

MINUTES

1. Call to Order

Mayor Nabours called the Work Session of the Flagstaff City Council held April 12, 2016, to order at 6:15 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 work session, 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. Pledge of Allegiance

The Council and audience recited the Pledge of Allegiance.

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 Interim City Attorney Sterling Solomon

4. 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.

Branch Library Assistant Claudine Taillac addressed Council on behalf of the Flagstaff Public Library to announce that it is National Library Week. She informed the Council that they will be receiving some information that highlights the successes of the Flagstaff Public Library and the various programs and partnerships with the community.

The following individuals addressed Council with concerns about Councilmember Putzova's efforts to assist in fighting the deportation of an individual in the community who is here illegally:

- Merle Henderson
- Joy Staveley
- Steven Harris
- Karen MacKean
- Steven Slaton

Mr. Solomon reminded the Council that they cannot engage in dialog during public participation but a Councilmember can respond to criticism should they choose to do so. Public participation under Arizona law, is a time that the public can address the Council, no discussion can take place. If there is criticism then the specific Councilmember can respond at the conclusion of public participation should they wish to do so.

Councilmember Putzova thanked the speakers for coming to the meeting and speaking about a topic they are interested in. She stated that she does not believe that the people who spoke today had any confidence in her when running for office and that will likely not change regardless of what she does. She said that the Pledge of Allegiance talks about justice for all and she worries that the words spoken today would infringe on the individual's right to a fair trial. Until a trial is held, the public should think about the rights of all individuals and the right to the presumption of innocence, legal counsel and the right to a fair trial.

5. Preliminary Review of Draft Agenda for the April 19, 2016, City Council Meeting.*

** Public comment on draft agenda items may be taken under "Review of Draft Agenda Items" later in the meeting, 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.*

Councilmember Overton asked if there is a dollar amount associated with each vendor in item 9C. Senior Procurement Specialist Patrick Brown stated that the dollar amount is predicated on the budget that is awarded the previous year. Councilmember Overton stated that in the past there had been amounts not to exceed; he asked if that is the same process or if it is based on past performance. Mr. Brown explained that it is based on ARS standards and what they have put in place of not to exceed. Councilmember Overton requested that those not to exceed dollar amounts be provided for each vendor.

Mayor Nabours stated that the Sign Code item will likely be postponed to a later meeting.

6. Humphreys/Route 66 Intersection: ADOT District Project Presentation

Community Development Director Mark Landsiedel introduced ADOT North Central District

Engineer Audra Merrick and FMPO Manager Dave Wessel who provided a PowerPoint presentation that covered the following:

HUMPHREYS TURN LANE PROJECT
PICTURES OF INTERSECTION
BACKGROUND
INTEGRATED TECHNICAL AND PUBLIC PARTICIPATION PROCESS
MILTON OPERATIONS ANALYSIS

Ms. Merrick continued the presentation.

B40/180 INTERSECTION
IDENTIFIED POTENTIAL OPPORTUNITY
HUMPHREY TURN LANE PROJECT

Councilmember Overton asked if there are other things that ADOT is looking for in terms of safety, traffic congestion or other needs that the City can be identifying for future grant and funding opportunities. Ms. Merrick explained that HISP safety funding that is available for safety concerns and that comes from a different funding source. For the Humphrey widening project they rated on if the agency goals are being met, operational improvement, safety, community support, budget viability and project delivery risk.

Mayor Nabours stated that ADOT will need some of the City landscaped land along the east side of City Hall and asked if it is known yet how much will be needed. Ms. Merrick explained that the rough numbers show 10 to 11 feet but they will not know for sure for a while. Mayor Nabours asked if that would infringe on the building. Mr. Landsiedel stated that it will not infringe on the building and the new LID wall should be able to stay in place.

Councilmember Oravits asked when the project would start. Ms. Merrick stated that the design funding is in fiscal year 2017 and construction funding would be in fiscal year 2019.

7. Presentation on Economic Development Incentives Available to Businesses in Flagstaff

Business Retention and Expansion Manager John Saltonstall introduced Keith Watkins with the Arizona Commerce Authority who provided a PowerPoint presentation that covered the following:

INCENTIVE OVERVIEW
INCENTIVES. WHY?
ARIZONA INCENTIVES

Mr. Saltonstall continued the presentation.

DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT: A TOOL FOR COMMON GOALS
DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT INCENTIVES
ASPEN PLACE/SAWMILL
JOY CONE COMPANY
ORPHEUM
NESTLE-PURINA

Mayor Nabours stated that there is a savings to Nestle-Purina of \$3 million in property tax; it is important to note that the City only has a portion of that property tax because other entities

receive a portion of that tax. Vice Mayor Barotz added that it is also important to note that there are other considerations and different points of view from a policy perspective on incentives and the question of fairness. Deputy City Manager Barbara Goodrich stated that the City makes up approximately 10% of the property tax bill and the City always checks with the other community partners prior to entering into some kind of incentive agreement to see if there are any concerns.

ECONA Vice President John Stigmon continued the presentation.

SUCCESSFUL GRANTS
MACHINE SOLUTIONS
T-GEN NORTH
MOUNTAIN HEART
JOY CONE COMPANY

Councilmember Evans stated that she would like more information about the follow up and monitoring of the various agreements. She would like to understand what happens if a business is found to be out of compliance or the return on investment is not as high as it was anticipated. Mr. Saltonstall stated that staff checks in on these businesses more than once yearly. Currently, most of the jobs at Purina are averaging a \$60,000 salary and while the agreement called for 50 new employees Purina ultimately added 79. There is a bigger story to each of those jobs but there has not been an economic impact study done yet.

Councilmember Evans stated that from a community standpoint an economic impact study would be helpful to weigh the value of what the community gets for these incentives. Having the incentives in a quantifiable manner would be a helpful tool in reporting back to the community.

Mr. Watkins stated that in regard to the ACA grants, there is a three year reporting requirement and so far every one of the grants have been a success in terms of return on investment. Additionally, the companies have to apply for reimbursement on the back end and that has been a sound policy for the incentive.

8. Discussion of CDBG Five Year Plan, Fair Housing Analysis and FY 2016 Projects (*SEE ITEM 10-F ON THE APRIL 19, 2016, DRAFT AGENDA PACKET*)

Housing and Grants Administrator Leah Bloom introduced Martina Kuehl with Kuehl Enterprise who is the consultant for three of Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) reports. Ms. Bloom provided a PowerPoint presentation that covered the following:

CDBG OVERVIEW
HOW DOES THE CITY ACCESS THE FUNDS?
PUBLIC PARTICIPATION PROCESS
TONIGHT

Ms. Kuehl continued the presentation

2016 ANALYSIS OF IMPEDIMENTS TO FURTHER FAIR HOUSING CHOICE
PROCESS
IDENTIFIED IMPEDIMENTS AND ACTION PLAN
EDUCATION AND OUTREACH ACTION PLAN
ADMINISTRATIVE ACTION PLAN
NEXT STEPS AND QUESTIONS

5 YEAR HUD CONSOLIDATED PLAN
PROCESS
STRATEGIC PLAN – FOUR PRIORITY AREAS
TARGET AREAS
REVITALIZATION, PUBLIC FACILITIES AND INFRASTRUCTURE
PUBLIC SERVICES AND ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITIES GOALS
HOMELESSNESS ACTIVITY GOALS
DECENT AFFORDABLE HOUSING GOALS
NEXT STEPS AND QUESTIONS

Ms. Bloom continued the presentation.

COUNCIL DIRECTION AND STAFF RESPONSIBILITIES
CONDUCTING RISK ASSESSMENT FOR EACH PROPOSAL
PROPOSAL SCORING CRITERIA EXAMPLES
HOW MUCH MONEY ARE WE TALKING ABOUT?
DISTRIBUTION ALLOWED BY HUD
HOW MUCH MONEY ARE WE TALKING ABOUT FOR EACH CATEGORY?
PUBLIC SERVICE PROPOSALS - \$94,600
HOUSING PROPOSALS - \$420,193
PUBLIC SERVICE RECOMMENDATIONS – 15% = \$94,600
HOUSING RECOMMENDATIONS – TOTAL AVAILABLE HOUSING FUNDING: \$420,193
NEXT STEPS AND QUESTIONS

Vice Chair of the Coconino County Board of Supervisor Liz Archuleta addressed Council to thank the Community Review Committee for their work. She stated that all the projects were worthy of funding and there is a great need in the community for more CDBG funding. The County submitted a proposal through the Community Services Department for \$60,750 to address housing stabilization through eviction prevention, mortgage foreclosure prevention and case management. Given the limited funds, City staff recommends a reduction to the proposal to \$24,600; with this the County would be able to assist 24 households. The need for this service is great in the community but the County understands that there is only so much to go around. They look forward to continuing their relationship with the City.

