
This document was created from the closed caption transcript of the June 16, 2020 City Council Regular and Special Meetings and 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, is available online at:

<https://www.scottsdaleaz.gov/Assets/ScottsdaleAZ/Council/current-agendas-minutes/2020-agendas/06-16-20-regular-and-special-agenda.pdf>

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

<http://www.Scottsdaleaz.gov/Scottsdale-video-network/Council-video-archives/2020-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: 00:00:18]

Mayor Lane: I call to order the June 16th, 2020, regular meeting. It's approximately 5:15. And I would ask the city clerk, Carolyn Jagger to please conduct the roll call.

ROLL CALL

[Time: 00:00:32]

City Clerk Carolyn Jagger: Mayor Jim Lane.

Mayor Lane: Present.

City Clerk Carolyn Jagger: Vice Mayor Solange Whitehead.

Vice Mayor Whitehead: Here.

City Clerk Carolyn Jagger: Councilmembers Suzanne Klapp.

Councilwoman Klapp: Here.

City Clerk Carolyn Jagger: Kathy Littlefield

Councilwoman Littlefield: Here.

City Clerk Carolyn Jagger: Virginia Korte.

Councilmember Korte: Here.

City Clerk Carolyn Jagger: Guy Phillips.

Councilman Phillips: Here.

City Clerk Carolyn Jagger: Linda Milhaven.

Councilwoman Milhaven: Here.

Carolyn Jagger: City Manager Jim Thompson.

City Manager Jim Thompson: Here.

City Clerk Carolyn Jagger: City Attorney Sherry Scott.

City Attorney Sherry Scott: Here.

City Clerk Carolyn Jagger: City Treasurer Jeff Nichols.

City Treasurer Jeff Nichols: Here.

City Clerk Carolyn Jagger: City Auditor Sharron Walker.

City Auditor Sharron Walker: Here.

Carolyn Jagger: And the Clerk is present.

MAYOR'S REPORT

[Time: 00:01:00]

Mayor Lane: All right. Thank you very much. You know, I would like to announce that as of June 1st, we could have actually done this as a study session but it would not have been proper protocol and in regular meeting to announce that councilwoman Solange Whitehead, has assumed the role of Vice Mayor. I want to thank Kathy Littlefield for her commitment to that role. Welcome Vice Mayor Whitehead into the position.

So I also want to encourage everyone in our community to follow the CDC health guidelines on social distancing as it relates to this COVID-19 pandemic. With that, we should be able to continue to move forward in a healthy fashion for our entire community, and actually effectively bring our economy back and solve a lot of issues that we're having to attend to as we have just discussed in the work -- discussed in the work study.

MINUTES

[Time: 00:01:56]

Mayor Lane: The next order of business, I would like to request to approve -- a motion to approve the regular meeting minutes of May 5th, 2020, and May 19th, 2020. Do I have a motion?

Councilman Phillips: So moved.

Councilmember Korte: Second.

Mayor Lane: The motion is made by Councilman Phillips and seconded by Korte. Are we ready to vote? All in favor aye. It's unanimous. Thank you. Our consent agenda items 1 through 21b. We have no cards on any of the consent items.

City Clerk Carolyn Jagger: Your Honor, we don't but we do have -- we need to take a vote on the added items.

ADDED ITEMS

[Time: 00:02:42]

Mayor Lane: Certainly, yes. Okay. Then I do have the added items that we need -- that are consent items 21a and 21b and they were added on the agenda on June 10th. I would like to request a vote to accept the agenda as presented, or to continue the added items to June 30th, 2020, council meeting. Do I have a motion to accept or continue?

Councilmember Korte: I move to accept the agenda as presented.

Councilman Phillips: Second.

Mayor Lane: The motion has been made by Councilwoman Korte and seconded by Councilman Phillips. All those in favor please indicate by aye. And register your vote. All right. Those items are added as presented.

CONSENT AGENDA

[Time: 00:03:34]

Mayor Lane: And now we will move on to our consent items, 1 through 21b. They have been provided for us. There's no comments on that one, that have been submitted on any of the consent items.

Clerk Jagger: Mayor, you had one written comment on item 20 and it was provided to the council around 3:30 this afternoon.

Mayor Lane: Very good. Thank you. And unless there's any discussion, I would accept a motion to accept.

Councilmember Korte: Mayor, I move to accept consent agenda items 1 through 21b.

Councilman Phillips: Second.

Mayor Lane: Motion has been made by Councilwoman Korte and seconded by Councilman Phillips. All those in favor, indicate by aye and register your vote. Okay. Unanimously approved. So the consent items are unanimously approved, all items. We will move on to the regular agenda items, 22 to 25.

ITEM 22 – TRUTH IN TAXATION HEARING AND PUBLIC HEARING ON THE PROPOSED FISCAL YEAR 2020/21 PROPERTY TAX LEVY

[Time: 00:04:39]

Mayor Lane: We have the truth in taxation hearing and public hearing on the proposed fiscal year 2020/2021 property tax levy. And we do have our budget director Judy Doyle here to present. Welcome, Judy.

Budget Director Judy Doyle: Thank you, good evening Mayor and councilmembers. This is the truth in taxation hearing and public hearing for the fiscal year 2020/21 property tax levy and rate. State requires that a public hearing be held at least 14 days prior to actually adopting the levy which is scheduled for June 30th.

As mentioned during the proposed budget discussion, overall property values in Scottsdale went up over the prior year by approximately 4.7%, or \$294.1 million. We did make the change that you had directed during the tentative budget adoption on May 19th, which was to remove the 2% statutory allowance to the primary levy. With that said, state statute requires the city to hold a truth in taxation or TNT hearing and public a TNT hearing notice in the newspaper if the city meets the necessary threshold determined by a calculation provided by the state. The calculation is based on the net assessed valuation, less new construction, which then using the current 19-20 levy amount calculates a maximum tax rate that could be imposed without a TNT hearing.

While the city did forgo the 2% statutory allowance, the tort liability claims included in the primary property tax exceeded the threshold and therefore a TNT is required. The language in the calculations

in that TNT notice are specific and they are required by the state. Unfortunately, it does not paint the whole picture as it is just the primary portion and does not include the new construction.

This slide summarizes a holistic view, which includes the new construction, and that secondary organization. The secondary property tax can only be used to repay debt service on general obligation bonds that are outstanding. In 2021, we plan to levy \$33.4 million which is a \$400,000 increase over 19-20, but because property values went up, the rate is decreasing 52 cents to 50 cents for \$100 assessed valuation. This related to the bond 2019 program and staying below the promise rate of 57 cents.

