

MINUTES

COMBINED SPECIAL MEETING/WORK SESSION
TUESDAY, OCTOBER 13, 2015
COUNCIL CHAMBERS
211 WEST ASPEN AVENUE
6:00 P.M.

SPECIAL MEETING

1. Call to Order

Mayor Nabours called the Special Meeting of October 13, 2015, to order at 6:01 p.m.

2. Pledge of Allegiance

The City Council and audience recited the Pledge of Allegiance and had a moment of silence for NAU shooting victim Colin Brough.

3. Roll Call

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

PRESENT

ABSENT

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

Others present: City Manager Josh Copley and City Attorney Michelle D'Andrea.

4. **Public Hearing** : Providing staff and consultants rate study presentation prior to modifying water, wastewater, reclaimed water and stormwater rates and fees. ***(Staff/consultant presentation and public comment regarding rate adjustment)***

Utilities Director Brad Hill provided a PowerPoint presentation that covered the following:

AGENDA
WATER CONSERVATION QUESTIONS
POLICY A.3.1 RATE STRUCTURE TO ENCOURAGE WATER CONSERVATION
CONSERVATION ACHIEVEMENTS – 108 GPCD
HISTORY OF RESIDENTIAL TIER CHANGES

COUNCIL HAS MANY OPTIONS
WATER CONSERVATION PROGRAM FUNDING

Vice Mayor Barotz asked what the programming budget entails. Mr. Hill explained that it consists of education and training, copying, printing, office supplies, travel, electricity, staffing, and things of that nature. Vice Mayor Barotz noted that a majority of the program costs are administrative.

Councilmember Evans asked if the rebate budget is the right amount of funding for the program. There are many people who are asking for rebates who are being told to come back in July of next year because the funding has run out. Mr. Hill stated that the fiscal year funding for rebates is \$20,000. Mr. Hill stated that there are more rebate requests than dollars available and staff have been deferring other costs to address some of the backlog in applications for rebates. Councilmember Evans asked how many applications for rebates have been received that are waiting until there is additional funding. Mr. Hill stated that he did not have that information readily available but would forward it to the Council. Councilmember Overton asked Mr. Hill to also provide an example of the kinds of rebates that are available to the public. He said that he feels that the amount of money allocated to rebates is where it should be and no adjustment is needed.

Vice Mayor Barotz asked for better clarification between what it costs to run the program versus how much it costs for the actual programming. Mr. Hill stated that to run the program there is one staff person and two part-time temporary summer workers. Vice Mayor Barotz asked for a ballpark cost for this staff. Mr. Hill stated that it is approximately \$130,000.

Mayor Nabours stated that when a residential water user enters into tier four they are paying quite a bit more per gallon versus someone in a lower tier. He asked if there would be a negative financial impact if the conservation efforts brought the tier four customers up into tier three. Mr. Hill stated that Willdan Consultant Johnathan Varnes would be able to address that question. Mr. Varnes stated that were there to be a significant reduction in the upper tier flow there would be a financial impact to the City. Mr. Hill's presentation noted that the flow is already at historic lows; those users at the outer tiers are likely not going to reduce materially more than what has already been reduced. Most of the conservation has already occurred. There would be an impact but they have not quantified that impact at this point.

Mayor Nabours asked what the impacts have been when Flagstaff has gotten a lot of rain and people are not using as much water as a result. Mr. Hill stated that the water revenues are flat even with a rate increase; this is because there is lower use in the winter and there has been an interesting shift in the rain patterns which may have contributed as well with the less need for irrigation. Mayor Nabours asked if that can be quantified. Mr. Hill stated that in fiscal year 15 the water revenue budget was estimated to be \$14.7 million and the actual was \$1 million less than that. Mayor Nabours asked if that is taken into account with the current rate study. Mr. Hill stated that the consultants do take that into account and the revenue they expect for next year is reduced to be closer to the actual numbers of the previous year.

