

## A G E N D A

JOINT WORK SESSION OF THE COTTONWOOD CITY COUNCIL AND THE COTTONWOOD CHAMBER OF COMMERCE BOARD TO BE HELD OCTOBER 11, 2011, AT 6 P.M. AT THE COTTONWOOD PUBLIC SAFETY BUILDING, 199 SOUTH 6TH STREET, COTTONWOOD, ARIZONA.

- I. CALL TO ORDER
- II. ROLL CALL
- III. ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION, CONSIDERATION, AND POSSIBLE DIRECTION TO STAFF:

**Comments regarding items listed on the agenda are limited to a 5 minute time period per speaker.**

- 1. RESULTS OF SURVEY CONDUCTED BY THE CHAMBER REGARDING CITY SERVICES.
- 2. CHAMBER USE OF THE CITY OF COTTONWOOD BED TAX CONTRIBUTIONS, TOTAL CITY CONTRIBUTION FOR THE PAST THREE YEARS, AND DIRECT AND INDIRECT BENEFITS THE CITY AND COTTONWOOD BUSINESSES RECEIVE FROM THOSE CONTRIBUTIONS.
- 3. BUSINESS PLAN AND FUTURE GOALS FOR THE COTTONWOOD CHAMBER OF COMMERCE.
- 4. PROMOTING COTTONWOOD AND REGIONALISM—HOW SUPPORTING THE ENTIRE VERDE VALLEY BENEFITS COTTONWOOD BUSINESSES AND THE CITY.
- 5. UPDATE ON SHOP LOCAL CAMPAIGN.
- 6. UPDATE ON THE WINE INDUSTRY AND THE WINE TRAIL.
- 7. UPDATE ON NEW BUSINESSES OR INDUSTRIES COMING TO TOWN.
- 8. UPDATE ON PROGRESS IN OLD TOWN AND HOW THE CITY ASSISTS ALL BUSINESSES IN ADDITION TO ASSISTING OLD TOWN.
- 9. UPDATE FROM ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT DIRECTOR, CASEY ROONEY, ON THE COTTONWOOD ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT COUNCIL, ITS BUDGET AND HOW IT SUPPORTS COTTONWOOD, THE CHAMBER, AND/OR THE REGION.
- 10. DIRECTION REGARDING RECENT DISCUSSIONS INVOLVING THE FEASIBILITY OF COTTONWOOD REINTEGRATING CAT (COTTONWOOD AREA TRANSIT) BACK UNDER THE MANAGEMENT OF THE CITY.

- IV. ADJOURNMENT

Pursuant to A.R.S. § 38-431.03.(A) the Council may vote to go into executive session on any agenda item pursuant to A.R.S. § 38-431.03.(A)(3) Discussion or consultation for legal advice with the attorney or attorneys of the public body.

The Cottonwood Public Safety Building is accessible to the disabled in accordance with Federal "504" and "ADA" laws. Those with needs for special typeface print or hearing devices may request these from the City Clerk (TDD 634-5526.) All requests must be made 24 hours prior to the meeting.

Members of the City Council will attend either in person or by telephone conference call.

## Cottonwood Chamber of Commerce City Government Questionnaire

### Surveys Returned = 77

Comments were recorded exactly as they were written.  
Grammar and spelling were not corrected.

1. How frequently do you deal with specific city departments? (1 = rarely or never, 2 = a few times a year, 3 = monthly, 4 = weekly)

City Department	No Answer	1	2	3	4
a. City Council / Administration	10	43	17	4	3
b. City Clerk	10	48	14	3	2
c. Finance Department	11	55	6	5	0
d. Community Development	9	39	19	8	2
e. Police Department	7	34	24	10	2
f. Utilities	8	27	18	19	5
g. Parks & Recreation	5	30	25	10	7
h. Library	9	39	14	10	5
i. City Court	11	55	8	2	1
j. Planning & Zoning	7	44	18	6	2

2. If knowledgeable, please rate the overall quality of your interactions with personnel in specific city departments (1 = poor, 10 = excellent)