The primary levy which will be used by the general fund will increase \$1.1 million to \$32.6 million for 20-21. This is basically our new base if you will. It's last year's, the 19-20 levy, plus last year's 2% allowance, plus last year's new construction. So our new levy base of 32.6. The direction on May 19th was to forgo the 2% statutory allowance. We didn't include anything for that, and this year's new construction of \$400,000 and the \$1.8 million for the liability tort settlements and judgments that you have approved during the most recent calendar year, which are booked. So a total of \$34.9 million. The primary property tax rate will increase from 52 cents to 53 cents to achieve that levied amount. So with that 2-cent increase -- or excuse me, the 2 cents decrease in the secondary rate and the 1 cent increase in the primary rate, our total 20-21 rate will decrease from \$1.04 to \$1.03 per \$100 of assessed valuation. Just a reminder that 90 cents of every dollar of property tax goes to other entities. 10 cents will stay with the city. 5 cents to the secondary tax and 5 cents primary.

This is a comparison to our valley cities. Gilbert and Mesa do not have a primary tax rate. Gilbert is coming in the lowest at 99 cents per \$100 of assessed valuation and we rank the second lowest at \$1.03.

So with that, the action tonight is no sow list the public testimony on the proposed 20-21 property tax levy, and by roll call vote approve a motion to levy the proposed property taxes which will be assessed by ordinance on June 30th. That concludes my presentation.

Mayor Lane: Thank you very much, Ms. Doyle. Do we have any from the council at this time? Hearing none, we have an obligation, of course, that's indicated that it's to solicit public testimony which was done ahead of time and we have had no contact and that's not been -- it's not been received by any councilmembers because there was none this. And then we have a requirement for this kind of hearing to have a roll call vote and I would ask our city clerk to go ahead and conduct it. I need a motion.

Councilmember Korte: Mayor? Mayor, I move to levy the proposed property taxes and taxes to be assessed by ordinance on June 30th, 2020.

Mayor Lane: I will second that. Motion made by Councilmember Korte and seconded by myself. We are now ready then for that roll call vote.

City Clerk Carolyn Jagger: Mayor Jim Lane?

Mayor Lane: Yes.

City Clerk Carolyn Jagger: Vice Mayor Solange Whitehead.

Vice Mayor Whitehead: Yes.

City Clerk Carolyn Jagger: Councilwoman Suzanne Klapp?

Councilwoman Klapp: Yes

City Clerk Carolyn Jagger: Councilmember Virginia Korte?

Councilmember Korte: Yes

City Clerk Carolyn Jagger: Councilwoman Littlefield?

Councilwoman Littlefield: Yes.

City Clerk Carolyn Jagger: Councilwoman Linda Milhaven?

Councilwoman Milhaven: Yes.

City Clerk Carolyn Jagger: Councilman Phillips?

Councilman Phillips: Yes.

Clerk Jagger: The motion passes unanimously.

ITEM 23 – PUBLIC HEARING ON PROPOSED FISCAL YEAR 2020/21 MUNICIPAL STREETLIGHT DISTRICT EXPENSES AND PROPERTY TAX LEVY (BY DISTRICT)

[Time: 00:11:26]

Mayor Lane: That completes our item of the truth and taxation hearing and public hearing on the proposed fiscal year 2020-2021 property tax levy. And moving on to 23, the public hearing on proposed fiscal year 2020-21 municipal streetlight improvement district expenses and property tax levy by district. Presenter again is Ms. Doyle.

Budget Director Judy Doyle: Yes, hello again. As you mentioned this is the public hearing on the '20-21 municipal street improvement district, property tax levy. Tonight's presentation will be brief. Just a bit of background as it relates to the streetlight improvement districts. They were established in 1971 to allow taxpayers residing in the benefiting area to pay for the operation of streetlights. Currently 355 streetlight improvement districts formed by petition of the property owners. For the sole purpose of purchasing electricity for the lighting of public streets.

State statute requires that the city council annual adopt an ordinance levying a special taxing district property tax in the amount sufficient to pay the expense of operating each of the streetlight improvement districts located throughout the city. The streetlight levy is calculated based solely on estimated energy costs. The cost of operating each district varies based on the cost of electricity, the usage, the number of streetlights, electrical services are provided by either the Salt River project or Arizona public service. Each assessing varying rates. As a result, property taxes levied may differ by district.

Therefore, there are 355 separate property tax calculations representing almost 34,000 properties. This is a map of those 355 districts. The yellow represents the district serviced by APS and blue by SRP, and the streetlight district utility bills are paid by the property. That levy and that levy request for fiscal 20-21 is \$526,791.

This item does require an action tonight, but the floor motion of the ordinance will be on June 30th. The action tonight is to solicit public testimony on the streetlight district proposed expense and tax levy, and then to approve a motion to levy the proposed 20-21 streetlight improvement district taxes by district to be assessed by ordinance on June 30th. And that concludes this presentation.

Mayor Lane: Thank you very much. And are there any questions from the councilmembers on this subject? We will solicit public testimony, I would ask for approval of a motion to levy the proposed fiscal year ending 20-21, IDE and property tax levy. Do I have such a motion?

Councilwoman Littlefield: So moved.

Councilwoman Klapp: Second.

Mayor Lane: Motion made by Councilwoman Littlefield and seconded by Councilwoman Klapp. We are then ready for a vote this does not require a roll call vote. So we will just please indicate your vote. Carolyn. There we go. It's unanimous that that item -- item 23 is accepted. That motion is approved. Okay.

ITEM 24 – FINAL PUBLIC HEARING ON THE FISCAL YEAR 2020/21 BUDGET

[Time: 00:15:13]

Mayor Lane: Item 24 is the final public hearing on the fiscal year 20-21 budget. The presenter is Judy Doyle. She remains standing at the podium.

Budget Director Judy Doyle: We are in the final stretch. On May 19th, you unanimously adopted a tentative budget. The only change to the 20-21 budget since that tentative adoption was related to the \$29.6 million in the Arizona CARES funding that we received. The \$29.6 million as was mentioned, earlier this evening was distributed in full last week. So it was completely received in fiscal '19-20. However, the expenses that can be covered with the funding spans over two fiscal years. The Arizona care funds can only be used no cover payroll expenses related to the city's public health and public

safety departments. It's for expenses that were incurred from March 1st, 2020, and can be forecasted through December 30th of 2020.