Mayor Nabours asked if the County has a similar CDBG process and allocation. Supervisor Archuleta stated that they do; the County CDBG funds are submitted through NACOG and each entity at NACOG goes through a rotation every four to six years. The County CDBG funding has to be used in the unincorporated parts of the County. As with the City, there are always more projects than funding allows.

Councilmember Putzova left the dais and joined the meeting telephonically at 8:25 p.m.

A break was held from 8:12 through 8:25 p.m.

Moved by Mayor Jerry Nabours, **seconded by** Councilmember Jeff Oravits to postpone item 10 (National Travel and Tourism Week Update and Arizona Winter Wonderland Recap) to another night.

Vote: 6 - 1

NAY: Councilmember Scott Overton

9. Discussion on Nuisance Party Ordinance

Deputy Police Chief Dan Musselman provided a PowerPoint presentation that covered the

following:

NUISANCE PARTY ORDINANCE
BACKGROUND
NUISANCE PARTY
MODIFICATIONS TO ORDINANCE
CITIZEN CONCERNS
CONCERNS CONTINUED

Police Chief Kevin Treadway continued the presentation.

CHIEF'S COMMENTS

The ordinance does not discriminate against socio-demographic status.

The Department is in favor of the definition of a gathering remaining at five.

Training prohibits officers from charging for both the civil and criminal violations.

The ordinance was crafted in similarity to other ordinances across the country and in the state.

The Department feels that the 120 day period is appropriate.

Deputy Chief Musselman continued the presentation.

VIDEO FOOTAGE

Deputy Chief Walt Miller continued the presentation.

PARTY NUISANCE AUDIT FINDINGS

Chief Treadway concluded the presentation stating that he believes that this problem will do nothing but continue to grow. As the Chief of Police he would recommend no changes to the ordinance.

Mayor Nabours asked what triggers the difference between what was seen in the video and a tailgate party before a football game. Chief Treadway stated that the difference is that there is a call for service when someone's peace is disturbed. The issues and responses are complaint driven and the police are relying on other people to report that their peace and quiet is being disturbed. Additionally, officers look at the ordinance to determine if traffic is being impeded or there a lot of trash or previous violations. The officers are using good discretion and common sense. If someone called at 3:00 in the afternoon complaining about a 10 year old party next door the officer will use the appropriate discretion to deal with the situation.

The following individuals addressed Council in opposition of the current ordinance:

- Michael Del Giorgio
- James Burton
- Christine Gannon
- John Bower
- Elisha Dorfsmith
- Jane O'Donnell
- Cindy Dorfsmith
- Rob Knox

The following comments were received:

- Opposed to the present composition of the ordinance and in favor of the changes that the

Flagstaff Liberty Alliance have requested.

- More specific language is needed in the ordinance.
- The most important thing is that the right of the people to peaceably assemble is not abused.
- Treatment or deferral programs may not be available when a civil penalty is applied.
- There is a fear of extortion to being at a party and being fined simply for being there.
- This is not the right tool for the problem.
- I have full assurance in the police currently but in 10-20 years as leadership changes what will happen?
- Language should be added that is more specific about what is a civil violation.
- Probationary period should be changed back to 90 days.
- The number of people constituting a nuisance party should be raised from 5 to 15.
- Criminal violations are specific and easy for officers to interpret but this ordinance is too vague.
- This ordinance brings concern with the right to assemble and many people could have been in violation to the nuisance party ordinance.
- There is an undue burden that is being placed on some of the citizens of Flagstaff.
- A warning should be given and an appropriate time boundary would be helpful.
- I should not be afraid to have a dinner party where nothing dangerous is happening and the music is just too loud.
- The main purpose of the ordinance is to combat large parties and gatherings so why have such a low attendance requirement?
- Request removing the number requirement completely. A small gathering under four people should not have a higher penalty then a group of five or more.
- The ordinance does impede on the basic right to assemble.

