

The public can join the meeting to provide public comment. Please notify Jessica Vigorito at Jessica.Vigorito@flagstaffaz.gov if you need any assistance joining the meeting.

ATTENTION
IN-PERSON AUDIENCES AT COMMISSION MEETINGS HAVE BEEN SUSPENDED UNTIL FURTHER NOTICE

[Click here to participate in the online meeting](#)

NOTICE AND AGENDA

COMMISSION ON DIVERSITY AWARENESS
Wednesday
September 21, 2022

VIRTUAL TEAMS MEETING
1:30 P.M.

1. **Call to Order**

2. **Roll Call**

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

Jean Toner, Vice Chair
Robert "Dan" Duke
Claire Hardi
Mandy Martinez Gebler

Marcela Pino
Christine Tucci
DeAnn Wegwert, Chair

3. **Mission Statement and Land Acknowledgment**

MISSION STATEMENT

A commission to foster support, respect, awareness and appreciation of diversity among all citizens of Flagstaff.

LAND ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The Commission on Diversity Awareness humbly acknowledges the ancestral homelands of this area's Indigenous nations and original stewards. These lands, still inhabited by Native descendants, border mountains sacred to Indigenous peoples. We honor them, their legacies, their traditions, and their continued contributions. We celebrate their past, present, and future generations who will forever know this place as home.

4. **Upcoming Opportunities and Announcements**

- Hispanic Heritage Month Proclamation was read and accepted at the September 13th City Council meeting.
- THANK YOU Chair Wegwert for your service and commitment to the Commission on Diversity Awareness

5. **Public Comment**

The Commission cannot act upon items presented during the Public Participation portion of the Agenda. Individual Commission members may ask questions of the public but are prohibited by the Open Meeting Law from discussion or considering the item among themselves until the item is officially placed on the Agenda. Each public comment or presentation will be limited to five (5) minutes.

6. **Consideration and Approval of Minutes:** Commission on Diversity Awareness Meeting of August 17, 2022.
Approve the minutes of the Commission on Diversity Awareness Meeting of August 17, 2022.

7. **Date of Next Meeting:** October 19th at 1:30pm

8. **Action Items**
None

- A. **Stride Forward, MetroPlan's update**
Listen to the presentation from MetroPlan and provide feedback.

9. **Reports/Discussion Items**

- A. **Recommendations**

- i. **Anti-Camping workgroup update**

- B. **Current Commission Priorities**

- i. **Library in Action workgroup update**
Listen to the workgroups' update and discuss the next steps.

- ii. **Diversity and Flagstaff Police Department**
Discuss questions for Flagstaff Police Department to answer in their October presentation.

10. **Agenda for Future Meeting(s)**

- A. **Proclamations**
Black History Month February

- B. **Renaming of the Peaks Workgroup Update**
Pending follow up from the High School group on when to send the Commission's recommendation to Council.

- C. **Equitable Restroom Recommendation**
The item is currently in the Staff Future Agenda Items queue which means it is waiting for some research and staff work before it moves forward again.

- D. **Municipal Equity Index**

Discuss next steps for this item or wait until the next report comes out.

11. **Adjournment**

CERTIFICATE OF POSTING OF NOTICE

The undersigned hereby certifies that a copy of the foregoing notice was duly posted at Flagstaff City Hall on _____,
at _____ a.m./p.m. This notice has been posted on the City's website and can be downloaded at www.flagstaff.az.gov.

Dated this _____ day of _____, 2022.

Jessica Vigorito, Human Resources Analyst



Commission on Diversity Awareness

6.

From: Jessica Vigorito, Human Resources Analyst

DATE: 09/21/2022

SUBJECT: **Consideration and Approval of Minutes:** Commission on Diversity Awareness Meeting of August 17, 2022.

STAFF RECOMMENDED ACTION:

Approve the minutes of the Commission on Diversity Awareness Meeting of August 17, 2022.

Executive Summary:

Minutes of the Commission meetings of the Commission on Diversity Awareness are a requirement of Arizona Revised Statutes and, additionally, provide a method of informing the public of discussions and actions being taken by the Commission.

Attachments

August 17, 2022 draft minutes

DRAFT MINUTES

COMMISSION ON DIVERSITY AWARENESS
Wednesday
August 17, 2022

VIRTUAL TEAMS MEETING
1:30 P.M.

1. Call to Order

Chair Wegwert called the meeting to order at 1:31 PM.