For use -- for ease -- I can't even speak. For ease, we applied this to police and fire. And as you can see from the breakdown here, for police and fire, by fiscal year, a budget transfer request for '19-20 will be included in the council report that staff will bring forward on July 1st to memorialize the direction that you had given this evening. The budget transfer will move the '19-20 budget from the police and fire general fund operating to the grant funds. We were able to get the '20-21 adjustment into the '20-21 budget prior to this evening. They do have a net zero impact to the budget. It's just a change to the funding source.

So here you can see that net effect to the '20-21 budget which is the change since the tentative budget adoption. It's a decrease of \$12.4 million to the general fund and an increase of an equal amount to the grant fund. By shifting that \$29.6 million from police and fire expenses from the general fund to the grant funds, it freed up \$29.6 million, thereby increasing the fund balance in the general fund by an equal amount which we you all gave direction on earlier this evening.

During the budget process, we had several budget-related meetings all of which were opportunities for the public to speak. The remainder of the '20-21 schedule is this final public hearing and later this evening we will convene into a special meeting to formally adopt the budget and on June 30th, the final adoption of the tax levies. And that concludes my presentation. There is no action needed on this item. This is the final public hearing to solicit that public testimony on the final adoption.

Mayor Lane: Thank you again, Ms. Doyle. Do we have telephone testimony? Okay. So we have solicited public testimony on this but there have been none received. That's a notice only. There's no action to be taken at this time. So we will move on.

Budget Director Judy Doyle: Thank you.

Councilwoman Milhaven: I would just like, Ms. Doyle, you have done such an impressive job. I know every year, of the ten budgets that I worked on, you also worked on and every year we leave and I neglect to tell you what an amazing job I think you do. You are so knowledgeable. You do such an amazing job making it easy for all of us to understand who are not as knowledgeable as you and I want to thank you for the great job that you have always done.

Budget Director Judy Doyle: Thank you. Thank you.

ITEM 25 – CODE OF ETHICS FOR CITY OFFICIALS AMENDMENT

[Time: 00:19:37]

Mayor Lane: Certainly. Okay. So moving on to the next item, 25, which is the code of ethics for our city officials amendment and this is a request to adopt ordinance 4421 to amend the ethics code of the Scottsdale revised code as is presented. So with that, we have our city attorney, Sherry Scott here to

present.

City Attorney Sherry Scott: Thank you, Mayor. As you all know, the council voted unanimously directing the city attorney to prepare and bring back amendments to the ethics code. Specifically prohibiting anonymous gifts that happened at your last meeting. As a result, I have prepared an amendment that I'm recommending which would prohibit anonymous gifts and making a few other clarifying amendments that I wish to present to you tonight. I have maintained the original wording and structure of the ethics ordinance as much as I possibly can pursuant to your prior direction.

I would categorize the amendments that I'm bringing forward in three baskets. The first being I have added a few definitions and some clarifying language. I added the gift prohibition that's requested. And I have combined the two separate code provisions related to gifts both of which apply to elected city officials and appointed city officials and those two provisions are in Chapter 14, the human resources ordinance and also in Chapter 2, which we refer to as your ethics code. So the first is a proposed amended definition to the term gift of any kind. This is the current language that you can see as it exists in your ethics code with the exception that I have added personal gifts or donations to that definition, and I have removed the wording of anything and value that may be construed as an attempt to create a more favorable relationship that enjoyed by any other citizen. I have removed that wording because I'm just putting it in the prohibition section to further clarify it. So it's not changing. It's just moving.

So one of the concerns that's been brought forward in the past is that engaged in a general practice, which is a concept that is currently discussed in your ethics code is not defined and some have thought that that's caused confusion. I have attempted to define that in the ethics code amendment that you are looking at to work as a lobbyist, attorney, consultant and land use professional or similar representative on matters that could regularly involve the decision-making process of the city council, a board or a commission. I have also included in that definition, those with the property interests in land in the city or doing business with or within the city, including their agents and representatives are considered to be engaged in a general practice if it is reasonably foreseeable that they could come before the city open more than one matter in a year in an effort to influence a city action or decision in which they have a direct or indirect financial interest greater than that of a general taxpayer.

I have also attempted to add a definition of engaged the specific situation to mean having a direct or indirect financial interest in an upcoming or pending item requiring action by the city council, a board or a commission, that doesn't include a citizen activist or other community member on a strong interest that could be presented by a decision on a city council, a board and a commission and whose only financial interest is that of a general taxpayer. I have included that definition, because I thought that was the intention of the original ethics code. Relative was also left undefined. We have always used the definition of relative in the conflicts of interest statutes. In fact, we are required to do so and I codified that definition in these proposed amendments.

So back to what I was directed to do. And the definitions are important to understand the prohibitions. These are now the prohibited gifts, any anonymous gift of any kind, made either directly or indirectly, except as specifically exempted below. And the yellow highlighted wording is the newer concepts that

have been added here.

Gifts of any kind, made directly or indirectly from anyone who is engaged in a general practice or specific situation that involves the city's decision-making or permitting process, except as specifically exempted below. That's original language. I have cleaned it up a bit, but those are the same concepts as what exist in your current ethics code. And then I added a catch-all provision, gifts of any kind and putting it here as your third prohibition. Gifts of any kind made directly or indirectly where acceptance might reasonably be construed as an attempt to create a more favorable relationship than that enjoyed by any other citizen, except improper influence on any municipal action or as a reward for another action, except as specifically exempted below.

And here are the exemptions. And, again, I have left this in in this fashion. It includes entertainment, the hospitality. I won't read that. I added the wording symbolic gifts. Somebody presents you with a symbolic gift when you are at an official gift or an official meeting, it's awfully difficult for you to refuse it. Without embarrassing the folks that are trying to gift you some sort of symbolic gift as a gesture. Admission to events that are sponsored or funded in whole or in part by the city has always been exempted. Those exemptions have been housed in Chapter 14 and I'm now moving them to the ethics code. Same with gifts of food or other small items of appreciation under \$25 in value, except accepted on behalf of the city and shared with others in the workplace. Items received to a charitable.

And item 14, moving that now to the ethics code. I added for clarification purposes only, personal gifts given by a relative. I don't know of any city councilmember who has ever declared such a gift, and I thought it deserves some clarification. Same with political campaign contributions that are publicly reported. Again, I'm attempting to clarify what the rules and regulations currently are. We have never considered that to be a gift controlled by the ethics ordinance. But I thought it deserved some clarification.

With the declaration, I have not changed the declaration rules. The declaration rules are still -- if after consideration of the ethical standards expressed in this policy, a gift of any kind in excess of \$25 is determined to be permissible and is accepted, it shall be declared in writing with the city clerk's office within five business days of acceptance, unless it is specifically exempted in Section 250 (B) I have highlighted that to draw your attention to it. I don't think that that provision is well understood by the city council, that an exempted gift right now under your current ethics code does not need to be declared because you often declare those gifts, even when they are exempted. But currently, it is not required to be declared. The declaration shall be on a form designated by the city clerk.

