

REGULAR COUNCIL MEETING  
TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 4, 2014  
COUNCIL CHAMBERS  
211 WEST ASPEN AVENUE  
6:00 P.M.

1. **CALL TO ORDER**

Mayor Nabours called the Regular Meeting of the Flagstaff City Council of February 4, 2014, to order 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).*

2. **ROLL CALL**

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

Present:

Absent:

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

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

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

The Council and audience recited the Pledge of Allegiance and Mayor Nabours read the 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**

**ITEM MOVED TO THE 6:00 P.M. PORTION OF THE MEETING**

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.*

None

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).*

None

8. **LIQUOR LICENSE PUBLIC HEARINGS**

**ITEMS HAVE BEEN MOVED TO THE 6:00 P.M. PORTION OF THE MEETING**

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.*

None

10. **ROUTINE ITEMS**

**ITEM HAS BEEN MOVED TO THE 6:00 PORTION OF THE MEETING**

## 6:00 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.~~

~~MAYOR NABOURS~~

~~VICE MAYOR EVANS~~

~~COUNCILMEMBER BAROTZ~~

~~COUNCILMEMBER BREWSTER~~

~~COUNCILMEMBER ORAVITS~~

~~COUNCILMEMBER OVERTON~~

~~COUNCILMEMBER WOODSON~~

#### 12. **PUBLIC PARTICIPATION**

Jeff Knorr, Flagstaff, said that at last week's meeting re Bushmaster Park there was talk about putting funds for revitalization, which he supported, but he hoped they would give consideration to the transient element that will be pushed out of the park, and to where it will be pushed.

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

- A. **Consideration and Approval of Minutes:** City Council Combined Work Session/Special Meeting of January 14, 2014; Regular Meeting of January 21, 2014; Mini Budget Retreat of January 23, 2014, and the Special Meeting (Executive Session) of January 28, 2014.

**Councilmember Overton moved to approve the minutes of the City Council Combined Work Session/Special Meeting of January 14, 2014; Regular Meeting of January 21, 2014; Mini Budget Retreat of January 23, 2014, and the Special Meeting; seconded; passed unanimously.**

#### B. **LIQUOR LICENSE PUBLIC HEARINGS**

Mayor Nabours opened the Public Hearing for both liquor license applications, noting that both licenses had received no reason for disapproval from the Police Department, Sales Tax or Community Development. No public input was received; therefore, Mayor Nabours closed the Public Hearing.

- i. **Consideration and Action on Liquor License Application:** Randy Nations, "Monsoon Asian Bistro & Sushi", 6 E. Aspen St. #100, Series 06 (bar- all spirituous liquor), Person and Location Transfer.

**Councilmember Oravits moved to forward the application for Monsoons to the State with a recommendation for approval; seconded; passed unanimously.**

- ii. **Consideration and Action on Liquor License Application:** William Ahern, "Canyon Diablo Spirits", 506 N. Grant Street, Suite C, Series 01 (in-state producer), New License.

**Councilmember Overton moved to forward the application for Canyon Diablo Spirits to the State with a recommendation for approval; seconded; passed unanimously.**

- C. **Consideration and Approval of Grant Agreement:** between the City of Flagstaff and the Arizona Department of Transportation for the Westplex Taxi Lanes Reconstruction Project at Flagstaff Airport.

Grants Manager Stacey Brechler-Knaggs reviewed the project noting that this was for the ADOT portion of a grant already received from the FAA for an airport project. She said that the State's matching share was \$240,000 as well as the City's, and the FAA share was \$4.9 million.

**Councilmember Overton moved to approve the grant agreement with the Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) Multimodal Planning Division Aeronautics Group and authorize the acceptance of grant funding in the amount of \$240,780; seconded; passed unanimously.**

#### 14. **PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS**

Planning Development Manager Tiffany Antol and Community Design and Redevelopment Manager Karl Eberhard gave a PowerPoint presentation on Items 14-A, B and C, which addressed:

- WHAT IS THE LANDMARK OVERLAY ZONE?
- EFFECT OF ZONING MAP AMENDMENT
- LANDMARK OVERLAY CRITERIA
- YEAGER RESIDENCE
- MOTEL DUBEAU
- PICTURE CANYON
- LANDMARK DESIGNATION REQUEST
- PUBLIC INPUT

With regard to Picture Canyon, staff noted that this would not stop the City from doing their work in that area and the sustainability staff is working on a zone change with others which would not affect this as well.

