

## MINUTES

REGULAR COUNCIL MEETING  
TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 5, 2013  
COUNCIL CHAMBERS  
211 WEST ASPEN AVENUE  
4:00 P.M. AND 6:00 P.M.

### 1. **CALL TO ORDER**

Mayor Nabours called the meeting of November 5, 2013, to order at 4:02 p.m.

#### **NOTICE OF OPTION TO RECESS INTO EXECUTIVE SESSION**

*Pursuant to A.R.S. §38-431.02, notice is hereby given to the members of the City Council and to the general public that, at this regular meeting, the City Council may vote to go into executive session, which will not be open to the public, for legal advice and discussion with the City's attorneys for legal advice on any item listed on the following agenda, pursuant to A.R.S. §38-431.03(A)(3).*

### 2. **ROLL CALL**

*NOTE: One or more Councilmembers may be in attendance telephonically or by other technological means.*

Present:

MAYOR NABOURS  
VICE MAYOR EVANS  
COUNCILMEMBER BAROTZ  
COUNCILMEMBER BREWSTER  
COUNCILMEMBER ORAVITS  
COUNCILMEMBER OVERTON  
COUNCILMEMBER WOODSON

Absent:

Others present: City Manager Kevin Burke; City Attorney Michelle D'Andrea.

### 3. **PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE AND MISSION STATEMENT**

#### **MISSION STATEMENT**

*The mission of the City of Flagstaff is to protect and enhance the quality of life of its citizens.*

### 4. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM PREVIOUS MEETINGS**

- A. **Consideration and Approval of Minutes:** City Council Special Work Session of September 19, 2013; the Regular Meeting of October 1, 2013; the Work Session of October 8, 2013; the Regular Meeting of October 15, 2013; and the Combined Special Meeting/Special Work Session of October 22, 2013.

**Councilmember Overton moved to approve [the minutes of the City Council Special Work Session of September 19, 2013; the Regular Meeting of October 1, 2013; the Work Session of October 8, 2013; the Regular Meeting of October 15, 2013; and the Combined Special Meeting/Special Work Session of October 22, 2013]; seconded; passed unanimously.**

5. **PUBLIC PARTICIPATION**

*Public Participation enables the public to address the Council about an item that is not on the agenda (or is listed under Possible Future Agenda Items). Comments relating to items that are on the agenda will be taken at the time that the item is discussed. If you wish to address the Council at tonight's meeting, please complete a comment card and submit it to the recording clerk as soon as possible. Your name will be called when it is your turn to speak. You may address the Council up to three times throughout the meeting, including comments made during Public Participation. Please limit your remarks to three minutes per item to allow everyone an opportunity to speak. At the discretion of the Chair, ten or more persons present at the meeting and wishing to speak may appoint a representative who may have no more than fifteen minutes to speak.*

Terrie Craig, Board Chairman for the Happy Hour Group, said that she spoke with the ADA offices and was told it was the City's choice whether to comply with their regulations. She asked that this item be placed on a future Council agenda.

6. **PROCLAMATIONS AND RECOGNITIONS**

None

7. **APPOINTMENTS**

*Pursuant to A.R.S. §38-431.02, notice is hereby given to the members of the City Council and to the general public that the City Council may vote to go into executive session, which will not be open to the public, for the purpose of discussing or considering employment, assignment, appointment, promotion, demotion, dismissal, salaries, disciplining or resignation of a public officer, appointee, or employee of any public body...., pursuant to A.R.S. §38-431.03(A)(1).*

A. **Consideration of Appointments:** Transportation Commission.

**Councilmember Brewster moved to appoint Kevin Parkes as a Citizen member to the Transportation Commission, term to expire July 2016; seconded; passed unanimously.**

**Councilmember Brewster moved to appoint Jeffrey Stevenson as a Citizen member to the Transportation Commission, term to expire July 2016; seconded; passed unanimously**

**Councilmember Brewster moved to appoint Bob Kuhn as a School member to the Transportation Commission, term to expire November 2016; seconded; passed unanimously.**

**Councilmember Brewster moved to appoint Jeff Meilback as a NAIPTA member to the Transportation Commission, term to expire November 2016; seconded; passed unanimously.**

**8. LIQUOR LICENSE PUBLIC HEARINGS**

- A. **Consideration and Action on Liquor License Application:** Navayogasingam Thuraisingam, "Modern Grove", 1020 S. Milton Rd., Suite 102, Series 07 (beer and wine bar), Person Transfer and Location Transfer.