The following individual addressed Council in favor of the current ordinance:

- Gloria Valencia

The following comments were received:

- The City Council has done something good for the citizens with this ordinance.
- Parties should be controlled and should be respectful of the neighbors.

Written comment cards in opposition of the current ordinance were received from the following individuals:

- Nathan Korotie
- Kelsey Hackett

Mayor Nabours stated that there is a big concern for being present at a big party and not participating in the obnoxious behavior but still being fined for being there. Chief Treadway stated that if they are not contributing to the nuisance then they will not be fined. Officers have been well trained to not take enforcement action on those not contributing to the nuisance. Officers face these kinds of discretions every day with other crimes.

Mayor Nabours stated that in the video many people are walking past the officer and he is not carding them or trying to determine if they are under the influence; he asked if that is usual and if the purpose was to simply disperse the party. Chief Treadway stated that it was a Saturday night around 1:00 a.m. and the three officers who responded likely made up 50% of the officers on duty that night for that side of town. The officers have to make determinations on how much time they can take at a party when there are other issues going on. It is a decision made on a case by case basis. Mayor Nabours clarified that it is not unusual for officers to just disperse the party and not issue citations. Chief Treadway agreed and stated that there are many times when a citation is not issued but the location is put on the party list to trigger the 120 day

probation period and that is often related to how cooperative the people are and if the party is dispersing quickly.

Councilmember Evans asked why there have not been any citations to property owners. Chief Treadway stated that the intent of the ordinance was to have property owners work with the Police Department. He recently received two letters from property owners notifying the department and the tenant of possible eviction should the behavior continue. Property owners are being proactive and including the police in their correspondence to show cooperation and support.

Councilmember Evans asked how many calls were received for the party in the video. Deputy Chief Musselman stated that he was only aware of one Crime Stop call.

Councilmember Evans asked if there has been any feedback received from people who are happy with the ordinance. Deputy Chief Miller stated that he has gotten a handful of calls from property owners thanking the department for the ordinance.

Councilmember Evans asked if it is possible to contest a nuisance party citation. Deputy Chief Miller explained that it is possible and that there is due process like any other type of citation.

Councilmember Oravits stated that a number of people brought up the number of participants as a concern; he asked why zero could not be an option. Assistant City Attorney Marianne Sullivan explained that when staff did the research on other community ordinances and looked at the different numbers one of the main concerns was for the officer's safety and making it easy to identify without having to count first. Councilmember Oravits stated that the same scenario could be applied to three or four attendees. He indicated that he has always had concern with the number and while he respects what this ordinance aims to do he feels the number could be set at zero.

Mayor Nabours stated that his inclination is to let the ordinance continue as is for a while. There was a problem and this was a tool that the Council felt necessary to solve the problem. Students did not police themselves well which led to the creation of the ordinance. He indicated that he is open to discuss and address any evidence of misuse or abuse.

10. National Travel and Tourism Week Update and Arizona Winter Wonderland Recap

Item postponed to a later date.

11. Advancement of the Southside Neighborhood Plan

Councilmember Evans stated that the City Council has already determined that they would like to move forward with a High Occupancy Housing plan and she is requesting that they also work on the Southside Neighborhood Plan at the same time. With everything that has happened lately the plan is needed. There is already a plan that was never accepted by Council that could be a starting point. If only one plan is worked on at a time it could be years before they are completed.

Mayor Nabours asked what the staff ramifications of working on two plans at the same time would be. Mr. Copley stated that in looking at a concurrent plan staff would need to use a consultant or hire additional staff. It would be a funding and budget discussion should the Council give direction on moving forward with two plans.