Councilmembers questioned why it showed the Historic Preservation Commission moving these items forward. Staff replied that they were already working on properties to bring forward so that is why it was done in this manner. Council requested that future requests come forward directly from the applicants.

Ms. Antol noted that there was very little public input received. The majority of questions related to what an overlay is and what it does. She said that these districts are related to specific property; in a way a floating district. In terms of Picture Canyon, the question was when it would be zoned to open space.

Mayor Nabours opened the Public Hearing on all three of the following applications. There being no public input, Mayor Nabours closed the Public Hearing.

- A. **Public Hearing, Consideration and Possible Adoption of Ordinance No. 2014-06:** An ordinance amending the official Zoning Map for a parcel of approximately 0.16 acres of land located at 515 North San Francisco Street, aka the Yeager House, by adding a Landmarks Overlay district designation ("LO") to the existing Single-Family Residential Neighborhood ("R1N") zoning classification. ***(For the purpose of strengthening cultural and historical features)***

**Councilmember Woodson moved to read Ordinance No. 2014-06 by title only for the first time; seconded; passed unanimously.**

*AN ORDINANCE OF THE FLAGSTAFF CITY COUNCIL AMENDING THE FLAGSTAFF ZONING MAP DESIGNATION OF APPROXIMATELY 0.16 ACRES OF LAND LOCATED AT 515 NORTH SAN FRANCISCO STREET BY ADDING A LANDMARKS OVERLAY DISTRICT DESIGNATION ("LO") TO THE EXISTING SINGLE-FAMILY RESIDENTIAL NEIGHBORHOOD ("R1N") ZONING CLASSIFICATION*

- B. **Public Hearing, Consideration and Possible Adoption of Ordinance No. 2014-04:** An ordinance amending the official Zoning Map for a parcel of approximately 0.26 acres of land located at 19 West Phoenix Avenue, aka Motel DuBeau Travelers Inn and Hostel, by adding a Landmarks Overlay district designation ("LO") to the existing Community Commercial ("CC") and T5 Main Street Transect Zone ("T5") zoning classifications. ***(To protect the historical significance of the structure)***

**Councilmember Brewster moved to read Ordinance No. 2014-04 by title only for the first time; seconded; passed unanimously.**

*AN ORDINANCE OF THE FLAGSTAFF CITY COUNCIL AMENDING THE FLAGSTAFF ZONING MAP DESIGNATION OF APPROXIMATELY 0.26 ACRES OF LAND LOCATED AT 19 WEST PHOENIX AVENUE BY ADDING A LANDMARKS OVERLAY DISTRICT DESIGNATION ("LO") TO THE EXISTING COMMUNITY COMMERCIAL ("CC") AND T5 MAIN STREET TRANSECT ZONE ("T5") ZONING CLASSIFICATIONS*

- C. **Public Hearing, Consideration and Possible Adoption of Ordinance No. 2014-05:** An ordinance amending the official Zoning Map for a site of approximately 400.16 acres of open space land known as Picture Canyon by adding a Landmarks Overlay district designation ("LO") to the existing rural residential ("RR") zoning classification. *(For the purpose of preserving archaeological elements and Flagstaff history)*

**Councilmember Barotz moved to read Ordinance No. 2014-05 by title only for the first time; seconded; passed unanimously.**

*AN ORDINANCE OF THE FLAGSTAFF CITY COUNCIL AMENDING THE FLAGSTAFF ZONING MAP DESIGNATION OF APPROXIMATELY 400.16 ACRES OF LAND KNOWN AS PICTURE CANYON BY ADDING A LANDMARKS OVERLAY DISTRICT DESIGNATION ("LO") TO THE EXISTING RURAL RESIDENTIAL ("RR") ZONING CLASSIFICATION*

- D. **Consideration of items related to formation of the "FLAGSTAFF DOWNTOWN BUSINESS IMPROVEMENT AND REVITALIZATION DISTRICT":**

Mr. Eberhard gave a brief PowerPoint presentation which addressed:

- A PROSAL FOR DOWNTOWN MANAGEMENT RES. 2014-06
- FORMATION FACTS
- FORMATION OPTIONS
- IGA FACTS

Mayor Nabours said that it was his understanding that if the District was formed this evening the next step was for the property owners in the District, and any residents, to vote on whether there is an assessment and the amount of the assessment, and that would take a majority vote. Mr. Eberhard said that was correct; in order to meet their budget the District will be asking for .39 cents per \$100. He added that even if someone did not want the District formed to begin with, they can still vote in favor of the amount.