**Councilmember Overton moved to open the public hearing; seconded; passed unanimously.**

**There being no public input, Mayor Nabours moved to close the Public Hearing; seconded; passed unanimously.**

**Councilmember Brewster moved to forward the application (for Modern Grove) to the State with a recommendation for approval; seconded; passed unanimously.**

**9. CONSENT ITEMS**

*All matters under Consent Agenda are considered by the City Council to be routine and will be enacted by one motion approving the recommendations listed on the agenda. Unless otherwise indicated, expenditures approved by Council are budgeted items.*

- A. **Consideration and Approval of the Section 8 Housing Choice Voucher Program:** Payment standards to exceed 110% of the Section 8 Fair Market Rents (FMR) and authorization to submit the request to HUD for final approval.

Mayor Nabours said that he sits on the Board of Flagstaff Housing Authority and this is for the Section 8 Housing Program received from HUD so they can rent private spaces. HUD sets what they think is the fair market rental, but in Flagstaff they often find that is too low and a person with a HUD voucher cannot find adequate housing. This action allows Flagstaff Housing to ask HUD to allow them to exceed the payment standards to 110%.

**Councilmember Barotz moved to approve [an increase of the Section 8 Housing Choice Voucher Program payment standards to exceed 110% of the Section 8 Fair Market Rents for the purpose of preventing financial hardship for families, to increase the number of voucher holders who become participants upon lease-up and to authorize the submission to HUD for final approval]; seconded; passed unanimously.**

- B. **Consideration and Approval of Cooperative Contract:** Purchase of black cinders utilizing a Coconino County bid with Miller Mining Inc., bid number 2014-01 for 10,000 tons in the amount of \$129,250.

Mayor Nabours asked what the process was for using a County bid and whether it would have made a difference if the vendor knew that their bid may be used by

others. Mr. Compau said that the County let out a bid that includes verbiage to allow a cooperative agreement with other agencies to utilize the same bid. He said that the fact that the bid documents included that wording would give a vendor the indication that others may use the bid as well.

Mr. O'Connor said that within the bid they broke out the different areas and the amounts that may be needed. He noted that they have been purchasing these cinders this same way for some time and this is the same price they have paid in the past.

**Councilmember Woodson moved to approve purchase of black cinders for ice control utilizing a Coconino County bid with Miller Mining, Inc., bid number 2014-01 for 10,000 tons in the amount of \$129,250; seconded; passed unanimously.**

10. **ROUTINE ITEMS**

A. ITEM MOVED TO 6:00 PM AGENDA 15-B.

B. **Consideration and Adoption of Ordinance No. 2013-22:** An ordinance of the Council of the City of Flagstaff, Arizona, Amending Title 10, Zoning Code, Division 10-50.100, Sign Standards, Section 10-50.100.080, Sign Districts of Special Designation, of the Flagstaff Zoning Code by adding Section 10-50.100.080.E, Flagstaff Mall and Marketplace District.

Mayor Nabours noted that this was second reading of the ordinance.

**Councilmember Woodson moved to read Ordinance No. 2013-22 for the final time by title only; seconded; passed unanimously.**

*AN ORDINANCE OF THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF FLAGSTAFF, ARIZONA, AMENDING TITLE 10, ZONING CODE, DIVISION 10-50.100, SIGN STANDARDS, SECTION 10-50.100.080, SIGN DISTRICTS OF SPECIAL DESIGNATION, OF THE FLAGSTAFF ZONING CODE BY ADDING SECTION 10-50.100.080.E, FLAGSTAFF MALL AND MARKETPLACE DISTRICT*

**Councilmember Woodson moved to adopt Ordinance No. 2013-22; seconded; passed unanimously.**

C. **Consideration of the Intergovernmental Agreement (IGA)/Joint Project Agreement (JPA):** 13-0002790-I between the City of Flagstaff (City) and the Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) for the FY 2014 Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP), Design and Installation of Signs.