Comprehensive Planning Manager Sara Dechter stated that a CCR was distributed to Council

that laid out a few scenarios. The first is what is proposed in the City Manager's proposed budget which is to use existing staff and a \$15,000 consulting budget to do the High Occupancy Housing plan only, which is estimated to take 12 to 14 months. If it were to run concurrent with the Southside Neighborhood plan it would require additional resources and likely push the completion date out a few months. One option for concurrent plans would be to completely consult out one plan in the amount of approximately \$200,000. The work that is existing from the prior plan is good but does not fit the current legal context. The second option would be to fill the Neighborhood Planner position that was eliminated in 2010; the full burden rate for the Neighborhood Planner is roughly \$95,000 per year. Additional consulting funds would be needed totaling \$145,000.

Mayor Nabours asked if there is an option to change the priority and put the Southside Neighborhood plan ahead of the High Occupancy Housing plan with no great additional cost. Ms. Dechter stated that she is not sure that any time would be gained in putting off the High Occupancy Housing plan because staff is at a point of being able to kick off the discussions and planning along with public involvement. If the direction is shifted there would be a loss of the staff time that has already been dedicated.

Councilmember Oravits asked when they anticipate the High Occupancy Housing plan being done. Ms. Dechter stated that she worked up a project schedule and it is fairly variable right now with the earliest being February 2017 and the latest May 2017.

Councilmember Oravits stated that the reason the Council decided to do just the one plan was to avoid additional costs. He urged Council to stick with the original plan and then focus on the Southside Neighborhood plan at the time of completion in February or March of next year. Councilmember Evans stated that it is not her intent to change priorities. The High Occupancy Housing plan is extremely important. The issue is that the community needs to plan for the future and neighborhood plans do that. The Southside Neighborhood plan should have been addressed by the Council years ago and the City should have had a Neighborhood Planner on staff. To put this off for a year and then another year to complete it is still two to four years out. Having neighborhood plans is valuable and important especially for the neighborhoods that are impacted by redevelopment.

Mayor Nabours stated that he thinks that there may be some overlap with the High Occupancy Housing plan and elements of the Southside Neighborhood plan. His preference is to finish the High Occupancy Housing plan and see how it impacts the neighborhoods. Councilmember Evans stated that she thinks it is problematic to have the High Occupancy Housing plan drive or influence the Southside Neighborhood plan.

Charlie Silver addressed Council in support of the Southside Neighborhood plan. He stated that the 2005 plan is a great starting point to begin dialog with citizens and garner involvement.

Councilmember Overton stated that his preference is to focus on the High Occupancy Housing plan first. He added that Community Development is made up of a staff of 80 plus people and he would challenge staff to go back to the drawing board to figure out a better way to fund this; a couple hundred thousand dollars is a big budget ask when there are other needs in the City. He indicated that he would entertain hearing other proposals at the upcoming budget retreat. Mayor Nabours suggested looking at options that would allow the Southside Plan to get some preliminary work going while keeping the main focus on the High Occupancy Housing plan. Mr. Landsiedel stated that he appreciates the challenge but when the Community Development staff is broken down to the people who do long range planning, there are two. Everyone is already busy and he does not see the resources internally to bring forward two plans. Planning Director Dan Folke added that one of the things staff looked at was how they can do this more quickly and on less of a budget and they keep coming back to the public process which is the

most critical piece of these plans. There have been some trust issues with these topics and it is critical that the City engages the public in a meaningful way; staff has to receive the information, process, and develop a product that has time to be reviewed and commented on further by the public. With the current workloads there is just not the capacity to accomplish both of these plans without additional resources.

Councilmember Putzova stated that she is concerned that the City does not have a Neighborhood Planner. She also feels that the consultant fees are really high. She would like to see options and a timeline for doing the Southside Neighborhood plan as well as a long term plan for the other neighborhood plans.

Mayor Nabours stated that a majority of Council is not in favor of adding the Southside Neighborhood plan, they would rather wait until the High Occupancy Housing plan is complete unless a better funding proposal can be brought forward.

Vice Mayor Barotz left the meeting at 9:56 p.m.