So, again, some of these provisions move from Chapter 14, into your ethics code. But it's the same rules as what you currently have when it comes to declaring your gift. And, again, from Chapter 14, because I have moved all of those provisions over to the ethics code, to avoid confusion, I have made clear to strike that it also applies to elected and appointed officers, and add a section clarifying that it does not apply to elected or appointed officials whose actions is covered by ethics code.

Here's how it looks in legislative format. The gray shading is the new language. Here you see the new definitions. Here you see the prohibition of any anonymous gift and the added catch-all provision

under number three. You see the clarifications regarding personal gifts and political campaign contributions, not constituting gifts, and the declaration language that moved from Chapter 14 and, again, the change to Chapter 14. And I'm available to answer any questions you may have.

[Time: 00:29:51]

Mayor Lane: Well thank you, Ms. Scott. I appreciate it and I want to also just thank you for the extent of time in a very busy time anyway having gone through this. I know it's created a certain amount of turmoil all the way around. So it's an interesting thing to have put you under the gun for that and to bring it around.

Personally, I'm just going to say right out of the box, that I think this effort is -- has created more turmoil for an ethics code that was created, you know, almost 15 years ago, and didn't seem to necessarily cause us any great difficulty until which time somebody ended up, I suppose being a target of it, and frankly, as it worked out, found to be by the board of three judges in the final throes of it, not to be guilty of anything within that area of the law. But I just -- I'm concerned about where we might be going with the new one. We have received probably hundreds of emails, asking us and figuring that somehow or another, this new law creates more loopholes. I'm not sure that I recognize that myself, but at the same time, I don't see that there is any great consequence in staying with the product that we have right now.

And so I realize that it's a little bit on the early side of it, but I'm just going to say, there's probably a discussion that we take place. I will make a motion that reject this motion and stick with our ethics code as it is right now.

Councilwoman Klapp: Second.

Mayor Lane: The motion has been made and seconded. Councilwoman Milhaven?

[Time: 00:31:52]

Councilwoman Milhaven: Thank you. I too wanted to thank you for the fire drill and sorry for the short notice, but I no he that since we are in the middle -- I know that we are in the middle of a campaign season, folks had a sense of urgency around it.

As you mentioned in your presentation, the council unanimously agreed that we didn't want to have anonymous donations to electeds and I was quite frankly flabbergasted when I started getting emails from folks say please vote no because I couldn't imagine who would think an anonymous donation was okay. What I learned is that the angst was really coming from the clarification around political contributions. And I'm wondering if there might be compromise, and address some of the concerns of the community and what we wanted to address.

I have a couple of questions I wanted clarify. We had a recent ethics complaint that surrounded campaign contributions and my paraphrasing the response was campaign contributions are not covered

by the current ethics code. Is that a fair -- is that a fair interpretation of what the conclusion was?

City Attorney Sherry Scott: Mayor and Councilwoman Milhaven, contributions made to a political committee, they are not made to individual councilmembers and we never interpreted our ethics code to apply to campaign contributions, which I would have to say are also heavily regulated by state law so it wouldn't be something that we would tempt to regulate in an ethics code. So yes, in answering your question, we have never interpreted campaign contributions to meet the definition of gift to an individual councilmember in our current ethics ordinance.

Councilwoman Milhaven: And then you also said you added that for clarification. So if anybody would have thought it would have been, you wanted to make clear that it was not, and that was your intention. So what that suggests to me, it doesn't really create any material change to the ethics code in terms of what is allowed or not allowed?

City Attorney Sherry Scott: That's correct. Another reason -- there are really two reasons I added it. I wanted to clarify it, yes. I added the word directly and indirectly to the prohibitions because I wanted to tighten up those prohibitions. It became a little bit more important at that point so that the public is not confused to clarify that that would not include political campaign contributions. I also reviewed the definition of gift under state law, which more clearly states it does not include political campaign distributions. I have to say, I was -- contributions I have to say, I was influenced by that because it was a very good definition of gift and I will thought about changing our definition of gift to that definition, but, again, I didn't want to overly change the structure of our current ethics code. So there were a couple of reasons I added it but to simplify it, it was just for a clarification.

Councilwoman Milhaven: Because in having several exchanges with folks who had concerns that's where folks got hung up. My question to you would be, if we deleted that exemption, what impact would that have on what you are presenting to us?

City Attorney Sherry Scott: I think if the council wanted to really limit what they are doing here, the best thing is to simply add exemption number one. It gets hard now to start tinkering it.

Councilwoman Milhaven: What about eliminating six. From all the emails. That's the one that caused a lot of people concerns. If we just eliminated six, what concerns do you have?

City Attorney Sherry Scott: If you eliminated six, I would be more comfortable if you eliminated the language, directly or indirectly.

Councilwoman Milhaven: Okay.

City Attorney Sherry Scott: That I added to one, two, and three, just because I don't want to create confusion for people who are reading this ethics code. I don't believe that we can with this language start to try to regulate political campaign contributions whether we strike it or whether we leave it in, it's just not that simple. But I would like to have a document that's clear to the public who may be reading it.

Councilwoman Milhaven: So if that is the case then, I would like to make an alternate motion that we adopt ordinance 4461, making the changes to the proposed code to eliminate exemption number six, and to eliminate the language "directly or indirectly." I think that addresses the community concerns as well as accomplishing what the council wanted to by making this change.

Councilmember Korte: I second that.

Councilwoman Milhaven: I would also -- I don't know if this is appropriate now or if I wait until Mayor and council actions. I want to make a motion to agendize a discussion of the public process to revisit. I don't know if I can add that here or if I need to wait until Mayor and council --

Mayor Lane: Actually, probably wait.

Councilwoman Milhaven: Wait. Certainly. Okay.

Mayor Lane: Okay. We have two motions on the table. The alternative motion would go first. And so I would -- we do have some additional commentary on this in any case. I will start with Councilwoman Klapp.

[Time: 00:37:51]

Councilwoman Klapp: I never had a chance to talk after I seconded the motion. If you don't mind, I would like to talk about this.

Mayor Lane: My mistake.

Councilwoman Klapp: Okay. I think that Sherry made a comment that I think is relevant here. She doesn't want to create confusion. I think by allowing certain changes and taking out other changes, it's still creating confusion among people that have been sending out these emails to me. And so my feeling is that when we agree to address this, that we were looking primarily at adding the word "anonymous." And that was pretty much it to the language and not a bunch of other language. And so I'm concerned still about the changes that are being made here and I think it's far more appropriate right now to make no changes.