Traffic Engineer Jeff Bauman reviewed the project, noting that they were receiving \$300,000 from the Feds, through Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT), to design and install approximately 2,600 signs in this phase of the project. He explained that they start with regulatory signs such as stop signs and speed limit signs. They completed an inventory two years ago based on size, age, etc.

Mr. Burke added that there was a federal requirement on some of the reflectivity standards and many of the signs put up in the past did not meet those requirements. He added that there will probably be two more of these coming. Mr. Bauman said that was correct; this was roughly one-third of the signs.

Mayor Nabours asked what would occur if there were overruns. Mr. Bauman said that with this particular project they would stop whenever they run out of money.

**Mayor Nabours moved to approve the Intergovernmental Agreement between the City of Flagstaff and Arizona Department of Transportation for grant funds in the amount of \$300,000; seconded; passed 6-1 with Councilmember Oravits casting the dissenting vote.**

### **RECESS**

The Regular Meeting of the Flagstaff City Council held November 5, 2013, recessed at 4:25 p.m.

### **6:00 P.M. MEETING**

### **RECONVENE**

Mayor Nabours reconvened the Regular Meeting of the Flagstaff City Council held November 5, 2013, at 6:02 p.m.

### **NOTICE OF OPTION TO RECESS INTO EXECUTIVE SESSION**

*Pursuant to A.R.S. §38-431.02, notice is hereby given to the members of the City Council and to the general public that, at this regular meeting, the City Council may vote to go into executive session, which will not be open to the public, for legal advice and discussion with the City's attorneys for legal advice on any item listed on the following agenda, pursuant to A.R.S. §38-431.03(A)(3).*

### 11. **ROLL CALL**

*NOTE: One or more Councilmembers may be in attendance telephonically or by other technological means.*

Present:

MAYOR NABOURS  
VICE MAYOR EVANS  
COUNCILMEMBER BAROTZ  
COUNCILMEMBER BREWSTER  
COUNCILMEMBER ORAVITS  
COUNCILMEMBER OVERTON  
COUNCILMEMBER WOODSON

Absent:

Others present: City Manager Kevin Burke; City Attorney Michelle D'Andrea.

12. **PUBLIC PARTICIPATION**

Rudy Preston, Flagstaff, reminded Council that Snowbowl has started spraying their wastewater on the peaks and had been relayed a story that they were unable to keep the kids from eating the snow.

Jan McRae, Flagstaff, addressed the Council regarding the private pocket park in Boulder Point. She was told at the last HOA meeting that the City staff had recommended they match the City hours for parks, 5 a.m. to 10 p.m. or midnight. She requested that someone from the City send a letter stating that they were not recommending that.

Carol Kendall, Flagstaff, reminded the Council of its Mission Statement, noting that the impacts of initiatives for tax increases must be considered first on the lowest-income citizens of the community.

Katie Nelson, Flagstaff, suggested that the Council be recording radiation in at least one point within the City.

April Smith, Flagstaff, asked for the same protections as Buffalo Park for McMillan Mesa.

Roxanna Days, Flagstaff, asked that the Council not support the displacement of families in the Arrowhead Village, and asked for a moratorium on developments in those areas where residents already exist.

13. **CARRY OVER ITEMS FROM THE 4:00 P.M. AGENDA**

None

14. **PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS**

None

15. **REGULAR AGENDA**

A. **Consideration and Approval of Grant Agreement and Acceptance of Grant Funding:** Fiscal Year 2013 Arizona State Parks Growing Smarter Grant.

Sustainability Specialist McKenzie Jones reviewed the grant agreement regarding the purchase of Observatory Mesa. She said that the minimum bid the State would accept is \$11.6 million, and with the surveys the overall cost would be at least \$12.4 million. She said that the State is offering a grant in the amount of \$6 million to be used for this purchase and in order to complete the acquisition the City would grant them a conservation easement across the property.

**Councilmember Overton moved to approve the grant agreement with the Arizona State Parks Growing Smarter Grant Program and authorize the acceptance of grant funding in the amount of \$6,000,000; seconded; passed unanimously.**

- i. **Consideration and Possible Adoption of Ordinance No. 2013-25:** Authorizing the purchase of approximately 2,251 acres known as Observatory Mesa.

