roundabout. It was an F. It will be better, but it's only going to be an E-rated intersection. So, you are still going to have a signalized intersection with very dangerous spot there. Thank you.

Mayor Borowsky: Thank you, Yvonne. Next, we have Crystal Carroll and that's our last speaker in the non-agendized public comment.

[Time: 02:26:36]

Crystal Carroll: Hi, thank you for letting me speak, Madam Mayor and City Council. I wasn't going to get up and speak, but I want to, I think I need to stand up for other small businesses. I'm speaking as a small business in Old Town. After the last time I got up here and spoke, I want to address something that started circulating in the community and it's come to my attention that several people came into my cafe after speaking pretty passionately and told me that. Kwasman was letting people know that I was an anti-Semite. And so, I think we should, which I am not an anti-Semite. I'm engaged to a Jewish man. So, that lie kind of backfired.

But as a small business, we should be able to get up here and speak and express our concerns or whatever is going on without people spreading vicious, horrible lies in the community. And sadly, not only was this told to me by several people, it's upsetting even as I talk about it, but it was also, told to my fiancé, by other Jewish people that Kwasman let them know I was an anti-Semite. So, which I am not.

So, I just think that you guys you are you are working for the taxpayers and you need to represent everybody, and it takes, it takes time away from our family, away from work to spend gosh, I have been here for two and a half hours and to do that and then you trash our name in the community just is not it's not right. And I am just a community member, and it's actually in the state of Arizona, you can't viciously accuse people of lying because it's slander. So, I just want to encourage you to still get up and speak, and we shouldn't have to worry about any kind of slander in our own community. Thanks.

Mayor Borowsky: Thank you, Crystal. All right. That concludes our non-agendized public comment and next we have receipt the citizen petitions.

CITIZEN PETITIONS

Petition in this case, and Steve Sutton is going to come tell us about the petition he has presented which is related to his previous petition on citizen petitions. It's asserts that the Council Rules of Procedure violate Article 2, Section 15 of the Scottsdale City Charter and requests that the Council eliminate Option B of Section 8.2 of the rules of procedure. Go ahead, Steve.

[Time: 02:29:12]

Steve Sutton: Well, you already said much of what I was going to say. This petition is motivated by a couple of things. One that certainly got the attention of people, the actions of the Council, to hinder and discourage public criticism through public comment of any kind by changing many rules including the petitioning rule. But more importantly, the concern that the current rules are in violation.

This petition is Scottsdale City Charter Article 2, Section 15, mandates that any citizen of the city may appear before the Council at any regular meeting and present a written petition and that such a petition shall be acted upon by the Council in the regular course of business within 30 days. The Council's Rules of Procedure violates the Charter in requiring citizens to submit petitions to business days and it advance of a Council meeting and also, allowing the Council to outrageously dodge acting on citizen petitions by directing the city manager or other charter officers by investigating the matter and write a comment to the Council and the petitioner. Thus avoiding the Charter's requirement for the Council to act in a regular course of business within 30 days as required by the Charter.

In accordance with Article 2, Section 15 of the Scottsdale City Charter we the undersigned petition the Scottsdale City Council to eliminate Option B in Section 8.2 of the Council's Rules of Procedure. As agendizing the petition for the next available Council meeting will allow a charter officer to make presentation for consideration by the Council and in full light of the public. Thank you.

Mayor Borowsky: Thank you, Steve. I don't have my speaker screen up. Anyone want to talk about this?

Ben Lane: Mayor, I apologize the computer froze. You can do a voice vote when it comes time.

Mayor Borowsky: That's okay. I don't have anything to vote on.

Ben Lane: I don't know if anyone wants to make a motion or if anyone has any comments.

Mayor Borowsky: I will talk about this for a minute. I think it makes sense to agendize it. Maybe there are occasions when a report is easier. Anyone want to talk on this? Not easier but more appropriate, I should say.