We were attempting to address, I believe, originally a comment that was made that one of the councilmembers was very concerned that some of us were going to immediately go out and open up go fund me accounts and there's only three people who are impacted by this ordinance right now and that's Guy Phillips, Virginia Korte and myself. So we are the only three who could potentially go out and open up a go fund me account. We are the only elected officials running for office. This does not apply to anybody else, but us three. So by making the changes we are making. It kind of makes you sound like you are guilty before you proven innocent and I don't like the concept of making all of these changes to the ethics code right now because I don't really think it's critical necessary. I guess if you want me to pledge that I won't open up a go fund me account, I will do that.

I would suggest we not make any changes to this because there is confusion. And there is angst about this and I believe the best place for these changes to be made is we live with this code for 15 years and without any problem until just recently. Now there seems to be great concern. So if there is a need to make changes or to have a process that will be suggested later. I think it should go to the new council that will be elected in January and that we just reject this code change for now.

There's no reason to need it unless you think the three of us will go out and open up a go fund me account. And just say no to this and go ahead and allow whomever is elected in January to make a decision what they want to do about the ethics code rather than us presupposing what they may want. Whatever process they may want. I think that's really the better course of action, as far as I'm concerned. So I won't be voting for the alternate motion.

Mayor Lane: Thank you councilwoman. Councilman Phillips.

[Time: 00:41:22]

Councilman Phillips: Well, the angst you were getting in all the emails about number six is all along people thought that getting excessive campaign contributions to candidates or incumbents and then voting on the project is unethical. And so for our attorney to put in there that basically states, no, it's not unethical and you can go ahead and do it, just goes against the grain of anybody who thinks, well, somebody is going to give you \$13,000 and you will vote on the project. Just because it's a campaign contribution doesn't make it unethical. And it's them saying it's a political campaign or committee and not a candidate. I think what people want to see is include the contributions to candidates as unethical and not exempt it. That's the big problem there.

I would never vote to include that because even though our city attorney says it's a state issue and you have to go through state, that's not really true. The state can go ahead and do it all they want. As a city, we can say that we will not allow contributions from those who are going to come before the council. I don't see why anybody wouldn't want to agree with that. I won't take money from somebody that I know is coming to the council, and I don't see why anybody else should either. So that's what people are upset about. They have always been upset about that and now you kind of have the opening to change that and to say we will no longer do that, when instead we are doubling down and saying it's okay to do that. Thank you.

Mayor Lane: Thank you, Councilman Phillips. Councilwoman Littlefield.

[Time: 00:43:20]

Councilwoman Littlefield: Well, from the emails I received, both personal and city, the biggest thing I finally came to understand why people were very, very upset with this. And mainly it's the provision that exempts someone who comes before the city as being in violation of the ethics code. We can't make it legal but we can make it unethical. By exempting this from the ethics code, it's not illegal -- it's not unethical, I'm sorry, because we exempted it. That's what people are seeing. That's what people are angry about.

I think that's where the confusion with a lot of these folks. No, it needs to be included because if it's wrong, we need to know about it. If it doesn't have to be reported, we won't know about it, if it's not up ethical it won't be there. That's what people are concerned about. At least that's what I'm getting that they are concerned about.

We can't declare accepting contributions from someone who has business before the city council as illegal. The Arizona State says we can't do that but we do have the power to declare it a violation of the ethics code and then they can be brought up on charges of up ethical behavior. If we don't have it as a violation, they can't be brought up for something that's not a violation. So that's what people are looking at. That's what they are seeing and that's what they don't want. I will go with the Mayor's suggest that we do not do this at this time, that we say no, that we leave it down and go when the new council comes in in January and we make decisions on what we want to do at that time with this code. Thank you.

Mayor Lane: Thank you, Councilwoman Littlefield. Councilwoman Korte.

[Time: 00:45:30]

Councilmember Korte: Thank you, Mayor. I would certainly agree with most of you. I certainly agree with most of you who have expressed the desire to visit this ethics code in a robust revision and public input process in 2021.

But I believe tonight we are confusing the -- all the emails that were received by us, concerning campaign elections, campaign contributions, we're confusing that with the key issue of this ethics code revision tonight, which was closing the loophole around the autonomous gifts and that's the bottom line is that this closed loophole around anonymous gifts. I believe if we reject these changes that as a council, that you are condoning these anonymous donations. I don't think any of us do that and I don't think any of us want that. That's why I support Councilwoman Milhaven's alternate because it closes the loophole, and also removed the point of contention by many of our residents.

I would love to see the emails from these 507 individuals and who sent it. I think -- I think it was intentionally confusing. The ethics code has never included and never been about campaign contributions and I think the sooner that we disclose but also explain and have these conversations with our citizens, I think the better off we are going to be.

You know, this motion, the alternative motion is really about transparency. It's about accountability. It's really there against dark money and anonymous gifts and I believe that's what our citizens would like us to do. Is support transparency and accountability and not embrace dark money and not embrace anonymous gifts.

Mayor Lane: Thank you, Councilmember Korte. Vice Mayor Whitehead.

[Time: 00:48:07]

Vice Mayor Whitehead: I support both motions. I think we asked the city attorney to get rid of anonymous donations and so I was pretty disappointed to have any additional language added to it. I think we need a much broader look but I'm supportive. I don't think any of us no matter how we vote, mind getting rid of anonymous donations. I think that's a pretty clear-cut item. I will say that it is confusing because what people don't understand is that every time we cannot do what is clearly obvious and clearly beneficial and wanted by our citizens there's usually a state law behind that.

Once again, our citizens, nobody has ever come to me and said, you know, I think donations from people who are coming before council make our city better. That never happens. But it is hard for these citizens to understand that, in fact, the has bead a decision that limits us but the one avenue we have on transparently or disclosure, is this ethics code. So we never want to -- we always want to lift the ethics code and make it better. We never want to add something saying well, the state won't let us do and we will lower our standards on the ethics code. It's confusing.

We need to see what we can do to strengthen our ethics code despite the fact that there are state laws that limit what we might otherwise want to do. But that said, I'm very supportive of both -- both on the table today.

Mayor Lane: Okay. Councilwoman Milhaven.

[Time: 00:50:02]

Councilwoman Milhaven: It's not just three of us that would be held accountable to this ethics code. It's all seven of us and we have how many more months, six or seven months in the year of decisions to be made that I think we need to recognize that we are all held accountable to this not just those running.