Mr. Burke said that although the minimum bid price is \$11.6, this ordinance would approve the purchase without a specified amount.

**Councilmember Overton moved to read Ordinance No. 2013-25 by title only for the first time; seconded.**

Councilmember Barotz said that this project was an example of the community expressing its values and the importance of open space. Councilmember Oravits echoed that and recognized that over the past six months to a year, between Picture Canyon and Observatory Mesa the City has designated around 3,000 acres as Open Space.

**Motion passed unanimously.**

*AN ORDINANCE OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF FLAGSTAFF AUTHORIZING THE ACQUISITION AND PURCHASE APPROXIMATELY 2,251 ACRES MOST COMMONLY REFERRED TO AS OBSERVATORY MESA*

Mayor Nabours noted that second reading and adoption would occur at the November 12, 2013, Special Meeting.

- ii. **Consideration and Adoption of Resolution No. 2013-27:** A resolution of the Mayor and Council of the City of Flagstaff, Arizona declaring for purposes of section 1.150.2 of the Federal Treasury Regulations, official intent to be reimbursed in connection with certain capital expenditures related to Regional Open Space - Observatory Mesa Land Acquisition.

Management Services Director Barbara Goodrich stated that this resolution would allow the City to use current funds to fulfill the auction requirements and then reimburse itself from the bond funds.

**Councilmember Overton moved to read Resolution No. 2013-27 by title only; seconded; passed unanimously.**

*A RESOLUTION OF THE MAYOR AND COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF FLAGSTAFF, ARIZONA DECLARING FOR PURPOSES OF SECTION 1.150.2 OF THE FEDERAL TREASURY REGULATIONS, OFFICIAL INTENT TO BE REIMBURSED IN CONNECTION WITH CERTAIN CAPITAL EXPENDITURES RELATED TO REGIONAL OPEN SPACE - OBSERVATORY MESA LAND ACQUISITION.*

**Councilmember Barotz moved to adopt Resolution No. 2013-27; seconded; passed unanimously.**

- B. **\*Consideration and Adoption of Ordinance No. 2013-21 and Resolution No. 2013-22 (Zoning Map Amendment):** An Ordinance Adopting That Certain Document Entitled "2013 Amendments to Chapter 10-20, Administration, Procedures and Enforcement," By Reference; and Thereby Amending Division 10-20.50, Amendments to the Zoning Code Text and the Zoning Map, and Division 10-80.20, Definition of Specialized Terms, Phrases and Building Functions; and a Resolution of the Council of the City of Flagstaff, Arizona, Declaring as a Public Record That Certain Document Filed with the City Clerk and Entitled "2013 Amendments To Chapter 10-20, Administration, Procedures And Enforcement."

Zoning Code Administrator Roger Eastman stated that they did not have a detailed presentation this week, but did want to provide some clarification. He said that the action taken last week did not change the zoning requirements, but rather the submittal requirement. He said that the other two recommendations of the Planning and Zoning Commission were not accepted.

He said that he wanted everyone to understand that the requirement for impact analysis for traffic and utilities has no change to it. Through the concept zoning there is sufficient information to be submitted so they know how big it will be. Additionally, they are not taking away any opportunities for public participation.

Mr. Eastman then illustrated the opportunities to comment for the public through the process. Councilmember Barotz said that she agreed that the number of opportunities to comment do not change, but she would argue that they do not have any value. Without meaningful information there is not anything to talk about. After question by Mayor Nabours, Mr. Eastman responded that the public would be advised of the extent possible within the development.

Mayor Nabours said that if a property owner requested a change to highway commercial (for example) and they said they would not know if it was to be an office building or hotel, or retail, etc., the public could object to any of those uses. Mr. Eastman said that was correct; however, the City would still need to know what the use of the property is. If not, staff is going to make the developer provide an impact analysis on the highest use in the zone. That may end up costing them more money if they cannot be more specific.

Mr. Burke said that the developer will be required to identify the most intense use of the property and in the absence staff would identify the highest use possible.