Councilmember Putzova referred to page seven of the answers document; she stated that the rates are different than what was reported at the last meeting and asked for clarification on the difference. Mr. Varnes stated that at the meeting of October 6, 2015 the Council requested that Willdan add a percent change column to the table. In order to get the true percent change he had to add not only the baseline rates that were in the prior presentation, but also the energy charge. The energy charge was embedded in all of the rates at the last presentation; in order to get a true representation of the percentage change in the rates the energy charge had to be removed. Mr. Hill added that it is important to note that the energy charge changes each year which is why it needed to be removed in order to get an accurate calculation on the

percentage change.

Councilmember Putzova stated that it appears that over five years the rates are increasing more in the lower tiers than in the higher tiers which means the more one conserves the greater the rate increase will be.

Mayor Nabours asked for the cost of the average water bill. Mr. Varnes stated that the average user uses 5,000 gallons per month and their bill is \$33.14. Mayor Nabours stated that the average user will experience an increase of about \$2 per month each year for the next five years.

Councilmember Oravits asked if the rates shown in a utility bill include the energy rate. Mr. Hill explained that the energy rate is actually broken out on the utility bill as a separate line item.

Councilmember Putzova asked if the energy surcharge changes with the different tiers. Mr. Hill explained that it is the actual expense of the electricity used to deliver the water and it is not associated with the tier structure. Acting Management Services Director Rick Tadder further explained that each year the Finance Department trues up the electricity costs based on actual usage by the Utilities Department.

Councilmember Putzova stated that the new tables are not helpful and she would prefer to go back and calculate the percentage of change in five years by customer class. Mixing the energy surcharge in that calculation loses clarity because the City posts the rates differently. Mr. Hill explained that the rates posted on the City's website are those with the energy charge included. The total is broken down by utility rate, energy surcharge, and overall rate.

Mayor Nabours stated that the energy charge is calculated with a different process than the utility rates. Mr. Hill explained that rate can change year to year based on the amount of energy that is used. Mayor Nabours further clarified that the energy surcharge will not be included in the 3% increase proposed because it is completely dependent upon the total energy costs to deliver the water.

Councilmember Overton clarified that the City is not charging in both locations, the gallons are being charged as gallons and the energy is being charged as energy. The table provided by the consultants in the answers was an attempt to get true percentages of the water rate increase only. This table was an answer to a question and not a table that would be used in the publications to the public. Mr. Hill agreed stating that the numbers that are published show the water rate and the energy rate separately and then combined for the total rate. The data is the same between the two tables, they are just being displayed differently in an effort to show that true percentage of increase.

Mayor Nabours asked how the energy surcharge is calculated for each household. Mr. Tadder explained that the Finance Department looks at the overall energy consumption by the Water Department and divides that by the estimated gallons to be consumed in the year. The result is the energy charge that is assessed per gallon used to each user.

Vice Mayor Barotz requested that the consultant provide a chart that does not have the energy surcharge built into the rate to determine the percent increase.

Mayor Nabours asked if there is an issue for reclaimed water when less water is used in the home which results in less reclaimed water available for reclaimed users who then have to supplement with potable. Mr. Hill explained that conservation on the wastewater side does make it challenging when the strength of the wastewater is more. Mayor Nabours then asked if it is possible for Flagstaff to get to a point where there is too much conservation and there is

not enough reclaimed water available. Mr. Hill explained that if Flagstaff continues to have growth the reclaimed volume will expand due to more residents and their water use.

Councilmember Evans asked about the funding associated with the water rates. She asked which of the options presented last week was the most feasible. Deputy City Manager Barbara Goodrich stated that when the City issues bonds it looks out five, ten and twenty years to see what is going to occur. The focus is on what kind of rate the City going to get when the bonds are issued. Either plan will be sustainable; there is enough revenue stability that there would be no impact to the City from a debt standpoint.