And then finally, here -- and I have heard in the emails that there are people who are thinking that we shut some constraints or local constraints on campaign contributions and I think we should have that conversation and consider that. However, that is completely different from whether or not we allow anonymous campaign contributions.

To not accept these changes today is saying that I'm -- it's okay to accept an anonymous contribution because we haven't limited campaign contributions. I think they need to be separated and certainly we can come forward and have a community conversation around campaign contributions. I think it is irresponsible for us to put those two together and say, we're going to allow anonymous contributions because we are not limiting cam pane contribution -- campaign contributions we can deal with them separately and ethically. I think we need to hold ourselves to a higher standard. Thank you.

[Time: 00:51:27]

Mayor Lane: Thank you, councilwoman. It's interesting. There is certainly a lot of points across the board as far as how we look at this and how confusing it may be to others.

But one clarifying point was made when recent complaints were filed against two members of this council right now, on the basis of the old -- the old version. And that was quickly resolved that -- hmm?

[Off microphone comments]

Well, absolutely. But the idea was just exactly the item that's been talked a little bit about as far as the misunderstanding as to whether or not legally or ethically we say that a certain segment of the population is not entitled to any kind of political speeches might be presented in a campaign by a donation to a campaign versus to a personal gift. And the presumption of guilt is unbelievable and even in the wording of that -- that particular complaint, where we said the city needs to start an investigation, not that there was an assertion of guilt, but simply that there's a perceived or construed implication and therefore, guilty as charged. And the individual needs to essentially prove his or her innocence through an investigation before anything could be concurred.

I -- the anonymous thing is something that I certainly understand personally, with regard to the -- you know, something -- a new mechanism that was relatively new mechanism of cloud funding or -- or go fund me kinds of operations. But, again, it's an interesting thing to try to draw upon somebody to say, in that environment, if you were to disclose it, and it didn't exceed other indications within it. Why would that be a problem? So leaving it anonymous, I'm not sure -- if it's anonymous, you don't even know who it is that you are supposed to be favoring by that action. So I'm -- I got to tell you, this is probably as confused as anyone -- and sitting in these seven seats right here right now, I am. And -- but I'm concerned about it.

But I do know we have a program. We have an ethics code that has essentially worked for it, even though there's a number of frivolous kinds of things that are presented just in order to put on file that somebody has ethics complaint against them, it may be meaningless, but nobody maybe looks beyond the top line on it. So I'm -- I'm -- I still think we are better suited right now if somebody is going to suggest we do something in the future, but for right now, I think this is a bad time to be -- to be messing with this right now and I think there's an awful lot of politics that are involved on both sides of this in trying to create a little bit of havoc and maybe some disruption in it. So I'm -- I still think that -- well, I'm no on the amendment and certainly sticking with what we got.

Councilmember Korte: Call for the question.

Mayor Lane: Okay. We have alternative motion that's on the table. So that would go first, as indicating. All those in favor of the alternative motion please indicate by aye and opposed with a nay. Nay. The motion fails 5-2. With Councilwoman Milhaven and Councilwoman Korte in the affirmative.

We'll move to the second motion which was essentially to -- to reject the amended version, and if we are then ready for that, it's yes, if you are for rejection, and no if you are not for rejection. Aye. 5-2 with now in the reverse order, opposing Councilwoman Milhaven and Councilmember Korte. I think that completes that item and we move on to the next point. Again, Sherry, thank you very much for all the work you did. I mean -- okay.

MAYOR AND COUNCIL ITEMS

[Time: 00:56:13]

Mayor Lane: Our next item is the Mayor and Council items. Are there any Mayor and Council items? Yes? Councilman Phillips.

Councilman Phillips: I have a motion and a statement. First off, I want to commend our police officers for the fine job they do day in and day out. It's a dangerous job and that's I didn't hold them in such high esteem. They need our support and they need the proper equipment to protect themselves while they protect us. Unfortunately, on May 30th, there appeared to be a call during a publicized riot during Downtown for your officers to stand down. I'm glad no officers or the public was injured, it raises a question of how safe we really are. Right now old town is boarded up and many shops have left. We can't go on like this. We cannot feel unsafe. We can't have resident and vigilantes standing guard. The public and the business community need to know that our police department will be instructed to uphold the law to protect and serve as they were sworn to do.

Therefore, I move to direct staff to investigate the stand down order on May 30th and to agendize a discussion on their findings.

Mayor Lane: Thank you, councilman. A motion is on the table to agendize. Any comments or questions? Second?

Councilwoman Littlefield: Yes, I would like to ask Councilman Phillips, I would like to hear a report from the police and fire department, mostly police, what happened, what they did, why they did it -- a bit of a report on what happened during the riot, the night of the riot, primarily, and what changes, additions compensations to their tactics were made at that time. I'm concerns that I had heard comments from some. People in the police that they weren't going to protect private property, and that I think is a big concern for a lot of the people in downtown and the businesses and stuff like that. I would like to have comments on that also on what they meant or if that was just an off the wall or whatever. But I think a report from the police would be good for us to hear and public meeting. So I will second that motion.

Mayor Lane: Thank you councilwoman. Any further comment?

[Off microphone comments]

Mayor Lane: Pardon?

Councilman Phillips: The motion is to direct staff to investigate the stand down order and to agendize a discussion on the findings.

[Off microphone comments]

Councilwoman Littlefield: Police is staff too.

Councilman Phillips: I will modify if the report is public. I don't want a secretive report to the council that can't go out to the public.

Councilwoman Littlefield: I will second making it public, yes.

Mayor Lane: Okay. A motion has been made and seconded.

City Clerk Carolyn Jagger: Your Honor? Could we please clarify the amended motion?

Mayor Lane: Please go ahead.

Councilman Phillips: Okay. Move to direct staff to investigate the stand down order and to come back with a public report on their findings.

Mayor Lane: So the agendized item is really to come back with the report so this is a --

Councilman Phillips: Well, it wouldn't be agendized if they come back with a public report.

Mayor Lane: Yeah. Okay.
[Off microphone comment]

Councilman Phillips: You want to hear it again. I move to direct staff to investigate the stand down order on May 30th and to come back with a report -- a public report open their findings.

[Off microphone comments]

Councilwoman Littlefield: Well, I think -- [Off microphone comments] -- If we want to make it by staff, that's fine, but I would also like to have input and discussion by the police department also. I don't want it to be one sided. So I think that would be good to add to it, if that's okay.

Councilman Phillips: Well, how are you wording that? How are you going to word that? I mean -- when you have staff, staff includes the city manager, the police --

Councilwoman Littlefield: So your motion already included the police. I would like to have it from basically the police and the fire, if appropriate, to bring back what happened and report on the incident.