The following individuals then addressed the Council in support of the proposed changes:

- Rob Wilson
- Maury Herman
- David Monihan
- Julie Pastrick, representing the Flagstaff Chamber of Commerce
- Jeff Knorr
- Bill McCullough

The following comments were received:

- The upfront costs required of developers at this time are unnecessary and lead to additional costs being passed on to the buyer
- These changes will still allow for public input but make it easier for local investors to develop their property
- Supported this change at the first meeting and after hearing public comments, still supports it
- These changes won't affect the large developers, but could help smaller developers
- Public comment is still clearly available
- Allows developers opportunity to not have to spend as much money up front

The following individuals addressed the Council in opposition to the proposed changes:

- Evin Deschamps
- Peggy Sheldon-Seurlock
- Anamaria Ortiz
- Vance Peterson
- Karen Pedersen
- John Gearhart
- Carol Kendall
- John Viktora
- Kathleen Nelson
- Rudy Preston
- Sallie Kladnik
- Norm Wallen
- Alicyn Gitlin
- Moran Henn
- Nat White

The following comments were received:

- They chose to live here because it is a small town; need to continue providing opportunity for public input
- Anything that has to do with speculative rezoning should be considered carefully
- Need moratorium on development; need protections for Flagstaff residents
- Imperative that Council continues to provide citizens with opportunity to speak on issues
- Council needs to carefully consider the issue—what if it was next to their house?
- Council is doing an excellent job of providing information, but feels the changes being proposed reduce the amount of information available
- Biggest concern is the rights of citizens who live or own businesses must be weighted in zoning decisions
- Needs to remain a democratic process
- Need to notify property owners more than 300' from development

- Nearly all of the members of the “stakeholders group” were associated with development
- Developers need to have some sense of what they are going to do with their property
- Not in the best interests of Flagstaff
- Amendments were not unanimously approved at the roundtable
- There is nothing to demonstrate that the current zoning code is not working
- Makes it hard to know what questions to ask
- Weakens the ability of Planning and Zoning Commission to do their job
- Directly contradicts what previous Council voted for unanimously
- Compromise – keep the current code for the larger developments, where the developer does not know what they want to do, with a trigger mechanism

A break was taken from 7:15 p.m. to 7:28 p.m.

A few members of the public attempted to discuss the Arrowhead Trailer Park issue, but were unable to since that item was not on the agenda.

The following individuals addressed the Council in support of the changes:

- Judy Louks
- Keri Silvyn, representing several landowners
- Rich Bowen

The following comments were received:

- How many are familiar with existing Land Use & Transportation Plan? The citizens have already voted on land use through the Regional Plan
- Congratulate Council on an incredible job in adopting design criteria, etc. to make sure that any developer or landowner must develop their property appropriately, whether or not it has to be rezoned.
- Was part of the roundtable discussions; there was a thorough review with major community groups and it was a good process

The following individuals addressed the Council in opposition to the proposed changes:

- Jeremy Young
- Jason Bull
- Sat Best
- Tish Bogan-Ozmun
- Brittain Davis
- Eduardo Tapia
- Michelle Thomas
- Connie Kim
- Pete Traylor
- Kara Kelty

The following comments were received:

- Is it the Council's role to reduce public input on issues?
- Public will not know anything about it until after it is approved
- Council did not support all recommendations of Planning and Zoning Commission, such as the boundary for protecting natural resources
- Support's compromise position
- Natural resources should be considered at the beginning of the property
- Is an attack on democracy
- Growth for growth's sake—ideology of the cancer cell
- Lack of understanding on both sides—postpone decision—bring community members into the conversations
- This is a way to silence the public input
- Knowledge is power

Vice Mayor Evans said that they have referenced the legacy pieces of property several times and asked why they could not address them individually rather than changing the entire process.

Councilmember Barotz asked what the value was in having another meeting between the developer and surrounding residents after the rezoning occurred.

A break was held from 8:12 p.m. to 8:27 p.m.

Mayor Nabours asked Council, due to the time, if they wanted to address the Regional Plan later in the evening or reschedule (so they could let those present for that discussion to leave if they were not going to discuss). Consensus of Council was to move forward and discuss later in the evening.

Councilmember Brewster said that there have been a lot of comments voiced regarding the term "speculative" and she asked staff for a definition. Community Development Director Mark Landsiedel said that he was not sure there was one sole definition. He believed that many were referenced from one used in the planning industry when a Council would give a rezoning with no strings attached to the landowner. In this case the amendments show that the landowner will have to declare what their land use is and that forms the basis of their impact analyses. Additionally, another aspect would be the development agreement, signed by the City and developer, which would memorialize and tie down conditions that run with the land.