2. Roll Call

PRESENT	ABSENT
Jean Toner, Vice Chair	Mandy Martinez Gebler
Robert "Dan" Duke	Marcela Pino
Claire Hardi	
Christine Tucci	
DeAnn Wegwert, Chair	

3. Mission Statement and Land Acknowledgment

MISSION STATEMENT

A commission to foster support, respect, awareness and appreciation of diversity among all citizens of Flagstaff.

LAND ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The Commission on Diversity Awareness humbly acknowledges the ancestral homelands of this area's Indigenous nations and original stewards. These lands, still inhabited by Native descendants, border mountains sacred to Indigenous peoples. We honor them, their legacies, their traditions, and their continued contributions. We celebrate their past, present, and future generations who will forever know this place as home.

The Mission Statement was read by Chair Wegwert and the Land Acknowledgment was read by Vice Chair Toner.

4. Upcoming Opportunities and Announcements

- Vice Chair Toner and Chair Wegwert attended the Indigenous Commission meeting on August 3rd. Vice Chair Toner added that they communicated the Indigenous Peoples Day Proclamation would be handled by the Indigenous Commission moving forward.
- Indigenous Representation Project at Sawmill Multicultural Art and Nature County Park next meeting is on August 29th at 6:30pm at Willow Bend. Commissioner Duke and Vice Chair Toner will be attending.
- Staff Liaison informed the group that an e-mail from Stride Forward will be sent to the Commission with two surveys that close August 22nd. If any members are able to complete the surveys, it would be greatly appreciated.
- CODA Social Event update – Chair Wegwert expressed gratitude for this event and for meeting members in person

5. Public Comment

No Public Comment

6. Consideration and Approval of Minutes:

- Chair Wegwert noted that agenda item 7.A. second bullet had a spelling error, update Char to Chair.
- Commissioner Gebler joined at 1:44pm.
- Vice Chair Toner motioned for the July 19, 2022 regular meeting minutes to be approved with the noted amendment.
- Commissioner Duke seconded the motion.
- Motion approved unanimously.

7. Date of Next Meeting - September 21, 2022 at 1:30pm

No conflicts stated

8. Action Items

A. Hispanic Heritage Month Proclamation

- The Commission reviewed the draft Hispanic Heritage Month Proclamation.
- Chair Wegwert motioned for the Hispanic Heritage Month Proclamation to be approved as written.
- Commissioner Gebler seconded the motion.
- Motion approved unanimously.
- The group discussed who will be attending the October 4th Council meeting on behalf of CODA. The Staff Liaison stated that there is a pending request for the September 13th Council meeting and will follow up to confirm. Vice Chair Toner nominated Commissioner Gebler to accept the Proclamation on behalf of the Commission. Chair Wegwert and Vice Chair Toner would like to be present but will confirm.
- The Commissioners discussed future Proclamations and stated that the Native American Heritage Month will be done by the Indigenous Commission so the next Proclamation for the workgroup to work on is the Black History Proclamation in February

9. Reports/Discussion Items

A. **Library Equity in Action** - Felicia Fiedler

- Library Equity in Action - Felicia Fiedler provided a summary presentation on the Library in Action efforts including Mission, Vision and Purpose.
- City Staff Felicia Fiedler asked for input on ways to collaborate and ways to expand this information and partner with the Commission.
- Vice Chair Toner asked what is helpful for the Library and asked about a workgroup to help with the distribution of the information.
- Chair Wegwert is not able to be part of the workgroup. Commissioner Tucci is interested in the workgroup but unsure about availability. Vice Chair Toner is able to assist with the workgroup.
- Once the workgroup has met, they will report back to the Commission on the recommendations for review and approval.
- Chair Wegwert requested this item to be placed on the September agenda and requested the Staff liaison add the presentation to the minutes.

B. **Current Commission Priorities**

i. **Criminal Justice conversation with Flagstaff Police Department**

- Deputy City Clerk Fobar recommended having the staff liaison request to the City Manager's Office to set up a meeting with Acting Chief Scott Mansfield on "How the Police Department currently works with diverse populations". There would be an opportunity for Q&A after the presentation and then a discussion after the presentation could be set up.
- Deputy City Clerk Stacy Fobar suggested the Citizens Police Academy and the Citizen's liaison committee as options for the Commission members to participate in.