Mayor Lane: So consistent with the motion?

Councilwoman Littlefield: Yes.

Mayor Lane: Vice Mayor.

[Time: 01:01:20]

Vice Mayor Whitehead: I would like to make an alternate motion that there be a staff review that includes police chief, and input from the officers on the ground and reviewed by the city manager, so it's not a review that's focused just on the police chief, but it be a review and have a public report result presented to council.

Councilwoman Milhaven: Second.

Councilman Phillips: Mayor?

Mayor Lane: Yes, go ahead.

Councilman Phillips: And since that's alternate and it's been seconded, we are going to vote on it, but my main objective here is to investigate the stand down order. And so we don't just need a review of what happened because we already know what happened and already doing a review of it.

Vice Mayor Whitehead: It's not my understanding we do know what happened. I would say that in particular, we would like an independent, perhaps a city manager oversight on whether there was a stand down and, you know, clarification on what happened, why it happened. So I would include specifically that the review should include stand -- the -- you know, that there was a stand down order.

Councilman Phillips: Basically the same thing.

Vice Mayor Whitehead: Well, it doesn't assume guilt. I assume that it should be reviewed.

Mayor Lane: Okay. So he with have an alternative motion. I will just say something here, because we are talking about the stand down order and that's been asked and answered. And so I'm presuming that you know that there was one the way you have worded it. And that's of real concern to me, but nevertheless, the other is that you probably all are listening to the conversation that's taken place because of folks trying to arm and protect themselves and their business property. And as the -- as the current offering of trying to amend the state statutes in that regard to allow them to use force much less potentially deadly force but to use force in stopping somebody from attacking your property. Apparently that seems to be -- it's not -- I'm sorry, were you -- oh.

City Attorney Sherry Scott: I'm sorry, Mayor but I do worry about staying open agenda and this item is not really meant for debate. It's meant to simply to put something on your next agenda.

Mayor Lane: You are free to stop it us and I understand that, completely. She's sort of signed over here. I wasn't sure what she was saying over here. Nevertheless, yeah. It's my -- I understand and I appreciate that. You are absolutely right.

Councilmember Korte: I call for the question.

Mayor Lane: Go ahead and call for the question.

Clerk Jagger: I'm so sorry to interrupt. I didn't hear any date given to this. So I'm assuming that it's not at the next meeting; is that correct? It's just when the information is available?

Councilman Phillips: However long it takes.

Clerk Jagger: When you fit it in? Is that okay?

Mayor Lane: Okay. That's clear then. Okay. The alternate motion is on the table, and the first one to be voted upon. If you wouldn't mind vice Mayor, if you could restate your motion. We will put Councilman Phillips through this a few times.

Vice Mayor Whitehead: I would like staff to review and provide a report on the incidents of that night. I would like that review to come from the viewpoint of multiple parties involved and have April independent look from the city manager -- an independent look from the city manager. I would like to specifically have information provided on whether or not there was a stand down request and information pertaining to that. Stand down order.

Mayor Lane: Okay. If everyone is clear on that, I think we are ready to vote. All those in favor, please indicate by aye and register your vote. The motion passes 6-1, with Councilmember Korte opposing. So there's no further need to -- for another vote on that. So that first alternative motion or that alternative motion passes. So Mayor and council items. No further items indicated. So I will ask for a motion to adjourn.

Unknown: So moved.

Mayor Lane: And convene to the next council special session.

Councilmember Korte: I'm sorry I missed the opportunity for additional Mayor and council items. I would like to request a follow-up on a review and revision of the ethics code to begin in 2021.

Vice Mayor Whitehead: Second.

Councilmember Korte: It's not a motion. What do we do with this?

Mayor Lane: Well, if it's -- it's just like the last. This is to agendize.

Councilmember Korte: To agendize. Yes, thank you. For 2021.

Mayor Lane: Can we make a motion for a new council?

City Attorney Sherry Scott: I believe you can. The new council can take another motion and see it differently, but you can certainly pass the motion.

Mayor Lane: Okay. Motion -- did I hear a second? Second? Any further comments by anyone? All

those in favor please indicate by aye and those opposed with a nay. It's unanimous then, 7-0. 2021 agenda item is a matter of record. Okay. Regular meeting and follow that with convening -- and to convene at the same time the city council special meeting.

Councilman Phillips: Move to adjourn.

Councilwoman Littlefield: Second.

Mayor Lane: And to convene.

Councilman Phillips: And to convene.

Councilwoman Littlefield: And to convene.

Mayor Lane: The city council special meeting.

The motion has been made and seconded.

All those in favor signify by saying aye and register your vote. Any nays? No. Okay.

SPECIAL MEETING

[Time: 01:08:53]

Mayor Lane: So this is a final -- let's see. A final adoption of a fiscal year 2020-21 budget systems request to adopt ordinance 4460 setting the final budget estimates for the fiscal year 2020-21 year ended operating budget and capital improvement plan as tentatively approved on May 19th, 2020. So we have Ms. Doyle here in this special meeting for this one.

Budget Director Judy Doyle: Thank you.

Mayor Lane: Immediately following the last meeting.

Budget Director Judy Doyle: Yes, thank you. My final appearance tonight is very brief. This is no formal presentation. At this point in the process, it's just a formality to adopt the budget. We are asking you to adopt ordinance number 4460, setting the final budget estimates for fiscal year 2020-2021, operating budget and capital improvement plan, as tentatively adopted on May 19th, 2020. And that concludes the presentation.

Mayor Lane: Okay. I don't presume there's any questions on this. So do I have a motion to adopt?

Councilman Phillips: So moved.

Councilwoman Klapp: Second.

Mayor Lane: The motion has been made. Any further comment? Hearing none. I think we are ready

to vote. All those in favor, indicate by aye, those opposed with a nay. It's unanimous acceptance. Thank you, again, Ms. Doyle.

Budget Director Judy Doyle: Thank you.

Mayor Lane: All right. Everybody ready for the CFDs? That's a better question I suppose.

DC RANCH COMMUNITY FACILITY DISTRICT

[Time: 01:11:17]

Mayor Lane: This is the DC Ranch community facilities district. I'm calling to order this meeting at this time and this date. The roll call will do one time. Carolyn, would you please?

City Clerk Carolyn Jagger: Mayor Jim Lane.

Mayor Lane: Present.

City Clerk Carolyn Jagger: Vice Mayor Solange Whitehead.

Vice Mayor Whitehead: Here.

City Clerk Carolyn Jagger: Councilmembers Suzanne Klapp.