Vice Mayor Evans asked why they were proposing to change the zoning code to address the specific legacy properties. Mr. Landsiedel said that the Council convened the roundtables and there were many options explored. The direction given to staff is what they have presented to Council.

Vice Mayor Evans asked why it was a good thing for developers and economic development to make these changes. Mr. Burke said that was a value judgment; not a staff judgment.

Mayor Nabours asked if they could make different zoning procedural rules for different parcels of property. Ms. D'Andrea responded that if the properties were

similarly situated they could not have different rules that apply. Vice Mayor Evans asked how that related to special districts or overlay districts.

Vice Mayor Evans asked, if they knew there was a total of 28 properties, if they could extend an offer to those individuals to fix their problem. Ms. D'Andrea said that she could not give them a yes or no answer without specifics.

Councilmember Barotz said that she recalled at the stakeholders meetings that Nat (White) put forward the idea of corrective rezoning. Ms. D'Andrea said that they did discuss addressing all of those consistent with the Regional Plan to follow one path, and those not consistent another path, but then there could be issues with the Regional Plan being vague enough.

Councilmember Woodson said that there have been circumstances that put fear in people of where they were going with this. He asked Mr. Eastman if what is being proposed had an impact on how they deal with open space. Mr. Eastman said there would be no major change. They are asking for a concept plan.

Councilmember Woodson asked if the proposed changes would impact how they deal with natural resources. Mr. Eastman said that the natural resources would still be indicated, but more in a conceptual way. When they get to the final design plan it would still have to be dealt with.

Councilmember Woodson asked if it impacted dark sky or recycling. Mr. Eastman replied that it did not impact either of those issues. With regard to staff time, the amount of time would not change, however the allocation of time would.

Vice Mayor Evans said that there is a lot of confusion about this, especially since people have stated things that may or may not be correct. The majority of the community does not know.

Vice Mayor Evans asked how they would deal with someone coming forward with a design, but did not know between a hotel or student dorm. Mr. Eastman said there is a big difference between zoning for a hotel and student dorm. They would require the applicant to make that decision. If it was a hotel there would be different impacts than a student dorm. Once that is established the applicant would know how many units and then the City would know how big the footprint would be and determine how big the building would be.

Vice Mayor Evans asked what would happen if they went through the process and then changed the project. Mr. Eastman said that if it was a similar project, such as a hotel but a different hotel, they could move forward, but if they decided to go with a student dorm, it would be a different project and would have to go back through staff, Planning and Zoning Commission and Council.

Councilmember Barotz asked, if they went with the most intense usage for a development because the developer was not sure, how it would impact the adjacent property owners regarding water. Mr. Eastman said that goes back to the policy discussions with Brad Hill. When they have property entitled to water allocation, it is based on that current zoning.

Mr. Burke replied that if the adjacent parcel was RR (for example) the water allocation would be based on the RR zoning. If they wanted to rezone to a higher use, it may impact, but in the terms of their current zoning it would not.

Councilmember Brewster said that she heard a lot of comments about outside developers coming into the area and this process making it easier for them, but it would also make the process easier for the local developers.

**Mayor Nabours moved to adopt Resolution No. 2013-22; seconded; passed 5-2 with Vice Mayor Evans and Councilmember Barotz casting the dissenting votes.** (Note: Resolution No. 2013-22 was read by title only at the October 15, 2013, Council Meeting)

**Mayor Nabours moved to read Ordinance No. 2013-21 for the final time by title only; seconded; passed 5-2 with Vice Mayor Evans and Councilmember Barotz casting the dissenting votes.**

*AN ORDINANCE ADOPTING THAT CERTAIN DOCUMENT ENTITLED "2013 AMENDMENTS TO CHAPTER 10-20, ADMINISTRATION, PROCEDURES AND ENFORCEMENT," BY REFERENCE; AND THEREBY AMENDING DIVISION 10-20.50, AMENDMENTS TO THE ZONING CODE TEXT AND THE ZONING MAP, AND DIVISION 10-80.20, DEFINITION OF SPECIALIZED TERMS, PHRASES AND BUILDING FUNCTION*

Councilmember Barotz said that she would not be voting for the ordinance as she still believes it is not in the community's best interest. She is open to hoping that as the process unfolds that some of the problems will not materialize. She does believe that the ability of the public to meaningfully weigh in is being diminished on a zoning matter, and a rezoning is not an entitlement. She believes the entire community has an investment in ensuring that they know what happened on a piece of property.