10. Agenda for Future Meeting(s)

A. Equitable Restroom Recommendation

The item is currently in the Staff Future Agenda Items queue which means it is waiting for some research and staff work before it moves forward again.

B. Municipal Equity Index

The item is currently in the Staff Future Agenda Items queue which means it is waiting for some research and staff work before it moves forward again.

C. Renaming of the Peaks Workgroup Update

Pending follow up from the High School group on when to send the Commission's recommendation to Council.

D. **Future Priorities:**

- Conversation with Downtown Business Alliance including literature to distribute
- Civil Rights

11. Adjournment

Chair Wegwert adjourned the meeting at 2:36pm.

[GO TO PREVIOUS PAGE](#)

[GO TO THE TOP OF THE PAGE](#)



AgendaQuick ©2005 - 2022 Destiny Software Inc. All Rights Reserved.



Commission on Diversity Awareness

10. B.

From: Jessica Vigorito, Human Resources Analyst
DATE: 09/21/2022
SUBJECT: Renaming of the Peaks Workgroup Update

STAFF RECOMMENDED ACTION:

Pending follow up from the High School group on when to send the Commission's recommendation to Council.

Executive Summary:

Informal Working Groups

Informal working groups may be created to research, gather information, and provide recommendations back to the commission on various matters. No official appointments are made to a working group by the commission. Working groups may consist of members of the public and/or less than a quorum of commission members. Unlike subcommittees, working groups are not required to have formal agendas or minutes.

All information and recommendations from the work group must be provided and presented to the commission in an open meeting for public discussion. Informal working groups do not have any powers, duties, or responsibilities of the parent commission. No actions, statements, or recommendations can be made or provided by the working group on behalf of the commission

Attachments

Dr. Silver Report
Presentation from students
Land Acknowledgment Recommendation
Flagstaff Water Resources information email

CITY OF FLAGSTAFF “DENIES” HOPI RELIGIOUS BELIEFS in SNOWBOWL LEGAL FILINGS

City compares harm to Hopi religion by use of City’s reclaimed wastewater on sacred area as similar to recreational boat owners being “deprived of no more than their occasional Sunday piscatorial [fishing] pleasure.”

Excerpted quotations from the City of Flagstaff’s legal filings in *The Hopi Tribe v. Flagstaff* (with **Emphasis Added**) follow.

From the **City of Flagstaff’s October 10, 2014, VERIFIED ANSWER AND THIRD-PARTY COMPLAINT** in *The Hopi Tribe, Plaintiff, vs. The City of Flagstaff, Defendant.*; NO. CV2011-00701; in the Superior Court of the State of Arizona in and for the County of Coconino:

“...Without any evidence to support its [the Hopi’s lawsuit Complaint’s] inflammatory claims, Plaintiff [the Hopi Tribe] asks this Court to grant it relief that has broad-reaching, and, frankly, disastrous, implications upon Arizona’s comprehensive statutory scheme of water use. There is no public nuisance here [by the City’s reclaimed wastewater contaminating of Hopi sacred sites on the San Francisco Peaks].”...

115. Defendant [the City of Flagstaff] lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief regarding the truth of the allegations in paragraph 115 of the complaint [that “The Peaks have played a central and essential role in Hopi culture, traditions, and way of life for centuries. The Peaks, known as Nuvatukya’ovi to the Hopi, are the single most important sacred place the Hopi have. Every month Tribe members go to the Peaks for prayers, and during some months tribe members collect water, greens, and herbs for the ceremonies.”], and therefore [the City of Flagstaff] denies the same [that “The Peaks have played a central and essential role in Hopi culture, traditions, and way of life for centuries. The Peaks, known as Nuvatukya’ovi to the Hopi, are the single most important sacred place the Hopi have...”].

116. Defendant [the City of Flagstaff] lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief regarding the truth of the allegations in paragraph 116 of the complaint [that “The Hopi have been making regular pilgrimages and trips to the Peaks since before recorded history as a central part of their culture and the Hopi way of life. The various Hopi ceremonies conducted during the year, particularly Powamuya in the winter and Niman in the summer, require visits and offerings to specific shrines on the Peaks.”], and therefore [the City of Flagstaff] denies the same” [that “The Hopi have been making regular pilgrimages and

trips to the Peaks since before recorded history as a central part of their culture and the Hopi way of life...”]...