Councilwoman Klapp: Here.

City Clerk Carolyn Jagger: Kathy Littlefield.

Councilwoman Littlefield: Here.

City Clerk Carolyn Jagger: Virginia Korte.

Councilmember Korte: Here.

City Clerk Carolyn Jagger: Linda Milhaven.

Councilwoman Milhaven: Here.

City Clerk Carolyn Jagger: Guy Phillips.

Councilman Phillips: Here.

Mayor Lane: Okay. Do I have a motion to approve the regular meeting minutes of Tuesday, June 22nd, 2019. This is for the DC Ranch Community Facilities District.

Councilwoman Klapp: So moved.

Councilmember Korte: Second.

Mayor Lane: All in favor. Aye. Opposed?

Do I have a motion to adopt resolution number -- a motion to adopt resolution number 53, which sets out proposed budget and calls for public hearing?

Councilwoman Klapp: So moved.

Councilmember Korte: Second.

Mayor Lane: Motion has been made and second. All in favor aye.

There is a call for public testimony on the budget. Hearing none, no public testimony. Do I have a motion to adopt resolution number 54, which approves the budget and sets the tax levy?

Councilwoman Littlefield: So moved.

Councilmember Korte : Second

Mayor Lane: The motion has been made and seconded. All those in favor indicate by aye. We are adjourning the D.C. Ranch CFD board.

MCDOWELL MOUNTAIN RANCH COMMUNITY FACILITY DISTRICT

Mayor Lane: Moving on to the McDowell -- I'm now convening the McDowell mountain ranch facility.

Unknown: We need a motion to adjourn.

Mayor Lane: I think I just announced we adjourned it. I was cutting it short. I'm getting sloppier, I suppose. In any case, I'm convening the McDowell mountain ranch community facilities district and calling it to order.

Do I have a motion to approve the regular meeting minutes of Tuesday, June 11, 2019.

Councilwoman Littlefield: So moved.

Councilwoman Klapp: Second.

Mayor Lane: Moved and seconded. All in favor, indicate by aye. Minutes are approved.

Do I have a motion to adopt resolution, number 65 which sets out proposed budget and calls for public

hearings.

Councilmember Korte: So moved.

Councilwoman Klapp: Second.

Mayor Lane: Motion and a second. All those in favor please indicate by aye. There's a call for public testimony on the budget. No testimony is given.

Do I have a motion to adopt resolution 66 which approves the budget and sets the tax levy?

Councilwoman Littlefield: So moved.

Councilmember Korte: Second.

Mayor Lane: Motion and a second. All in favor, aye. Opposed? Motion to adjourn the McDowell million ranch community facilities district. Motion and second. All in favor. Aye.

SCOTTSDALE MOUNTAIN COMMUNITY FACILITIES DISTRICT

Mayor Lane: I will convene the Scottsdale mountain community facilities district. Do I have a motion to approve the regular minutes of Tuesday, June 11th, 2019.

Councilwoman Klapp: So moved.

Councilmember Korte: Second.

Mayor Lane: Motion has been made and seconded. All those in favor in indicate by aye.

Do I have a motion for to adopt resolution 68, which is sets out proposed budget and calls for a public hearing?

Councilwoman Klapp: So moved.

Councilman Phillips: Second.

Mayor Lane: Motion and a second. All in favor aye. All went out for public testimony on the budget. None heard.

Do I have a motion to adopt resolution 69 which approves the budget and sets tax levy.

Councilwoman Klapp: So moved.

Councilman Phillips: Second

Mayor Lane: Moved and seconded. All those in favor please indicate by aye. Opposed? No?
Do I have a motion to adjourn?

Unknown: So moved.

Unknown: Second.

VIA LINDA ROAD COMMUNITY FACILITIES DISTRICT

Mayor Lane: We are adjourned. I would like to call to order and convene the Via Linda road community facilities district.

And we will start with the one order -- the first order of business is the approval the minutes do I have a motion to approve the regular meeting minutes of June 11, 2019.

Councilwoman Littlefield: So moved.

Councilmember Korte: Second.

Mayor Lane: Motion and a second. All those in favor please indicate by aye. Minutes are approved.

Do I have a motion to adopt resolution number 49, which sets out proposed budget and calls for public hearing?

Councilwoman Klapp: So moved.

Councilwoman Littlefield: Second.

Mayor Lane: Motion has been moved and seconded. All those in favor please indicate by aye. We called for public testimony on the budget. None heard.

Do I have a motion to adopt resolution number 50, which approves the budget and sets tax levy?

Councilwoman Klapp: So moved.

Councilman Phillips: Second.

Mayor Lane: The motion has been made and seconded. All those in favor please indicate by aye. Motion passes. Do I have a motion to adjourn the Via Linda CFD board?

Unknown: So moved.

Unknown: Second.

Mayor Lane: Motion moved and seconded. We are adjourned.

SCOTTSDALE WATERFRONT COMMERCIAL COMMUNITY FACILITIES DISTRICT

Mayor Lane: I would like to convene and call to order the Scottsdale waterfront commercial community facilities district. And start with the approval of minutes.

Councilwoman Littlefield: So moved.

Mayor Lane: Do I have a motion to approve regular meeting Minutes of Tuesday June 11, 2019 and Tuesday, October 22, 2019?

Councilwoman Littlefield: So moved.

Councilwoman Klapp: Second.

Mayor Lane: Okay. All those in favor please indicate by aye.

Do I have a motion to adopt resolution number 36, which sets out preliminary budget and calls for public hearing?

Councilwoman Klapp: So moved.

Councilman Phillips: Second.

Mayor Lane: The motion has been made and seconded. All those in favor please indicate by aye. Call for the public testimony on the budget. None heard.

Do I have a motion to adopt resolution number 37 that approves the budget and sets tax levy?

Councilwoman Klapp: So moved.

Councilman Phillips: Second.

Mayor Lane: The motion made and seconded. All those in favor of resolution number 37, please indicate by aye. Opposed? Motion passes. Do I have a motion to adjourn the waterfront commercial CFD board?

Unknown: Move to adjourn.

Mayor Lane: The motion has been made and seconded. We are adjourned. That completes our CFDs board meetings. If I'm not missing a page, that's it.

ADJOURNMENT

[Time: 01:16:44]

Mayor Lane: And so we are -- I would ask for a motion to adjourn. Thank everybody for the participation in the work study and also in this meeting. Thanks very much for all of the staff that's been here with us too. A motion to adjourn on this regular meeting.

Mayor Lane: Moved and seconded. All those in favor of adjournment, please indicate by aye. We are adjourned.