Vice Mayor Evans said that she would still be voting no. She said that there are pieces of property that have major issues, but she believes there are other ways to address them. She has a great deal of respect for past Councils, the current Council and staff, but historically citizens have had issues with decisions made by Council and/or staff. She thinks that a good development that comes forward will be as specific as it can be and it will be up to the community to be vigilant to make sure they get the development they want.

Councilmember Brewster said that she believed that the Public Participation, as outlined in the amendment, will allow no less participation.

**Mayor Nabours moved to adopt Ordinance No. 2013-21; seconded; passed 5-2 with Vice Mayor Evans and Councilmember Barotz casting the dissenting votes.**

16. **DISCUSSION ITEMS**

A. **Regional Plan Discussion #10** – Economic Development

Comprehensive Planning Manager Kimberly Sharp gave a PowerPoint presentation that reviewed this section on Economic Development. She noted that this was the last section in the Regional Plan, but is what all the other elements feed into. She said that the Economic Development Working Group met for nine months and they had the most heated discussions.

Vice Mayor Evans asked that this item be placed on the Parking Lot. She said that on page 3, talking about image, she did not see one specific goal that addresses tourism, and she believed that should be a separate category in this Chapter. Additionally, she did not see anything speaking to economic trades between the City and the many sovereign nations that surround them, and she believes that needs to be a section.

She also said there needs to be more information under Flagstaff Unified School District and, in reference to Section 12, she would like a list of all goals and policies that are linked to the preservation of the resources being leveraged.

Councilmember Brewster noted that the red-line version submitted by the Chamber also addressed the need to have a separate section on tourism.

Mayor Nabours asked what the purpose was of pages 14.8 and 14.9. Ms. Sharp said that a lot of people do look at the Regional Plan and the committee thought it was good to celebrate all of the work force development in the community.

The following individuals spoke on this section of the Regional Plan:

- Michelle Thomas, representing North Country Health Care
- Angela Horvath, representing the Coconino County Health District
- Richard Miller
- Bill McCullough
- Rob Wilson
- Mike Sistak, representing the Flagstaff Chamber of Commerce
- Gaylord Staveley
- Carol Kendall
- Rudy Preston
- Joy Staveley

The following comments were received:

- Supports this section of the Regional Plan
- Consider health in any development
- Chamber has given their list of items
- Chapter should emphasize that economic development has to be more on the private sector
- Need to encourage private funding

- One of the City's strengths is the regional airport
- Emphasize STEM efforts and other school systems, e.g. charter schools
- Part of the intended use of this is to introduce those not familiar with Flagstaff; would suggest removing verbiage such as "low-impact," "green jobs" as it could turn off people before they get involved
- Important to include sections about ecotourism and its impact, and that of outdoor activities, play in tourism
- Distinguish between economic activity and economic development, and activities that expand and diversify the revenue streams. Have blurred the two and missed its mark
- NAU students linked to economic development is misplaced; eliminate or rewrite
- Keep taxes down; economic development is not a role of government
- More important to maintain infrastructure
- Promotion of things like STEM is exactly what is causing the problem of having poor people more and more having trouble making ends meet
- Not enough time spent looking at the way economic development works
- Common core standards do not require calculus
- Chapter seems to focus on inventory
- Less government involvement could better impact economic development

Councilmember Oravits agreed with adding this discussion to the Parking Lot. He agrees with Chamber's position; tourism needs to be focused on. They need to do more with business attraction and retention, but in the private sector as well. Also on the Parking Lot he would like to discuss the election date.

Mayor Nabours agreed that pages 8-9 included too many acronyms. Would also like to add to the Parking Lot further discussion of charter schools in area.

Councilmember Brewster stated that under Higher Education there should be a direct reference as to the students' economic impact on the community.