City Department	N/A	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
a. City Council/Administration	38	2	1	2	1	2	1	5	6	1	18
b. City Clerk	51	0	0	0	0	2	1	1	5	4	13
c. Finance Department	51	0	0	1	0	2	1	2	6	2	12
d. Community Development	39	0	0	1	1	6	0	4	4	5	17
e. Fire Department	30	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	13	8	23
f. Police Department	25	3	0	1	0	2	1	4	14	5	22

g. Utilities	35	3	1	2	1	4	3	3	7	7	11
h. Parks & Recreation	27	0	1	1	0	4	2	3	9	6	24
i. Library	40	0	0	0	0	3	3	1	2	6	22
j. City Court	52	0	1	0	0	4	2	2	6	1	9
k. Planning & Zoning	36	1	0	1	0	8	1	1	11	5	13

Comments:

1. I don't have regular dealings with many departments, but when I do they all have been courteous and easy to work with.
2. City government is helpful and responsive.
3. We have courteous staff that tries to please. However, the city phone system is inefficient, impersonal and not customer-friendly. When you call in and press a certain extension, instead of hearing the recipient's name along with a greeting you get "The owner of extension #\_\_ is not available". Talk about impersonal!
4. We have only had excellent experiences.
5. You left out economic development department.
6. Very slow callback response from P&Z. There seems to be a number of issues/circumstances that we raise where there is no clear cut policy or exact procedure on how to handle. Everyone is very nice, friendly, professional.
7. The Council is simply a rubber stamp for Doug Bartosh. They are out of touch with real issues.
8. No employees seem to be happy in their jobs. The way people waste time and money in our city disturbs me greatly. The way some people are in their jobs playing God is awful. (Bartosh & Luder) It trickles down from the top. People can't talk due to fear of job loss.
9. Planning and Zoning I feel are bias with Community Development depending on what is for them. The town of Cottonwood gets special favors while from Planning & Zoning – building others have to pay.
10. Seems to be concerned w/ Old Town and forget the rest of small businesses. Need someone in Economic Development that knows how to develop economies for the whole city!
11. We have required the fire department several times and they are always so kind and wonderful to us and our clients. Always. The police officers vary on who comes and their patients.
12. Have only lived here about 8 months so not a lot of contact.
13. Your fire department would score higher however your Chief does not always site fact when he speaks in public.
14. P&R dealt w/ Rec Center – Excellent facility – Not happy with with sound system at Birding Festival keynote – No staff to deal with it.

- 15. Have heard from a few people (our clients) that Planning & Zoning is very difficult to work with and they feel they are not working to support new businesses opening.
- 16. We don't deal with any city departments on regular basis.
- 17. We should encourage the City to spend **ALL** of it's revenue in town where they get their revenue from.
- 18. I don't do business with these departments. Struggling to do business on my own.
- 19. Cannot judge at this time.

3. Please indicate whether you agree or disagree with the following statement: "The City of Cottonwood is supportive of local business"

a. Strongly agree	<u>17</u>
b. Agree	<u>16</u>
c. Not sure	<u>23</u>
d. Disagree	<u>9</u>
e. Strongly disagree	<u>4</u>
f. No Answer	<u>8</u>

Please share your experience.

Strongly Agree:

- 1. For the most part professional, happy, friendly personnel.
- 2. Their success reviving Old Town business district.
- 3. CEDC works closely with the City, and Doug Bartosh and George Gehlert are members of CEDC. Casey Rooney works very hard to smooth the way for existing and new businesses so they can be successful, and the recent City Councils are also favorably inclined toward business growth.
- 4. This is an amazing community when it comes to support of local businesses.
- 5. BAC, VV Wine Consortium, Old Town upgrades, Casey Rooney – This city is working hard to improve economy.

Agree:

- 1. Display our brochures. Chamber volunteers visit our museum to be knowledgeable and answer visitor's questions about our museum.
- 2. I call city utilities, water dept. a lot in relation to my business. Only once, must have been a new clerk, was I ever disappointed in customer service.
- 3. Hiring Casey is a powerful indicator. However, I hear that it can be difficult to start a new business.

Not Sure:

- 1. Never experienced any real "marketing" effort for our businesses and we are just down the road from Sedona, one of America's vacation capitals! Our tourist attractions do all the advertising, not our city.
- 2. My life goes along smoothly w/ all these entities.
- 3. Difficult to get answer about permits and what we are allowed to do.