Councilwoman Whitehead: You know, petitions have played a really big role. Thank you, Mayor. I guess I'm taking the floor. The petitions have played such a huge role in our city's budgets. So, petitions are really important. We were requested because of staff time. I mean, our staff work very long hours. That's something that concerns me that there's just a need to have the two-day period and at times, residents come forward with a petition that makes no sense to agendize. I think the key is if a petitioner wants it agendized is to really reach out to the different Councilmembers ahead of time and basically lobby them to get it on an agenda. Plenty of times I have voted to agendize something, but I have been outvoted or vice versa. I think it's critical because while Mr. Sutton has brought forward a lot of petitions and we have acted on them. I think we have acted on them without agendizing them. The dog park we took care of administratively. I think this has worked. This isn't an affront to anybody. But there is a reality that when you submit a petition it takes time. And so, we need to and so, we are better evaluating it if we have time. I don't think two days is a huge penalty. I think having that option to have staff just take care of something makes it more efficient and helps a lot of petitioners. I would argue that again, petitions are important but I don't support it and I don't I'm happy to have the city manager look into or to take no action and just to encourage Mr. Sutton to get those petitions in two days ahead and if you really want something agendized and call each of us and give is your reasons, and we do listen.

Mayor Borowsky: Thank you. So, I would like to point out I would like to get rid of number three, take no action honestly because I think having some response, when someone takes on the challenge and the time to submit a petition to us, there's usually some questions that need to be answered or answered or information provided. So, I I would be more inclined to do a removal of the take no action. So at least we get some response to the the petitioner.

Councilwoman Whitehead: I would support that. I would motion to remove take no action.

Mayor Borowsky: Yeah, we need to hear from the city attorney. I guess we can agendize it to talk about it.

[Time: 02:35:01]

Luis Santaella: Mayor, members of the Council. It's only agendized for one of three things. To either agendize it for another meeting or direct the city manager or another charter officer to do a report or take no action.

Mayor Borowsky: So, I will make a motion to agendize it for a future meeting.

Councilwoman McAllen: I will second it.

Mayor Borowsky: That way we can discuss maybe taking no action off there.

Councilwoman McAllen: And can I speak to my second.

Mayor Borowsky: Sure, of course.

Councilwoman McAllen: Thank you, Mayor. I believe I was one the people that ask for the two-day waiting period on petitions because of the staff turnaround and when they were coming at us rapidly over the last year, and we literally would get a petition thrown at us as we are starting. So, then you are having public officials who are who are not educated on what the petition is or the understanding of why it was needed. So, in order for and to make sure that it was a resident. We had a gentleman who came to several City Council meetings who was not a resident handing in petitions. This gives our staff time to actually authenticate that it's resident driven and that and to educate us on what it is. So, I would support keeping the two-day time. I know that may not be popular. But it would give you, the residents an opportunity to have us make educated decisions which is important. Thank you.

Mayor Borowsky: Thank you. And before we vote, Councilman Graham has something to say.

Councilman Graham: Thank you, Mayor. I will make an alternate motion for item number two.

Councilwoman Dubauskas: Second.

Mayor Borowsky: All right. Let's vote on that. All right. That motion passes. So, we will not agendize that for a future meeting. Thank you very much, Steve. Appreciate you being here tonight.

MAYOR AND COUNCIL ITEM

[Time: 02:37:16]

Moving right along, Mayor and Council items, PSPRS appointments. This was continued from last week's meeting, actually February 24th. That was last week. And it's about the Public Safety Personnel Retirement System Police and Fire board. And the Council requested to well, the resolution to the concerns was to have the nominees come and they're not speaking tonight, are they? No. No one is speaking tonight. Okay. So, I think whoever wanted to meet with the candidates did or spoke to them and at this point, I will entertain a motion to appoint either Bob Bessen or Carl Frasor. They were both great applicants and we were fortunate to have them. I supported Carl Frasor excuse me and I will make a motion for Carl Frasor.

Councilwoman Whitehead: I will second that.

Mayor Borowsky: Vice Mayor Kwasman.

Vice Mayor Kwasman: Thank you, Madam Mayor. I would like to make an alternate motion for Bob Bessen.