Mr. Eberhard explained that the Board appointed this evening would serve one year and during that year the District would hold an election for board members to serve a longer period of time in the future. He said that it was not clear if they can increase the number of Board members in the future.

Mr. Eberhard said that in the statutes there was no requirement for when the assessment election was held, but in order to tax in 2015, they would need to hold the election by August, although he has been told the stakeholders plan to do it within the next 60 days.

Mayor Nabours said that there are two types of parcels owned by the City. Those that the City owns and uses, such as the courthouse, and those owned by the City but are occupied by a tenant. He asked if there was a way in the IGA to distinguish between those parcels if they chose to.

Mr. Burke said that the IGA is an agreement between the City and the District and talks about a payment in lieu of tax. He said that how the City collects that money for its tenants does not need to be in the IGA.

Mayor Nabours asked if that was a legal question and something the City could include within their leases with the tenants. Ms. D'Andrea replied that it was, but it would need to be renegotiated with the tenants and would depend on their willingness.

Mayor Nabours asked if the City could give to its tenants the right to vote within the District. Ms. D'Andrea said that she would need to research further, but she was not aware of any ability for them to do that.

Councilmember Brewster said that she thought the votes were determined on the total assessed valuation, not the number of properties. Mr. Eberhard explained that the voting is the most complex seen. For future activities, the vote is based on 1/7 of an acre ownership. He said that the stakeholders do not believe the City or County could control it, but he has not personally done the math to determine that.

After some questions, Mr. Eberhard explained that the formation of the district required petitions to be filed in support, which were considered yes votes. They did not receive any "no" petitions. Whatever was not a petition was considered a no vote for voting purposes. They had 100 parcels in the district, with 56 unique property owners, but they received petitions from 63 in favor of the district formation. Since that time they have received five formal objections (copies of which were included in the Council packet—from Madge Anderson, David McCormick, F.W. Thompson, Mary Scheuring; and Peter Barnett [including his tenant Nick Lawrence]).

Councilmember Barotz said that the slide presentation indicated that the District had a sunset; she asked if it could be dissolved voluntarily. Mr. Eberhard said that it could, through a similar election process if a majority voted that way.

Discussion was held on the actions needed at the meeting this evening. Mr. Eberhard said that in order to tax in 2015, the District would need to be formed tonight; however, the IGA could be delayed.

1. **Conduct a Public Hearing** and hear testimony and evidence presented in support of, or in opposition to, the formation of the "*Flagstaff Downtown Business Improvement and Revitalization District*", including the areas to be included and/or the General Plan for the district; and

Mayor Nabours opened the Public Hearing.

John VanLandingham, Flagstaff, said that he has been a part of the conversation about a district since 2007 or 2008 and has been a downtown and business property owner since the early 1990's. He said

that the prior Special Improvement District and Main Street allowed some improvements to be made, but those both eventually went away.

He said that the all-volunteer Downtown Business Alliance has done great things, but for those that have been involved there have been severe limitations with money, time and resources. He said that they have recognized the issues are not new, but they are not going away. He said that they were not coming before Council, hat in hand, but rather asking for a new way to address the needed improvements in the downtown area.

Mayor Nabours said that he would imagine that some property owners might be concerned with the amount of property owned by the City and County, and he asked Mr. VanLandingham if he had those same concerns. Mr. VanLandingham said that he did not; they were excited to partner with the City, and the legal foundation is not there for that to happen.

Councilmember Barotz said that they have had several presentations on this, but one of the concerns she has heard raised was that not everyone was notified in a meaningful way, and she asked Mr. VanLandingham to talk about the notification process.