122. Defendant [the City of Flagstaff] lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief regarding the truth of the allegations in paragraph 122 of the complaint [that “There are Hopi sacred areas, including shrines, in the immediate vicinity of the Snowbowl Resort Area.”], and therefore [the City of Flagstaff] denies the same [that “There are Hopi sacred areas, including shrines, in the immediate vicinity of the Snowbowl Resort Area.”]...

125. Defendant [the City of Flagstaff] lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief regarding the truth of the allegations in paragraph 125 of the complaint [“The Hopi collect water from springs on the Peaks and use the water for a variety of ceremonial activities. Several of the springs on the Peaks are associated with specific ceremonies and religious societies.”], and therefore [the City of Flagstaff] denies the same [that “The Hopi collect water from springs on the Peaks and use the water for a variety of ceremonial activities. Several of the springs on the Peaks are associated with specific ceremonies and religious societies”]...

135. Defendant [the City of Flagstaff] lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief regarding the truth of the allegations in paragraph 135 of the complaint [“Artificial snow made with reclaimed wastewater will introduce numerous chemicals that are not degraded or removed in the wastewater treatment process to the San Francisco Peaks, in particular to the areas in the Snowbowl Resort Area and its vicinity that have been a part of Hopi use for ceremonial pilgrimages and hunting and gathering trips for centuries.”], and therefore denies the same [that “Artificial snow made with reclaimed wastewater will introduce numerous chemicals that are not degraded or removed in the wastewater treatment process to the San Francisco Peaks, in particular to the areas in the Snowbowl Resort Area and its vicinity that have been a part of Hopi use for ceremonial pilgrimages and hunting and gathering trips for centuries”], except [the City of Flagstaff] avers [asserts as fact]...upon information and belief, that the ceremonial significance of the San Francisco Peaks to the Hopi Tribe (among others [Navajo, Havasupai, Hualapai, Yavapai Apache, and White Mountain Apache]) was fully litigated in the eleven-day Religious Freedom Restoration Act Trial conducted in *Navajo Nation v. US Forest Serv.*, 408 F. Supp. 2d 866 (D. Ariz. 2006), *aff’d*, 535 F.3d 1058 (9th Cir. 2008).”¹

¹ *Navajo Nation v. US Forest Serv.* directly resulted from the City of Flagstaff’s decision to defer and refer to the Forest Service the decision to respect Tribal cultural and religious concerns regarding use of reclaimed wastewater on the Peaks. The City made this decision to defer and refer in spite of the fact that the Forest Service decision would inevitably be preordained to reject Tribal concerns. In *Navajo Nation v. US Forest Serv.*, the Navajo, Hopi, Havasupai, Hualapai, Yavapai Apache, and White Mountain Apache challenged in federal court the Forest Service decision to reject Tribal concerns regarding the use of reclaimed wastewater on the Peaks.

Excerpts from *Navajo Nation v. US Forest Serv.* that the City of Flagstaff “avers” or asserts as factual include:

...5. The Ninth Circuit has clearly articulated the proper legal standard to be applied in this case: an action “burdens the free exercise of religion if it puts substantial pressure on an adherent to

modify his behavior and violate his beliefs, including *904 when . . . it results in the choice of an individual of either abandoning his religious principle or facing criminal prosecution." *Guam*, 290 F.3d at 1222. . . .

7. The government's land management decision will not be a "substantial burden" absent a showing that it coerces someone into violating his or her religious beliefs or penalizes his or her religious activity. *Lyng*, 485 U.S. at 449-53, 108 S. Ct. 1319...see *Wilson*, 708 F.2d at 741 ("Many government actions may offend religious believers, and may cast doubt upon the veracity of religious beliefs, but unless such actions penalize faith, they do not burden religion."); see also *Havasupai Tribe*, 752 F.Supp. at 1484-1486 (finding Forest Service approval of plan for operations of uranium mine does not substantially burden exercise of religion because, although Havasupai Tribe's religious and cultural belief systems are "intimately bound up" in the site, "Plaintiffs are not penalized for their beliefs, nor are they prevented from practicing their religion."); *Means*, 858 F.2d at 406-07 (finding no substantial burden where "[t]he Forest Service has performed no act of compulsion to interfere with appellees' ceremonies or practices nor has it denied them access to [the Forest lands] for religious purposes").

8. Indeed, "Courts consistently have refused to disturb governmental land management decisions that have been challenged by Native Americans on free exercise grounds." *Means*, 858 F.2d at 407 (providing citations to numerous cases). . . .