Vice Mayor Evans suggested that they also include the private colleges, and perhaps get information from Flagstaff Culture Partners on the arts/culture tourism impact.

As permitted at the discretion of the Mayor, Mayor Nabours included a Public Participation at the end of the meeting for those requesting to speak.

### **PUBLIC PARTICIPATION**

Michelle Thomas, Flagstaff, addressed her concerns with the public participation process overall on agenda items and questioned how they could vote in favor of something when the vast majority of those speaking were against it.

Angela Horvath, Flagstaff, asked if the City could provide a translator as they are having more and more people speak in Spanish and others are unable to understand them.

Karen Pedersen, Flagstaff, said after sitting through the meeting that the public has a hard time understanding where and when they need to attend meetings in order to voice their concerns on issues.

17. **POSSIBLE FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS**

*Verbal comments from the public on any item under this section must be given during Public Participation (#5) near the beginning of the meeting. Written comments may be submitted to the City Clerk. After discussion and upon agreement of three members of the Council, an item will be moved to a regularly-scheduled Council meeting.*

None

18. **INFORMATIONAL ITEMS AND REPORTS FROM COUNCIL AND STAFF, REQUESTS FOR FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS**

Councilmember Barotz asked that agenda wording be made clearer and easier for citizens to understand.

Councilmember Barotz asked if staff could ensure that the call-in system would be working for the 11/26 meeting as she will be out of town but would like to participate in the meeting.

Councilmember Brewster suggested that the Council have a quick session on how it is that they make decisions when it appears the majority of the public is feeling differently. Brief discussion ensued, and concern was voiced on how that could occur.

Vice Mayor Evans said that the City has a major issue with graffiti and it's clean up, with no policy re graffiti on private property. She asked that this item be added to the list for Possible Future Agenda Items. Mayor Nabours said that perhaps they could start with a CCR from staff, with input from legal as well.

Vice Mayor Evans said that she would like to see the Happy House issue on a future agenda. She asked if they have looked at the option of using the ground floor room for meetings. Mr. Burke said that he would reply in an e-mail.

Vice Mayor Evans requested that they receive a list of proposed developments moving forward with potential student housing, and where they are being proposed.

Vice Mayor Evans asked for clarification on the Boulder Pointe issue and whether staff had made a statement to them as the individual had stated.

Vice Mayor Evans asked for a memo re Sinagua Heights. This was the first time she had heard about it and asked where they are at in the process, and where residents can make their comments.

Vice Mayor Evans told Mr. Burke that she knows they have big agendas but she believed that if he would add the requested items to the Possible Future Agenda Items category and let the Council decide whether to move forward with future discussion, it may help him eliminate some of the issues.

Councilmember Oravits said that the Property Maintenance Ordinance is still listed on the City's website as something being worked on, but he thought that had been put to rest.

Regarding the Budget Parking Lot, Councilmember Oravits requested for the 12/4 meeting, discussion of possible money for the Fourth Street area, as he thinks they need to address pedestrian issues.

Councilmember Oravits said that he had a citizen report to him that their sales tax check sometimes takes six to seven days to process through the bank.

Councilmember Oravits requested a quick e-mail on the status of the Arrowhead project.

Mayor Nabours asked that three items be added to the Possible Future Agenda Items list: 1) Charter Review Committee; 2) Establishment of an ad hoc committee to address overhead power lines in viewsheds; and 3) sale of property at Lonetree and Butler to provide funds for affordable housing.

19. **ADJOURNMENT**

The Regular Meeting of the Flagstaff City Council held November 5, 2013, adjourned at 10:10 p.m.

\_\_\_\_\_  
MAYOR

ATTEST:

\_\_\_\_\_  
CITY CLERK

**CERTIFICATION**

STATE OF ARIZONA)  
                                  ss.)  
County of Coconino )

I, ELIZABETH A. BURKE, do hereby certify that I am the City Clerk of the City of Flagstaff, County of Coconino, State of Arizona, and that the above Minutes are a true and correct summary of the meeting of the Council of the City of Flagstaff held November 5, 2013. I further certify that the meeting was duly called and held and that a quorum was present.

Dated this 3rd day of December, 2013.

\_\_\_\_\_  
CITY CLERK