4. The Utility Dept has an attitude that has angered some new residents who want to connect to city services.
5. I have contacted the maintenance dept to bid for projects and daily needs. Was told to go on line to the web sight. In the last four years they have spent less than \$400 in my store. \$300 was in '08.
6. No knowledge.
7. Cottonwood used to be pro-business and still sees itself that way. In speaking with the developers of our most recent stores, however, the developers say that the development experience here is unpleasant and if given a choice, would not develop here again. They say that the city constantly changes its mind about what the layouts and appearances would be, has high fees, takes too long in making a decision and does not act like they know what they are doing. This could be one reason our commercial development is not proceeding more rapidly.

Disagree:

1. Raising sales tax to pay for the Rec Center drives business OUT of Cottonwood.
2. The City Council keeps wanting to zone or bid out garbage service. They already sent a form in the water bill to question if people wanted to change to one garbage company. It was 75% that said leave it like it is w/ competition.
3. Only for certain businesses.
4. Overly concerned with aesthetics & minor details, to the detriment of costs of doing business ie: sign ordinances, parking, landscape requirements.
5. Make it hard for local business to contract larger jobs.

Strongly Disagree:

1. I don't think outside of what helps the "City of Cottonwood" they could care less about. Just building themselves up.
2. Doug Bartosh & Dan Leuder (who actually runs the entire city) care only about much money the city takes in & the size of the city government. They may "cheer lead" local business but refuse to do anything to actually help.

4. What issues can the Cottonwood Chamber of Commerce advocate on your business' behalf?

1. Senior Living, Assisted Living
2. Nothing more than continued support.
3. Just keeping business local when possible.
4. More small business development
5. We are in favor of the proposed wastewater facility at Riverfront and the plans to use recycled water in parks and school facilities. Continuing street and right of way maintenance is also important, as well as friendly relationships with our neighboring communities.
6. None – no problems
7. Business helping business
8. Chamber of Commerce could be much better about working with Cottonwood Jnl Extra, keeping us informed of Chamber initiatives instead of blatant, unfair favoritism towards a Chamber officer's business.

9. One wonders what the City does to promote local businesses to the outside world – perhaps some communication.
10. I have a good working relationship with whom I have ever encountered.
11. Community volunteerism, promoting Cottonwood as community that works together to help each other.
12. Refer domestic violence victims to our facility – Verde Valley Sanctuary 634-2511. If you would like brochures, let us know.
13. More recycling: Residential, Business & Governmental so we can create more ‘Green Collar’ jobs!
14. They should make it a point to speak to the developers and commercial contractors and find out what kind of experience they are having. Once the Chamber finds out what’s going on they will be in a better position to find out the best course of action. The Chamber should also consider sending an officer or member to the City Council meetings to find out the pros and cons of various issues, including whether the City is spending more than they can afford on their many ambitious projects!
15. Not having the sewer and water billing combined. Very hard for rental property mgmt to then have to break out owner vs tenant charges.
16. Personal service; integrity; small town attitude with big town benefits; helpful; friendly – they really care; conscious & “present” with customers; bonded w/ others in making a better community
17. I would like more info - - what each dept does, how they are working to bring new businesses into Cottonwood, etc.
18. Just keep up the good work!
19. Chamber doing a good job.
20. Reduced cost of operations with consolidation of professional services “fire” in particular.
21. The Chamber is great. They seem very proactive & supportive.
22. I think the Cottonwood Chamber is doing a wonderful job.
23. We need a supportive city. We are a huge tax payer/generate tax revenue.
24. None – I don’t have any issues.
25. Nothing specific. We do believe you (the City) want to cooperate with us as much as possible.
26. Main Street traffic has been a problem for years from Safeway to the Chamber of Commerce building making a left on Main in the afternoon is near impossible! Hurts the businesses there.
27. City needs to hear what businesses need to survive in this economic climate. Quit hiring additional staff & dept heads to supervise enforcement. Rein in the utility dept expansion.
28. More jobs develop more businesses & support existing businesses.
29. Be more knowledgeable (spelled as received) of local businesses and support them.
30. Please keep the garbage collection like it is with competition. Do not try & get only one waste hauler for the city. Small garbage companies & local companies will suffer the consequences.
31. Lower sales tax

32. Put a 3 year moratorium on the \$5843.00 impact fee that established during the boom & abolish the extra 1% sales tax that was tacked on to residential construction at about the same time.
33. It's hard for other businesses to get started. How about helping them!