10. The evaluation of when the government's land management decisions cross the line from legitimate conduct to unconstitutional prohibitions on the free exercise of religion "cannot depend on measuring the effects of a governmental action on a religious objector's spiritual development." *Lyng*, 485 U.S. at 451, 108 S. Ct. 1319. . . .

13. Here, Plaintiffs have failed to demonstrate that the Snowbowl decision coerces them into violating their religious beliefs or penalizes their religious activity. *Cf. Lyng*, 485 U.S. at 449, 108 S. Ct. 1319. In fact, the Forest Service has guaranteed that religious practitioners would still have access to the Snowbowl and the approximately 74,000 acres of the CNF that comprise the Peaks for religious purposes. . . .

15. Plaintiffs' assertions of perceived religious impact are near identical to those voiced by the Hopi Tribe and the Navajo Nation in *Wilson v. Block*. In that case, the plaintiffs [Navajo Nation] similarly asserted that "development of the Peaks would be a profane act, and an affront to the deities, and that, in consequence, the Peaks would lose their healing power and otherwise cease to benefit the tribes." 708 F.2d at 740. They [Navajo Nation] contended "that development would seriously impair their ability to pray and conduct ceremonies upon the Peaks." *Id.* Considering this information, the D.C. Circuit found the agency's decision did not substantially burden the tribes' exercise of religion. *Id.* at 745. The same decision is warranted here. The subjective views and beliefs presented at trial, although sincerely held, are not sufficient for the proposed project to constitute a substantial burden under RFRA [Religious Freedom Restoration Act] on the practice of religion by any Plaintiff or any members of any Plaintiff tribe or nation. . . .

18. The Snowbowl decision does not bar Plaintiffs' access, use, or ritual practice on any part of the Peaks. The decision does not coerce individuals into acting contrary to their religious beliefs nor does it penalize anyone for practicing his or her religion. . . .

28. ...*Lyng*, 485 U.S. at 453, 108 S. Ct. 1319 ("Whatever *907 rights the Indians may have to the use of the area . . . , those rights do not divest the Government of its right to use what is, after all, its land.")...

... *908 III. Conclusion

The Forest Service properly observed all of the procedural requirements during the various stages of approving the Snowbowl project, including preparation of an extensive EIS [Environmental Impact Statement]..."

This case, *Navajo Nation v. US Forest Serv.*, now cited by the City of Flagstaff, directly resulted from the City of Flagstaff's March 19, 2002, refusal to evaluate, on its own, Tribal concerns regarding the effects of the City's clearance to use its reclaimed wastewater on the Peaks. Instead of respecting Tribal concerns, the City of Flagstaff chose to defer and refer to the Forest Service the evaluation and the ultimate decision. This decision essentially guaranteed that Tribal concerns would be rejected based on (1) the Forest Service's history of consistently denying protection of sacred sites, and (2) the Forest Service's history of success in defending its consistent denials of sacred site protection in court.

Snowbowl's "future depends on artificial snow making."² On February 21, 2002, the Snowbowl formally asked the City of Flagstaff for a commitment to sell the City's reclaimed wastewater for use on the Peaks.³ By March 19, 2002, the City of Flagstaff swiftly agreed to sell its reclaimed wastewater to the Snowbowl contingent on the Forest Service's ultimate "decision" regarding its use.⁴

Predictably, the Forest Service would go through the motions to produce an outcome-preordained environmental study rejecting Tribal concerns. Ultimately and predictably, the Forest Service would then defend its "decision" in *Navajo Nation v. US Forest Serv.* **The outcome in *Navajo Nation v. US Forest Serv.* was completely predictable owing to the April 19, 1988, U.S. Supreme Court ruling, *Lyng v. Northwest Indian Cemetery Prot. Assn.*, 485 U.S. 439 (1988) ["*Lyng*"]. In *Lyng*, the U.S. Supreme Court ruled, that the Forest Service may destroy the sacred nature of its land as long as the government does not "coerce" one to violate their religious belief.**

Specifically, in *Lyng*, the U.S. Supreme Court rules,

"...Incidental effects of government programs, which may interfere with the practice of certain religions, but which have no tendency to coerce individuals into acting contrary to their religious beliefs, do not require government to bring forward a compelling justification for its otherwise lawful actions...Even assuming that the Government's actions here will virtually destroy the Indians' ability to practice their religion, the Constitution simply does not provide a principle that could justify upholding respondents' [Native American's] legal claims."