Vice Mayor Barotz asked for further explanation about the rationale behind the existing tier structure for off-peak/golf course under the reclaimed water section. It appears that the rate does the opposite from what is done with the residential. Mr. Hill stated that prior to 2011 there were four off-peak tiers and at Council direction staff reduced them to two off-peak tiers. The current rate book does show four tiers but tiers one, two and three show the same rates; with this rate change the materials will be updated to show only the two tiers. Vice Mayor Barotz asked why it is called off-peak/golf course when in the summer it is peak usage. Mr. Hill stated that golf courses do not pull from the reclaimed system during the day but the City delivers the reclaimed water to their on-site storage ponds during the night which is off-peak. Mr. Varnes added that the rate structure is a carryover from the prior rate study. Mr. Hill stated that staff provided a CCR to the Council that described how the original rates were developed as a combination of the peak factor and the desire to encourage reclaimed water use. Vice Mayor Barotz stated that she would like to understand why the consultant feels that there is no change needed in the rate structure for reclaimed water. Mr. Varnes stated that the reclaim rate structure is in line with the industry standards and the recommendation is to keep the structure but modify the rate. In the rate study the City provided billing data from its system and it was validated within less than a 2% variance. On the reclaimed water side, due to data limitations, there was not a confidence level for redesigning or adjusting the structure because it did not look materially wrong or inaccurate. Vice Mayor Barotz stated that she does not understand how there would be something not right with the data that was provided by the City. She would like to understand how the Council can be confident that the other data provided is correct and where the deficiency in the reclaimed data occurred. She does not feel that the rationale is adequate to leave the reclaimed water structure the way that it is. A lot has changed in the last five years and leaving reclaimed water off the table is a mistake.

Mayor Nabours stated that he would like to know how much water the golf courses use each month and if the City has reclaimed water it wants to get rid of are golf courses encouraged to be the customer that helps the City do that.

Councilmember Evans stated the Council is being asked to make decisions based on the information that was provided and the consultant is stating that they could not get the right information from the City to make a recommendation on reclaimed water. She feels that the reclaimed section should be removed from consideration until there is confidence that the information submitted is correct. She also requested information on how many times the City has subsidized the reclaimed water system with potable water.

Mayor Nabours asked if the options to increase the reclaim water rates was a flat 3% or 7% without a detailed analysis of what the cost would be in 10 or 20 years like was done with water. Mr. Hill stated they were able to determine the cost associated with the delivery of the reclaimed water during this rate period. Mr. Varnes stated that they looked at the cost of reclaimed water over the next five years and developed the reclaimed rate increases so that they would adequately fund the costs over the next five years; there was no change in the structure by which the cost is recovered.

Councilmember Overton asked if the off-peak golf course customer pays \$1.38 per 0-150 million gallons and then \$1.07 above or does it trigger \$1.07 plus for when they get over 150 million gallons. Mr. Hill stated that for the large users it triggers the lower rate when they reach the threshold. Mr. Tadder further explained that the usage is on a yearly basis meaning that their usage from 0-150 million is charged at \$1.38 per gallon and when they go over the 150 million the rate is reduced to \$1.07 going forward.

Vice Mayor Barotz requested additional information as to the revenues from the reclaimed water broken out by class.

Mr. Copley asked the Council if they would prefer to hold off on the capacity fee discussion until next week in the interest of time and to allow some public comment. Mayor Nabours stated that they will take public comment on what has been discussed thus far and come back at a later date for the capacity fee report.

Robert Vane provided Council a printed PowerPoint presentation for review. A copy of that presentation is attached. Mr. Vane represents the Flagstaff Water Group and provided their recommendations to the Council.

Mayor Nabours asked Mr. Vane to attend the next meeting to provide further comments and recommendations from the Flagstaff Water Group.

Councilmember Putzova asked for Mr. Vane to discuss further the group's philosophy and structure of commercial tiers; she would like to understand more about the distribution and usage.

Councilmember Evans asked Mr. Vane to speak more about the commercial rebate recommendations next week.

Moved by Mayor Jerry Nabours, **seconded by** Councilmember Coral Evans to suspend the Rules of Procedure to allow Mr. Vane to come next week and speak again for 15 minutes on behalf of the Flagstaff Water Group.

Vote: 7 - 0 - Unanimously

Councilmember Evans asked that the Flagstaff Water Group be allowed to show their presentation on the overhead so that the public understands what material Council has been provided. She feels that by allowing Mr. Vane to display the presentation it makes for better transparency and public participation. Mayor Nabours stated that he will speak with Ms. D'Andrea about that option.