He said that they have spoken to many of the property owners either in person or by phone. For those they could not reach, they sent packets of information to the owner of record, including a brochure indicating their goals. Beyond that, the process started in 2008 with the City Manager and staff explaining the idea and concept and there were many public meetings that far exceeded the current mapped area. It has been a topic of conversation at the Downtown Business Alliance meetings for some time. He said that over a period of two years the City funded and hired a District coordinator, Steve Seville, who was working on not only the Downtown District but also the Fourth Street District. He said that there has been a tremendous amount of time devoted to getting the word out, and nothing has been happening in secret.

Councilmember Barotz said that she has heard another objection that the General Plan of the District is too vague. Mr. VanLandingham said that it is somewhat vague. So much of what they are proposing is prescribed by ARS, so they used the actual phrasing, "all things allowable by statute" so they would not be limited by the wording in the future.

Lengthy discussion was held on whether the Council should vote at all, if they should vote according to the tenants' wishes, and, if they do vote, how it would occur. Ms. Wendel said that if the Council does decide to vote, there needs to be direction provided by Council to staff.

The following individuals spoke in support of the proposed district:

- Maury Herman



- Rick Lopez
- James Craven
- Dave Stilley

The following comments were received:

- Thanks to Mr. VanLandingham for the number of hours he has put into the project
- The retail segment is suffering
- They need to do something to improve downtown so it can better compete
- Suggested that the future of downtown lies in the arts, entertainment, food and beverages, along with offices; all of those require higher use for parking than retail
- Encouraged the Council to support the District and put fairness back into the community
- Let the District establish itself as its own entity with its own goals
- No one wants to tax themselves, but it is for a good cause; they need parking
- They need to decide on ways to make revenues to fix up downtown
- He will not be passing on to his tenants whatever the assessment is
- The other things they have tried have not worked to the level they wanted
- These types of districts have worked well in other communities
- With very few exceptions, private enterprise can almost always do something more efficiently and cost-effectively
- The District is governed by the stakeholders and can create a cohesive, continuous voice for downtown; government cannot do that for them
- This is an affordable district; he, too, will not be passing along the cost to his tenants

Councilmember Oravits said that he has property on Fourth Street and was involved in the proposed district there. One of the comments made was that the tax will get passed on to their tenants, and he asked Mr. Herman how his tenants feel about the proposed district. Mr. Herman said that he has not had anyone say it was a poor idea or they should not do it.

Mr. Herman said that one of the things that happens with businesses and property owners is they are very occupied with what they need to do in the next 24 and 48 hours to keep their businesses go. To take a long view into the future is hard to do. He has not had a large amount of reaction, but he has had no negative comments.

The following individuals spoke against the proposed district:

- Nicholas Lawrence, downtown business owner
- Rick Scheuring

The following comments were received in opposition:

- Heard of the district through his landlord (whose sentiments were the same as his)
- Has seen a lot of business turnover in the downtown area
- Is all for making the downtown cleaner, safer, more inviting but, at what expense?
- Who is paying for it? Landlord? Tenant?
- Who is truly benefiting?
- Plan does not meet a definition of a plan
- Informational packet mentioned many services already provided by the City including an office
- Based on staffing referenced, the actual expenses would be much higher than the \$168,500 suggested

Councilmember Oravits said that his understanding of a district is that if a district can do services normally provided by the City more efficiently, they could keep the amount of funds normally paid by the district.

A break was held from 7:34 p.m. to 7:53 p.m.

The following individuals spoke in support of the proposed district:

- Mark Lamberson
- Blake Rolley, downtown business owner (tenant)
- George Averbeck
- Antoinette Beiser

The following comments were received:

- He is in favor of the district moving forward
- He is not a property owner, but is a tenant and his lease will carry the burden of the assessment
- It is not a burdensome amount; he will be charged \$1.42 a day
- Over 60% of the property owners voted in favor of the district; 5 voted no and 35 did not respond
- They cannot sit still; they need to move forward
- If the City abstained from paying their fair share or paying some and not others, that is unfair to the whole district; the City should be a fair share partner
- Enjoy having their business in the downtown area
- Cleanliness is #1 – they have a lot of tourism and the City needs to show its best face
- Parking is needed
- Just signed a lease on Mill Avenue in Tempe for their business and the assessment here is quite a bit less than there
- Believes Tempe and their business district work well together
- Have been getting a lot of graffiti downtown

Mayor Nabours asked why the map was drawn as it was, down to Phoenix Avenue on the south when the only property down there is

owned by the City. Mr. Eberhard said that they started with a much larger area and whittled it down to a contiguous area where they had support.