Since 1988, *Lyng* and its following legal rulings unfortunately have become the defining legal authority in obstructing protection of sacred sites on public lands. **Simply stated, *Lyng* summarily declares that (1) the Forest Service's right to use its land as it wishes overrides the claim of Native American religious practitioners, because the government is not**

² "Court rejects ski resort's snow plan for wastewater," Bruce Geiselman, Waste News, March 19, 2007 ("The operators of the Arizona Snowbowl said...the resort's future depends on artificial snow making."); See also: Draft Environmental Impact Statement for Arizona Snowbowl Facilities Improvements, Coconino National Forest, Coconino County, Arizona, February 2004.; and Final Environmental Impact Statement for Arizona Snowbowl Facilities, Volume 1, Coconino National Forest, Coconino County, Arizona, February 2005.

³ "Snowbowl files reclaimed water plan," Jeff Tucker, Arizona Daily Sun, February 19, 2002.

⁴ City of Flagstaff City Council Minutes, March 19, 2002.

literally outlawing Native American religion, and (2) the First Amendment protects belief, but not the ability to practice religion for Native Americans.

***Lyng* and its following legal rulings have been the controlling legal authorities governing non-protection of Native American sacred sites since 1988. In 2002, the City of Flagstaff would have certainly known of *Lyng* and of the pain and suffering *Lyng* has been causing in Indian Country.**

Nonetheless, on March 19, 2002, the Flagstaff City Council unanimously passed a motion to “enter into an agreement to sell reclaimed wastewater” to Arizona Snowbowl saying “that the purpose of the NEPA [National Environmental Policy Act Forest Service] process is to take all cultural, social, religious, and environmental issues into account as part of the body of information used to make a decision at the next level...”⁵

The City of Flagstaff’s ignoring the 1988, U.S. Supreme Court *Lyng* decision is obviously a lie by omission. Forest Service’ NEPA evaluations and decisions, subsequent to the 1988, *Lyng* decision, do not protect Native American sacred sites and religious practices on federal lands. The cultural and religious concerns of the Navajo, Hopi, Hualapai, Havasupai, Yavapai Apache and White Mountain Apache would not influence, would not affect, nor would these concerns change the predetermined Forest Service NEPA approval of the use of reclaimed wastewater on the Peaks resulting from the City’s deferral and referral to the Forest Service.

From the City of Flagstaff’s June 21, 2017, City of Flagstaff’s Answering [Appellate] Brief in 2017 WL 3198131, Court of Appeals of Arizona, Division 1.; The Hopi Tribe, v. The City of Flagstaff, Defendant/Appellee., and Arizona Snowbowl Resort Limited Partnership, Third-Party Defendant/Appellee.:

“While the Hopi may enjoy the Peaks in different manner than hikers, photographers, bird watchers, hunters, or other uses, the use and enjoyment of the Peaks which they claim is no different than that of any other group or the public at large.”...

“The City of Flagstaff submits that this Court should affirm the trial court and, in doing so, should award it fees and costs for this appeal.”

From the Appellate Court’s February 8, 2018, OPINION in the City of Flagstaff’s Appeal from the Superior Court in Coconino County in the Arizona Court of Appeals, Division One; The Hopi Tribe, Plaintiff/Appellant, v. ARIZONA SNOWBOWL RESORT LIMITED PARTNERSHIP, et al. [City of Flagstaff], Defendants/Appellees.; No. 1 CA-CV 16-0521, FILED 2-8-2018; Appeal from the Superior Court in Coconino County, No. S0300CV201100701:

⁵ These quotations come from the March 19, 2002, City Council minutes. City officials at the time included, Mayor Joseph Donaldson; Council Members Vice Mayor Karen Cooper, Allen Edgar, Bill Jeffery, Libby Silva, Penny Tovillion, and Al White, City Manager Dave Wilcox, and City Attorney Joe Bertoldo.

“Because we find the Tribe sufficiently alleged the use of reclaimed wastewater causes its members a special injury, different in kind than that suffered by the general public, by interfering with places of special cultural and religious significance to the Tribe, we reverse the trial court’s dismissal...

This emphasis on the emotional, cultural, and religious significance of the cemetery in *Beatty* supports the Tribe’s argument here that interference with a place of special importance can cause special injury to those personally affected, even when that place of special importance is upon public land.