12. **NAIPTA Update/ Transit Tax Renewal**

Assistant to the City Manager Stephanie Smith introduced NAIPTA General Manager Jeff Meilbeck who provided a PowerPoint presentation that covered the following:

TRANSIT DECISION 2016
KEY POINTS
PROMISES MADE FY08
TRANSIT BUDGET OVERVIEW
OPTIONS TO CONSIDER
TIMING OPTION: 2020
TIMING OPTION: 2018
OPTION: 2016 REQUEST
TIMING OPTION: NEVER
AMOUNT OPTION: FLAT RENEWAL
AMOUNT OPTION: UP OR DOWN
PUBLIC ACCESS AND TIMELINE
THANK YOU

Councilmember Overton suggested that Mr. Meilbeck review some of the higher level data during the public presentations, things like the cost per rider, the growth of the transit system and the benchmarks that have been accomplished. Mayor Nabours stated that it goes to the merits of the transit tax and highlighting if it is doing what it was intended to do. Ultimately it is an issue for the voters to decide if the tax will sunset or not. Councilmember Overton stated that he wants the public to have an opportunity to vote on the issue and is in favor of putting it on the ballot. Mr. Meilbeck stated that telling the transit story is important and the messaging has been developed and is being refined to communicate that story consistently.

The Council was in favor of putting the issue on the ballot in 2016 and asked Mr. Meilbeck to bring back ballot language for review and approval.

Moved by Councilmember Jeff Oravits, **seconded by** Councilmember Coral Evans to suspend the Rules of Procedure and continue with the next item on the agenda.

Vote: 6 - 0

13. New Municipal Courthouse Project

Mr. Copley introduced Court Administrator Don Jacobson, Judge Tom Chotena and Coconino County Director of Facilities Sue Brown. He stated that the Council and staff have been discussing the need for a courthouse for some time and the presentation will propose a path

forward for a courthouse in partnership with Coconino County at the site of the old jail at Birch and Agassiz.

Mr. Copley stated that staff is looking for direction from the Council on whether or not they would be interested in a bond question for the 2016 ballot in the amount of \$10 million to move the project forward.

Mr. Jacobson provided a PowerPoint presentation that covered the following:

SITE LOCATION
OLD COCONINO COUNTY JAIL
COUNCIL DIRECTION

Councilmember Oravits stated that his concern is always how it will affect people's cost of living and what the bond would do to their taxes. Ms. Goodrich explained that based on calculations, staff believes that capacity will be freed up within the current secondary property tax to be able to fund a \$10-12 million question without impacting the current rate charged to homeowners and commercial businesses.

Mayor Nabours asked what the amount of the proposed bond for the courthouse was a few years ago that failed. Mr. Jacobson stated that it was \$23 million for a court and parking facility.

Councilmember Overton stated that he is happy to hear the County is in discussions with the City for this project. He is comfortable with the fact that the City has not gone to the public for a few years with a facility request. He is willing to move forward with developing language for the ballot.

Councilmember Brewster also stated that she was happy to see a joint venture with the County. She asked if the proposal would include parking. Mr. Jacobson stated that parking is part of the discussion and the proposal is not to put the parking on the current site but to develop a parking structure within a half a block. The current parking needs that have been identified is about 200 spaces and staff is aiming for a few more than that.

Mayor Nabours stated that he is okay with moving ahead with the ballot language and stated that the education piece will be vital for the public to understand what is being asked for and give input on. Mr. Copley stated that staff will conduct high level engagement with the public so there will be input and answers for the Council from the public perspective.

Councilmember Evans stated that she is in support of developing ballot language and she added that she does not want the Cherry Street building sold in conjunction with the bond.

There is a consensus of Council to move forward with developing bond language for the ballot.

14. Review of Draft Agenda Items for the April 19, 2016, City Council Meeting.*

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

None

15. Public Participation

None

16. Informational Items To/From Mayor, Council, and City Manager.

Councilmember Oravits reported that he went down to the Capital yesterday and met with 16

different Representatives. He received very positive feedback on the Veteran’s funding of \$10 million and it looks very good and there could be some decisions made next week. He urged the public and the Council to keep making the phone calls in support of the funding.

Councilmember Evans reported that she got drawn for jury duty on the first day of the budget retreat; she has requested an alternative jury date but if she does not hear back she will have to report to jury duty first before the retreat.

17. Adjournment

The Flagstaff City Council Work Session of April 12, 2016, adjourned at 10:23 p.m.

MAYOR

ATTEST:

CITY CLERK