

**PRESCOTT CAPITAL NEEDS COMMITTEE
MEETING - PRESCOTT, ARIZONA
MAY 7, 2008**

A MEETING OF THE PRESCOTT CAPITAL NEEDS COMMITTEE WAS HELD ON WEDNESDAY, MAY 7, 2008, in the Arizona Room of the Hassayampa Inn, 122 East Gurley Street, Prescott, Arizona.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT: Chairman Tammy Linn; Vice Chairman Robert Weiss; Malcolm Barrett, Jr.; Joseph Baynes; John Danforth; Robert Reuillard; Ronald Younger; Milbeth Mauer; Roger Swenson; Eloise Esser; Tilden Drinkard; David Maurer; Rowle P. Simmons; Stephanie Bragg; Paddie Braden.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT: Elisabeth Ruffner; James Lawrence; John Stevens; Ken Lain; Steven Blair.

1. Call to Order.

Chairman Linn called the meeting to order at 4:00 p.m.

2. Approval of minutes of the April 23, 2008 meeting.

The minutes of the April 23, 2008 meeting were approved as amended: Page 3, top of line, before "to him" insert \$6,130,000; Page 4 paragraph 4, last line change "progressive" to "aggressive."

Younger had a question on whether the length of the runway would be enough to handle regional jets, and the minutes did not reflect an answer from Ben Vardiman. Staff will confirm, but believed that was correct.

3. Discussion on Evaluation/Prioritization Criteria.

Chairman Linn thanked the committee members for their dedication to the project, and gave a special thanks to those who worked on the subcommittee: Elisabeth Ruffner, David Maurer, Bob Reuillard and Roger Swenson. She said that the packet that will be handed out is the compilation of the subcommittee's work and will be explained in detail later.

The first part of the packet is a summary of the projects presented during the process. She said that Hadley and the department heads went through each request and narrowed them down to those deemed most essential to continue to provide a good level of service. The projects are listed by department with cost estimates.

The committee will work through a two-step evaluation process. The first will be a ranking of the projects from a cost neutral view, meaning the committee should

rank the projects based on their “gut feeling” on if it is good for the community. She said that while Hadley is tabulating the results from that ranking, she will explain the second ranking form in more detail. The results from the first will be available before the meeting is over.

Vice Chairman Weiss asked about the rating scale and if 1 was low and 5 high. Chairman Linn explained the scoring and how they would use the rating matrix. She then went through the list of projects and asked if the committee had questions to ask them now, not while they were doing the ranking.

4. Evaluation/Prioritization of Projects.

Esser asked if, as an example, she could give all the parks and recreation projects 5's. Chairman Linn said they could rank any project any level they saw fit. The purpose of this rating was so everyone on the committee could have his or her personal opinion expressed. Bragg thought it might be used as a process of elimination. Chairman Linn advised that was not the case.

Swenson asked if the committee was considering an indoor-only pool. Horton said no. Bragg asked for clarification on the 80-100 acre park location. It was noted that it would be the one north of Highway 89 in the airport/golf course area. Horton briefly explained the recreation center.

Bragg asked about the land for the airport runway extension. She thought the price seemed too high. The Mayor explained that the City hoped it would not be that expensive. Bragg asked when the City planned to purchase the land; it was noted that no definite date has been set. Reiuillard asked if the cost included construction or if it was just land.

Chairman Linn told the group that if they missed a meeting and didn't feel like they knew enough about a certain project, that they didn't have to vote on it.

Danforth asked what happened to the request from the Police Department for the indoor shooting range. Lt. Kabbel said it had been removed from the list. Danforth felt that was a good decision. Reiuillard thought the subcommittee had removed the armored SWAT vehicle from the list. Chairman Linn advised that the subcommittee had nothing to do with the revised list; it was done by the requesting departments. Reiuillard also made note that the cost of the rodeo grounds was good only if the structure was found to be sound. If it was not, the price would dramatically increase.

Chairman Linn then asked the group to begin the cost-neutral ranking. Swenson asked if everyone was comfortable doing this type of ranking. He felt it was good because it forced people to think about factors other than cost.

Chairman Linn then explained the criteria and matrix that the committee members could use if they needed something concrete to help with their decisions. Swenson commented that the matrix would drive him crazy. Danforth thought it was a good tool as it caused the committee to reflect on the projects and their priorities. The committee wanted ten minutes to read the matrix and then ask questions if they had any.

All cost neutral rankings were submitted and Woodfill and Hadley did the tabulating. It was noted that five members were absent and that would skew the results. Younger asked if a standard deviation could be shown so the committee knew how close or far they were from each other in the rankings. Woodfill said that could be done. Barrett suggested that it would be easier to just show all the individual numbers for each item.

Before the ranking list was read, Chairman Linn asked that all those who could not finish the cost estimate rankings during the meeting have them turned in to Patti or Wendy at City Hall no later than noon on Friday.

The following was the order projects ranked: (note – this ranking is missing five responses and therefore is considered preliminary):

Downtown Fire Station and Admin Building	4.5
New Police Headquarters	4.3
Police Fire and Storage Building	4.1
Park Upgrades	4.0
Airport Terminal	4.0
Rodeo Grounds	3.9
Upgrade to existing shooting range	3.9
Public Safety training center	3.9
Land Acquisition for runway extension	3.8
Willow/Watson Lake Fire station	3.7
Elks Opera House	3.3
Police Capital Equipment (command/armored)	2.9
Aquatic Center – indoor and outdoor	2.8
Recreation Center	2.7
80 – 100 acre park	2.2
Aquatic Center – outdoor only	1.9

Staff noted that once all rankings are received the list will be updated.

5. Questions.

None.

6. Adjournment.

There being no further business to be discussed, the Prescott Capital Needs Committee meeting of May 7, 2008 adjourned at 5:15 p.m.

TAMMY LINN, Chairman

ELISABETH RUFFNER, Secretary