Councilwoman Dubauskas: Second.

Mayor Borowsky: We will go ahead and vote on that. So, I don't want to vote against Bob Bessen because he was a great candidate too. That's unfortunate. But that’s unfortunate, it’s not unfortunate. They are both great candidates. I will support Bob Bessen because I feel like sorry. Pardon me. That was loud. Who do we have that wants to speak?

Vice Mayor Kwasman: Moving forward on this, may I suggest that we put this in the same kind of nomination system as the boards and commissions.

Mayor Borowsky: If that's possible.

Vice Mayor Kwasman: Is it all right this is an awkward way to vote for this. And I want to give the respect due to both Carl and Bob that they deserve, and it should be the same methodology. So, just thank you to both the nominees. I'm grateful and just the structure was already put this way, but we'll fix it.

Mayor Borowsky: I would agree and you may recall Carl was the individual that brought this to our attention, which I certainly appreciated, and I thought it was very well said.

Councilwoman Littlefield: Mayor. If I can, I would like to second his motion to move this in with the boards and commissions.

Mayor Borowsky: He didn't make that motion, but he made the motion for Bob Bessen, but you can second it. I think it was seconded. Yeah. Thank you. Thank you, Councilwoman Littlefield. All right.

So, with that, we're going to go ahead and vote. On Bob Bessen's appointment. All right. That passes. Thank you, again, Carl, for your efforts and for applying. Okay.

COUNCILMEMBER REPORTS

Councilmember reports. Do we have anyone reporting here? Councilwoman Dubauskas, McAllen.

[Time: 02:40:32]

Councilwoman Dubauskas: Thank you Madame Mayor. I wanted to remind the audience that Kathy Littlefield and I provide office hours on the Monday before our Council meeting. So, our next office hours will be on March 23rd from 4 to 6 p.m. and we look forward to speaking with you.

Also, we received a notification. We receive these emails from the city; our wonderful Citizens Academy has openings. This is a tremendous program. It's Scottsdale Government 101. It's an opportunity to learn about the city and how we run as a business, and so, I would encourage all residents to reach out and take the opportunity to learn more about our budget, our water department, our police department, our solid waste. It's just a fascinating process and the city really poured their heart and soul into it. So, I hope you will take the opportunity and sign up for the Government 101 academy course. Thank you.

Mayor Borowsky: Councilwoman Whitehead.

Councilwoman Whitehead: I just want to call out city of Scottsdale employee Caesar Alcantar. I hope I'm saying that right. We received a nice email about his exceptional service. So, thank you to him.

Mayor Borowsky: Thank you, Councilwoman McAllen.

Councilwoman McAllen: Thank you, Mayor. I just wanted to congratulate the Scottsdale Historical Society and our staff that assisted them in the Founder's Day Celebration last week. Winfield Scott, our founder, is 189 years old. Yes, dressed as Bruce Wall. I just want to congratulate them on a wonderful ceremony and to remind everyone about the Rodeo. I'm going on opening night. Are you riding again in the entry way and the flag?

Mayor Borowsky: No, the bull riding I'm on hold. Doctor's orders. Thank you. Councilman Graham.

Councilman Graham: Our next Council meeting will be, I think March 24th. Does that sound right? That same day, a couple hours before that or 2 p.m., we are going to be doing a ribbon cutting an unveiling Museum of the West expansion, the Eddie Basha Art Collection. This Council just stroke a check for how much? $90,000 to promote it. And so, I'm helping them. I'm pushing that right here and I'm telling you, I'm looking right at you in the camera, right at you at home, you need to go to that event on March 24th at 2 p.m. to celebrate what will be a great addition to Old Town Scottsdale. Thank you.

Mayor Borowsky: Thank you. That concludes our business tonight and motion to adjourn.

Vice Mayor Kwasman: Motion to adjourn.

Councilwoman Dubauskas: Second.

Mayor Borowsky: Thank you very much.

ADJOURNMENT

[Time: 02:43:18]