Jack Rathjen addressed Council in opposition of a water rate increase. Mayor Nabours asked Mr. Rathjen what the City should do to cover the increased cost of infrastructure and production to which Mr. Rathjen replied sell more water. Growth pays for growth and when new developments tie into the system they should pay for their portion of the system to be increased.

Rudy Preston addressed Council stating that he would to know how much the subsidy is for regular rate payers to subsidize reclaimed water. The subsidy should be removed so that regular customers do not have to see increases in their rates. The City should be charging reclaimed water user what it costs to produce and deliver that water.

Councilmember Evans asked if potable water users are subsidizing the reclaimed water system and what the amount of that subsidy is. Mr. Hill stated that the rate study has split each

of the enterprise funds independently so they stand on their own. There is no cross subsidy from the water fund or the wastewater fund to the reclaimed fund. The cost of delivering reclaimed water in for the next five years is \$1.62 per thousand without any subsidy from the water or wastewater fund. Historically it had been comingled into one single fund. From this point forward the fund is split and if there is any cross funding you will see that in the budget. The intent of this model and the rate is to have no subsidy from the water or wastewater fund.

Written comments were received from the following individuals:

- Jack Rathjen
- Greg Kleiner
- Richard Miller
- Dawn Dyer

Comments received:

- The plan does not seem ready for a vote.
- I would like to see the reclaimed water rates in a tiered system and have the users pay a higher rate for using more.
- Every year there is a shortage of reclaimed water and it must be supplemented with potable; there should be incentives to conserve reclaimed water.
- I disagree with the assumption that the conservation that is possible has already occurred.
- Opposed to the current reclaimed water rate where the rate goes down as the use increases.
- Recommend dedicating up to 5% of reclaimed water production to conservation programs of surface water such as Francis Short Pond and Rio de Flag.
- Oppose water rate increases.
- If wastewater is not sold it is dumped.
- The cost of \$1.62 to treat wastewater is too high.

Mayor Nabours asked that all others who had submitted comment cards to return next week to make their comments.

5. Adjournment

The Special Meeting of the Flagstaff City Council of October 13, 2015, adjourned at 7:42 p.m.

WORK SESSION

1. Call to Order

Mayor Nabours called the Flagstaff City Council Work Session of October 13, 2015, to order at 8:00 p.m.

2. Preliminary Review of Draft Agenda for the October 20, 2015, City Council Meeting.*

** Public comment on draft agenda items may be taken under "Review of Draft Agenda Items", at the discretion of the Mayor. Citizens wishing to speak on agenda items not specifically called out by the City Council for discussion under the second Review section may submit a speaker card for their items of interest to the recording clerk.*

Mayor Nabours stated that there are a lot of commission appointments next week and the Council will be using the new process of one Councilmember making a recommendation on a single appointment. He intends to take each commission one at a time and suggested that each Councilmember consider having a backup recommendation should their planned recommendation be taken by another Councilmember. Additionally, the Council will be addressing the commissions that have specialty appointments. The City Clerk put together a chart that shows the breakdown of the commissions and the specialty appointments associated with those.

A. Discussion of the proposed La Plaza Vieja Neighborhood Specific Plan.

Mayor Nabours stated that this meeting is not the public hearing meeting and reminded the public that the public hearing will occur next week. This is a preliminary presentation from the staff. The Council can take public comment but they will have to repeat it next week to make it a part of the public hearing record.

Comprehensive Planning Manager Sarah Dechter provided a PowerPoint presentation that covered the following:

LA PLAZA VIEJA NEIGHBORHOOD PLAN
WHAT IS A SPECIFIC PLAN?
TIMELINE FOR LA PLAZA VIEJA PLAN
COMMISSIONS AND PUBLIC HEARINGS
NEIGHBORHOOD BOUNDARY
CHALLENGES TO PLAN IMPLEMENTATION
GOALS, POLICIES AND STRATEGIES
CONCEPT PLAN
ACTIVITY CENTERS AND NEIGHBORHOODS
NEIGHBORHOOD POLICY AREAS
SINGLE FAMILY COTTAGES
3D VISUALIZATION OF TRANSITION AREA AND COMMERCIAL EDGE – HOUSING
3D VISUALIZATION OF TRANSITION AREA AND COMMERCIAL EDGE

Flagstaff Metropolitan Planning Organization Manager David Wessel continued the presentation.