Mr. VanLandingham said that they also included the railroad property and the Chamber of Commerce on the south, who has been a very supportive partner. Their hope is to get enough property on the south where the proponents of the District can build support and they can come before the Council to create a larger, or adjacent, district.

Mr. VanLandingham noted that the railroad does pay an assessment, although it is via a convoluted formula controlled by the State.

Mayor Nabours closed the Public Hearing.

2. **Consideration and Possible Adoption of Resolution No. 2014-06: A Resolution of the City Council of the City of Flagstaff, Arizona, Forming the "Flagstaff Downtown Business Improvement And Revitalization District", a Special Taxing District; and appointing the initial Board of Directors; and**

Councilmember Brewster reiterated some things they have learned in the past, such as the downtown is the most visited thing in the City, more than 70% of the five million visitors a year in Flagstaff visit the downtown. It is not only historic, but the social corridor of the City. It is worth making this district possible so they can do more things that the City has been unable to do. It is not just good for downtown, but for everyone.

Vice Mayor Evans said that she remembers what the downtown used to look like before Main Street and what happened after it. Her understanding was that in the height of Main Street there was a 400% increase in sales tax revenue specific to the downtown area. She said that the property owners benefited a lot, but assuming 400% sales tax increase, the business owners would have had some benefit as well.

She said that she often gets complaints from business owners in the other parts of town that the downtown gets special treatment. In the past they have done things downtown that they do not do in other areas. As a City they no longer have the extra funding to offer those extra services.

Vice Mayor Evans said that the district provides some flexibility in moving faster than government and it provides direct ownership. She was happy to hear there were some property owners that were not going to pass on the assessment to their tenants. She has supported this since 2008 and was disappointed that there were not two districts being considered and that the south side did not grab on to this effort.

Councilmember Oravits said that after listening to everything he was going to be in favor of this. When the property owners and business owners have more control over their future, more times than not they benefit. If the private sector is willing to risk their own money, they should

support it, and he was confident that this commitment would push downtown forward.

Councilmember Overton said that there is positive and negative in the way the statutes are written. It is a simplistic process, coming to the Council asking for permission. The true selling point is for the property owners to pull together and the Council is allowing that. The property owners are taking that role and responsibility seriously. He does think there are going to be challenges. He believes there is some confusion on whether it is a City district or a Downtown District. They need to understand that the City has an interest, but they are not leading it.

He suggested that they take a close look at how the transition works, with the Clerk and Treasurer, and would like to separate those quickly and in a transparent manner. As far as whether or not the City votes, they can wait to discuss that further until an election is called by the District. He would prefer that the City be in a neutral position, but he completely understands they should be participating.

Councilmember Barotz said that she did not think that the status quo was an option. The folks in the downtown have tried their best to come together in an ad hoc fashion, and she thinks this is actually the most appropriate next step. She does think the City should pay their fair share and for those properties owned by the City with tenants, she would hope they do not pass along the assessment.

Mr. Eberhard noted that there were two resolutions being considered. The first was to approve formation of the district and the second was to approve the IGA between the City and the District.

Mayor Nabours said that to those that have objections about the lack of specificity within the Plan and the budget, those are arguments to be made among the property owners when they go to the vote about the assessment. He said that 51% of the property owners have to be satisfied with the assessment.

Mayor Nabours noted that there were a few options to be determined within the resolution regarding the boundaries of the district and appointment of the Board of Directors. He also noted that the map was not attached and it was agreed that it would be the same map as on file in the City Clerk's Office attached to the General Plan.

The City Clerk noted that she had not yet received the Affidavit of Publication, but she had seen the notice in the paper and knew it had been published.