City of Cottonwood, Arizona  
City Council Agenda Communication



Meeting Date: October 11, 2011

**Subject: NAIPTA (Northern Arizona Intergovernmental Public Transportation Authority) - Discussion of CAT Services and Area Stakeholders**

Department: Community Services (CAT - Cottonwood Area Transit System)

From: Richard Faust, Community Services General Manager

**REQUESTED ACTION**

Staff is requesting Council direction regarding recent discussions with City of Sedona staff involving the feasibility of Cottonwood reintegrating CAT into the management of the City.

**BACKGROUND**

Cottonwood City Staff were asked to attend a meeting with Sedona staff to discuss problems that have developed from their staff's perspective regarding the management of transit services by Northern Arizona Intergovernmental Transportation Authority (NAIPTA). This meeting was held on September 13, 2011. Discussions between Sedona's City Manager, Finance Director and Director of Community Services surrounded concerns with the management of NAIPTA over the past several years. Sedona staff expressed their interest towards the possibility of exploring in more detail, options available for a more localized transit operation thereby meeting the needs of the citizens more efficiently and effectively overall. Initially, their request centered on Cottonwood reintegrating CAT into our management structure and assuming the management of the Verde Lynx line as well.

According to our current Service IGA III Contract document with NAIPTA signed into effect on January 1, 2011, the City of Cottonwood placed into the document the following language in Section 5: **Term and Termination:**

5.3. *"Either Party may terminate this Agreement by giving the other Party one hundred eighty (180) days written notice of termination. NAIPTA will not incur any further obligation on behalf of Cottonwood after receipt of a written notice of termination. Cottonwood will pay NAIPTA for services rendered and capital assets acquired prior to the date of termination.*

5.4. *In the event of termination of this Service IGA III pursuant to Section 6.4 of the Master IGA and/or Section 5.2 or 5.3 of this Service IGA III, NAIPTA shall transfer and/or return to Cottonwood any and all funds and capital equipment held and/or used for the operation of the CAT system, including but not limited to grand funds (subject to any applicable grant requirements and restrictions), unexpended operating reserves (as set forth in Section 3.2.2 above), vehicles electronics, and furniture reasonably necessary for Cottonwood to operate the CAT system at then-existing service levels, and in the same or similar manner as it did immediately prior to the implementation of this Service IGA III.*

According to a recent telephone conversation between Rudy Rodriguez and Sam Chavez, Arizona State Department of Transportation involving our connection with NAIPTA and potential support from the state regarding Cottonwood reassuming management of CAT, Mr. Chavez indicated that the State would be supportive under any of these circumstances and would in effect work directly with Cottonwood or any future Transportation Authority in efforts to provide financial and administrative support. Mr. Chavez also offered administrative guidance if the Council decided to pursue other arrangements that included separating from NAIPTA.

Sedona is very interested in pursuing this opportunity as they feel Cottonwood has successfully run and operated the CAT program in the past. They feel that they would like to work more closely in developing a plan of action.

#### **JUSTIFICATION/BENEFIT/ISSUES**

The City of Sedona has expressed concerns regarding NAIPTA's management of the Lynx and former Road Runner transit systems. Our own staff has expressed some concerns as well particularly during this year's budget process. Cottonwood still has sufficient staff to manage the CAT and Lynx system and we would be eligible for the grant funding that has supported the system in the past.

The agreement with NAIPTA does allow for a termination of management services. It is important to remember that NAIPTA has managed the system for approximately 10 months. If the City Council directed staff to pursue the reintegration of CAT and Lynx into city management, staff recommends that such a transfer would probably best be accomplished at the conclusion of the fiscal year.

#### **COST/FUNDING SOURCE**

Per the agreement, all capital equipment would be returned to Cottonwood along with grant funding that supports the CAT and Lynx systems. We would need to negotiate use and/or ownership of the transit building. The land it sits on is owned by Cottonwood and leased to NAIPTA. The building was constructed with grant funding.

#### **REVIEWED BY**

City Manager: \_\_\_\_\_

City Attorney: \_\_\_\_\_

**ATTACHMENTS**