TRANSPORTATION – CLAY AVE. EXTENSION
HOW DID WE ARRIVE AT THE TRANSPORTATION SCENARIOS?
MICROSIMULATION RESULTS
SUMMARY
INTEGRATED TRANSPORTATION SCENARIOS – CONCEPT 1
INTEGRATED TRANSPORTATION SCENARIOS – CONCEPT 2

Ms. Dechter continued the presentation.

STREET CROSS SECTIONS – MINOR COLLECTOR
STREET CORSS SECTIONS – NEW LOCAL STREET

STREET CROSS SECTIONS – MODIFIED CLAY AVENUE – LOCAL STREETS WITH FUTS
STREET CROSS SECTIONS – FUTS TRAIL EXAMPLE – MID-BLOCK
ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

Councilmember Overton asked if the land use types and building forms shown in the 3-D models were examples of use types within today's existing zoning right. Ms. Dechter explained that because most of the parcels are Highway Commercial, using planned residential developments or conditional use permits individuals or developers can accomplish almost all of the shown building forms and types. Councilmember Overton stated that it raises the question of how to help private property owners understand that these are types that may be of interest and more fitting of the specific plan and the neighborhood but are not what may actually happen. Ms. Dechter agreed stating that it was communicated during the public meetings that existing rights and potential uses may not always be what the neighborhood defined in the specific plan. The neighborhood feels that the plan allows a visualization of what they want to see and that can be provided to developers to hopefully encourage them in that direction but also understanding that it may not happen that way.

Mayor Nabours asked if there had there been any discussion about making the neighborhood plan just apply to the area north of Clay. Ms. Dechter stated that the concept did come up for discussion but not from people who owned property south of Clay. The concerns of the business owners south of Clay were how the City was going to handle the transition area versus a commercial edge.

Mayor Nabours asked if there is anything in the plan that is contradictory to the Regional Plan. Ms. Dechter explained that the Regional Plan can be contradicting when applied to a small area so it is hard to say if the Neighborhood Plan is in complete compliance with the Regional Plan. The group worked really hard to find as many places to apply both the Neighborhood Plan and the Regional Plan. Mayor Nabours stated that at some point in the future the Council may get a request for rezoning or something else and the applicant points to a map in the Regional Plan that shows one thing and the Neighborhood Plan shows another thing. He noted that it would be helpful to look out for those types of things to avoid specific issues to this area and the Regional Plan maps. Ms. Dechter explained that the maps adopted for the Neighborhood Plan become more detailed than the Regional Plan and the intent is to clarify the Regional Plan. Typically staff and Council would refer to the Neighborhood Plan over the Regional Plan for this very reason.

Jesse Dominguez spoke on behalf of the La Plaza Vieja neighborhood in support of the plan. He submitted his comments in writing to the Council and a copy is attached hereto.

Mayor Nabours stated that the public hearing is next week and asked Mr. Dominguez if he could include his written comments into the public hearing record next week to which Mr. Dominquez replied yes.

Councilmember Brewster thanked Mr. Dominguez for his work on the plan and for sticking with it for as long as he did. She stated that the neighborhood and staff have come up with a good plan that shows collaboration even when they have disagreed.

3. Public Participation

Public Participation enables the public to address the council about items that are not on the prepared agenda. Public Participation appears on the agenda twice, at the beginning and at the end of the work session. You may speak at one or the other, but not both. Anyone wishing to comment at the meeting is asked to fill out a speaker card and submit it to the recording clerk. When the item comes up on the agenda, your name will be called. 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 to have 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.

Emily Davalos addressed Council with concerns for the move to have four votes required to put an item on the agenda.

Katie Nelson addressed Council in regards to the water rate structure. Ms. D'Andrea stated that the Council is unable to take public comment on an agenda item during public participation and the comments need to be received at the time of the item. The public hearing on water rates has been extended to the next meeting and she is welcome to speak at that time.