**Mayor Nabours moved to approve Option 1 as to the district boundary (as presented); seconded; passed unanimously.**

**Mayor Nabours moved to appoint John VanLandingham, David Stilley and Antoinette Beiser as the initial Board of Directors (Section 8); seconde; passed unanimously.**

**Mayor Nabours moved to read Resolution No. 2014-06 by title only (as amended above); seconded; passed unanimously.**

*A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF FLAGSTAFF, ARIZONA, FORMING THE "FLAGSTAFF DOWNTOWN BUSINESS IMPROVEMENT AND REVITALIZATION DISTRICT", A SPECIAL TAXING DISTRICT; AND APPOINTING THE INITIAL BOARD OF DIRECTORS*

**Mayor Nabours moved to adopt Resolution No. 2014-06; seconded; passed unanimously.**

3. **Consideration and Possible Adoption of Resolution No. 2014-07:** *A Resolution of the City Council of the City of Flagstaff, Arizona, Approving an Intergovernmental Agreement for Services with the Flagstaff Downtown Business Improvement and Revitalization District.*

Mayor Nabours said that he thought they needed to do more work on the IGA before approving it. He had no problem with the lump sum payment, but it needs to be conditioned on the assessment passing. He would also like to resolve the issue of whether they pay on the properties that the City does not occupy.

Mr. Burke noted that each lease with the City is written differently.

Mayor Nabours said that another issue is the rights-of-way within the district. He asked how they would be assessed, and how they would vote. Ms. D'Andrea noted that there is no assessed valuation on the county records with regard to the rights-of-way. She also noted that Section 4.1 already states that if there is no assessment, the City will not pay.

**Mayor Nabours moved to postpone consideration of Resolution No. 2014-07 for two weeks; seconded.**

After brief discussion, **motion failed with a vote of 1-6 with all but Mayor Nabours casting the dissenting votes.**

**Vice Mayor Evans moved to read Resolution No. 2014-07 by title only; seconded; passed 6-1 with Mayor Nabours casting the dissenting vote.**

*A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF FLAGSTAFF, ARIZONA, APPROVING AN INTERGOVERNMENTAL AGREEMENT FOR SERVICES WITH THE "FLAGSTAFF DOWNTOWN BUSINESS IMPROVEMENT AND REVITALIZATION DISTRICT"*

**Councilmember Woodson moved to adopt Resolution No. 2014-07; seconded; pass 6-1 with Mayor Nabours casting the dissenting vote.**

15. **REGULAR AGENDA**

None

16. **DISCUSSION ITEMS**

A. **Update on the Museum of Northern Arizona plans - Community Engagement and Service**

City of Flagstaff Retention and Expansion Manager John Saltonstall introduced Dr. Robert Breunig with the Museum of Northern Arizona, who gave a PowerPoint presentation which provided history of the Museum and their future plans.

Dr. Breunig said that he wanted City leaders to understand that they were not sitting still, or looking back, but they are looking forward to fit in with the STEM initiative and that they were the kind of institution that everyone in the community can be proud of.

Dr. Breunig said that it has become clear that a lot of people in Flagstaff do not understand that they have a vision for the future. For the short term, they want to work on funding improvements and when they feel that have the capacity, they will announce their future vision with a major push. He said that the first phase will be to fix what they have and make it as good as possible, and then the second phase would be the Visitors Center and other galleries.

17. **POSSIBLE FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS**

*Verbal comments from the public on any item under this section must be given during Public Participation 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 Oravits asked that staff look into the Fourth Street Bridge, past Gore and the Aquaplex, and the two left-turning lanes where traffic backs up.

Councilmember Brewster reminded everyone of the Dew Downtown during the coming weekend.

Vice Mayor Evans requested the following Possible Future Agenda Items:

- Concept of a National Conservation Area for Walnut Canyon

- Support for the Secure Rural Schools Initiative

Mr. Burke noted that the Council could consider support of that item without formal action because of their approved legislative agenda item to cross support alliance members.

She also requested:

- Possible donation or allocation of land for a Veterans Home in Flagstaff
- Information on film subsidies so she can better understand that as well as the pending state law regarding them

## 19. ADJOURNMENT

The Regular Meeting of the Flagstaff City Council held February 4, 2014, adjourned at 9:18 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 February 4, 2014. I further certify that the meeting was duly called and held and that a quorum was present.

Dated this 4th day of March, 2014.

---

CITY CLERK