Rudy Preston addressed Council in regards to the water rates and again, Ms. D'Andrea reminded him and the public that no further comments will be taken at tonight's meeting regarding water rates or the rate study. Mr. Preston then addressed Council with concerns about moving to four votes required to put something on the Council agenda.

Rob Wilson addressed Council with concerns about moving to requiring four votes to place an item on a future agenda.

4. Discussion regarding a proposed Intergovernmental Agreement between the City of Flagstaff and the Summit Fire District for shared services.

Fire Chief Mark Gaillard introduced Summit Fire Board President Howard Knott, Summit Fire Chief Don Howard, Summit Fire Battalion Chief Mike Bain and Summit Fire Captain and Board Vice President Bill Dunlap. He then provided a PowerPoint presentation that covered the following:

INTERGOVERNMENTAL AGREEMENT FOR MANAGEMENT SERVICES
THE SERVICE DILEMMA
AN OPPORTUNITY TO INNOVATE
TONIGHT'S OBJECTIVES
STRATEGIC ALIGNMENT
SERVICE AND FIREFIGHTER SAFETY
SMALLER GOVERNMENT
FUTURE OPPORTUNITIES
ELEMENTS OF THE IGA
PROVIDE FIRE CHIEF/CHIEF OFFICER SERVICES
FLAGSTAFF DIRECT ADDITIONAL COSTS OF IGA
MAINTAINS LOCAL CONTROL
LINE AND STAFF
INTERIM ORGANIZATIONAL CHART
ADDITIONAL TERMS AND CONDITIONS
SUMMARY

Vice Mayor Barotz Barotz asked how many employees Summit has. Chief Howard stated that Summit has 36 Firefighters, three Battalion Chiefs, one Fire Chief, one Administrative Officer and one Secretary.

Mayor Nabours asked what areas are covered by Summit Fire. Chief Howard stated that there are three stations on the east side and two stations along the 180 corridor.

Councilmember Brewster asked what the Summit Fire employees think about the proposal especially with Flagstaff having the Chief position. Chief Howard stated that there was concern initially. As they were able to talk about it more and get information out to the staff as well as introduce the resume of Chief Gaillard the staff ultimately voted in favor of it. Chief Gaillard has the leadership skills needed to make this model successful.

Councilmember Putzova asked about the provisions in the IGA and the impacts should Summit Fire or the City chose to return to the original model after two years. Chief Gaillard stated that the idea is that this is a pilot program and the intent is to make this something different and sustainable. In the event that either party does not want to continue after two years Flagstaff would downsize and Summit Fire would hire a Fire Chief. Flagstaff Fire is building capacity temporarily and this is constructed in a way that will allow them to move people back if need be. Councilmember Putzova asked for any negative impacts with the possible uncoupling. Chief Gaillard stated that there have been vast discussions about what could go wrong and he is confident in saying that the risk is low and the upside seems very high. If the two agencies uncouple the risks are low too; each agency would move back to the positions they are currently in and move forward. His outlook is that the partnership will be very favorable and good for both communities.

Councilmember Overton stated that the concept is a different one and feels a lot like an annexation; the City is taking an outside community and absorbing it and taking on additional responsibilities and implications. He expressed concern about the language of indemnification in the IGA separating the role of the Flagstaff Deputy Chief from the concerns and complaints of the district. He asked what insulates the Deputy Chief from taking on that responsibility and criticism as an agent of the City of Flagstaff. Chief Gaillard stated that there is nothing that insulates the Deputy Chief from taking that criticism. There are difficult things to deal with as there are at the City and hard decisions will have to be made. There are strong management practices in place and the hope is to take those into Summit Fire and apply them and have the same results that have been found in the City department.

Councilmember Overton also expressed concerns about promoting Flagstaff employees with the possibility of demoting them after two years if the program is not successful. Additionally, he is concerned with not adding employees to help carry the workload; he would like to understand what gets pushed aside or slips for the City of Flagstaff with taking on these new responsibilities. Chief Gaillard stated that benchmarks have been identified that need to be achieved. Staff and management will be able to identify early when performance starts to slip due to the metrics that are in place to monitor performance. He added that the Deputy Fire Chief position does not currently exist at Summit Fire and this particular arrangement would not work without it. Councilmember Overton asked if Human Resources weighed in on the proposal. Chief Gaillard stated that Human Resources did review the agreement and there were a few initial concerns that have been resolved.

Councilmember Oravits asked how this arrangement would benefit Flagstaff. Chief Gaillard stated that in the City organization he is struggling to find professional development opportunities for the existing staff and this arrangement provides that opportunity. By taking an existing Flagstaff Battalion Chief and giving them more and different responsibility as Deputy Fire Chief, that creates a vacancy at the Battalion Chief level allowing for upward growth for the existing staff. The other element is the opportunity to create capacity. If there are people doing redundant jobs for the two departments, there may be opportunity to combine those positions and create capacity elsewhere within the organizations.

Councilmember Oravits asked if there had been meetings with the community to discuss this possibility. Chief Howard stated that Summit has had three community meetings where this

opportunity has been discussed. People have been very interested in this and supportive of it in terms of looking at a more regional approach.

Mayor Nabours asked why Summit just did not hire another person to fill the capacity of Fire Chief. Chief Gaillard explained that Summit has had the opportunity to do that and they were in the middle of a Chief search when these discussions began. Hiring a Chief eliminated the opportunity for collaboration and the elimination of redundancy that this model will provide. It was a consideration by the Summit Board that they stop the Chief hiring process because they felt that this arrangement was something that should be explored.

Councilmember Putzova asked if the Chief could speak to how the process would work with regard to reporting and how direction would be given. Chief Gaillard stated that the Summit Board responsibility is very similar to that of a city council; they will provide policy direction which will guide the operations of Summit Fire operations. Summit will continue to control their resources. Mr. Copley added that the closest analogy he could give would be that the City Library Director, who is also the County Librarian. This individual reports to a Board that is not aligned directly with the City Manager and has a different set of policies but she also reports to the City Manager and also adheres to the policies of the City of Flagstaff.

Councilmember Oravits stated that he would like additional time to process the concept and formulate further questions. It is something that he is willing to explore further but feels there are too many unanswered questions to make a decision tonight.

Councilmember Brewster suggested that an executive session be scheduled to allow Council to discuss some of the legal ramifications of the agreement.

Councilmember Overton also stated that he needs time to consider the agreement and asked for it to be brought back on a future agenda for decision.

5. Review of Draft Agenda Items for the October 20, 2015, City Council Meeting.*

** Public comment on draft agenda items will be taken at this time, at the discretion of the Mayor.*

None

6. Public Participation

None

7. Informational Items To/From Mayor, Council, and City Manager; future agenda item requests.

Vice Mayor Barotz reported that she and the Mayor attended the Active Shooter Training put on by Risk Management and it was a very well done training. She learned more about how to handle that kind of situation than she thought was possible and found interesting that most of the training was counter intuitive. She highly suggested that the others attend if they have a chance to do so.

Councilmember Oravits reported that Representative David Gowan was in Flagstaff last Thursday and the highlight of the visit was touring McMillan Mesa in regards to the Veterans home. It was a good meeting and good conversation about the funding needed to carry the project forward.

Councilmember Evans requested a memo on what other future neighborhood plans are being worked on now that La Plaza Vieja is nearing completion.

Mr. Copley reminded the Council of the Zoning Code Amendment special meeting on Monday, October 19, 2015 at 4:00 p.m. He also reported that on October 22, 2015 at 10:00 a.m. at the Museum of Northern Arizona there will be a signing of the final Record of Decision for the Flagstaff Watershed Protection Program.

Councilmember Brewster stated that the memorial event at NAU was done very well. There were probably 1,000 people and the three speakers did a great job.

8. Adjournment

The Work Session of the Flagstaff City Council held October 13, 2015, adjourned at 9:55 p.m.

MAYOR

ATTEST:

CITY CLERK

CERTIFICATION

STATE OF ARIZONA)
) ss.
Coconino County)

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 on October 13, 2015. I further certify that the Meeting was duly called and held and that a quorum was present.

DATED this 17th day of November, 2015.

CITY CLERK