¶13 Adopting this position, we find that within its complaint, the Tribe sufficiently alleges special injury. ... the Tribe alleges:

131. The purity of the ceremonial objects collected by members of the Hopi Tribe during pilgrimages is of particular importance. These objects cannot be used for ceremonial purposes if they become tainted or impure. ...

138. ... Natural resources that the Hopi collect, as well as shrines, sacred areas, and springs on the Peaks will come into contact with the blown reclaimed wastewater ... This negatively impacts the Hopi’s use of the Snowbowl Resort Area, the Wilderness Area, and surrounding areas, and causes Hopi practitioners to stop using the areas they have traditionally used. ...

201. The Hopi Tribe suffers specific injury ... because the prevailing winds will blow the artificial snow outside the boundaries of the application area thus negatively impacting Hopi’s use of these areas, including for ceremonial practices. ...

202. The Hopi Tribe will suffer specific injury ... because the artificial snow will blow towards, and melting snow will runoff into, springs and water bodies the Hopi Tribe uses for ceremonial and utilitarian purposes. ...

¶14 We are not persuaded by the City’s reliance upon *Oppen v. Aetna Insurance Co.*, 485 F.2d 252 (9th Cir. 1973). There, the Ninth Circuit held that boat owners seeking to recover damages following an oil spill were not specially injured when “deprived of no more than their occasional Sunday piscatorial pleasure.” *Id.* at 253, 260 (internal quotations omitted). Unlike *Oppen*, where the boat owners’ loss of navigation rights was no different in kind from that suffered by the public generally, *see id.* at 260, here, the Tribe distinguishes its cultural and religious interest in the Peaks from the recreational interests of the public at large. ...

CONCLUSION

¶19 The trial court’s order dismissing the Tribe’s complaint is reversed...”

The City of Flagstaff appealed the appellate court ruling to the Arizona Supreme Court. From the City of Flagstaff’s March 12, 2018, PETITION FOR REVIEW IN THE SUPREME COURT STATE OF ARIZONA; The Hopi Tribe, Plaintiff/Appellant, v. The City

of Flagstaff, Arizona, Defendant/Appellee, and Arizona Snowbowl Resort Limited Partnership, Third-Party Defendant/Appellee.; Arizona Supreme Court No. CV-18-0057-PR:

“The City of Flagstaff, Arizona hereby petitions that this Court review the decision rendered by the Court of Appeals, Division One, dated February 8, 2018 in the above-captioned matter. ...

The “injury” alleged by the Complaint is the environmental damage of using reclaimed water for snowmaking. That injury is common to all of the public who frequent or utilize the area for many different purposes. ...”

From the **City of Flagstaff’s May 29, 2018, SUPPLEMENTAL MEMORANDUM in the State of Arizona Supreme Court; The Hopi Tribe, Plaintiff/Appellant, v. The City of Flagstaff, Arizona, Defendant/Appellee.; and Arizona Snowbowl Resort Limited Partnership, Third-Party Defendant/Appellee; No. CV-18-0057-PR.:**

“The Hopi Tribe lacks standing to bring a public nuisance claim because it has no “special injury” different than the environmental injury suffered by the public who use the Peaks.”...

“...The Hopi cite to no case which supports their position that environmental damage to religious objects is a “special injury...The injury that is alleged as public nuisance is environmental damage common to all who use the San Francisco Peaks” ...”

The City of Flagstaff’s appeal to the Arizona Supreme Court to reverse the appellate court’s ruling in favor of the Hopi was successful. The Arizona Supreme Court ruled in favor of the City of Flagstaff against the Hopi. From HOPI TRIBE, *Plaintiff/Appellant*, v. ARIZONA SNOWBOWL RESORT LIMITED PARTNERSHIP, ET AL [City of Flagstaff],. *Defendants/Appellees.*; No. CV-18-0057-PR, Filed November 29, 2018, in the Supreme Court of the State of Arizona; Appeal from the Superior Court in Coconino County, **AFFIRMED;** Opinion of the Court of Appeals, Division One, 244 Ariz. 259 (App. 2018), **VACATED AND REMANDED:**

“...opinion of the Court:

¶1 Private parties may bring public nuisance claims in Arizona if the alleged nuisance caused the plaintiff special injury, meaning “damage [that is] different in kind or quality from that suffered by the public in common.” *Armory Park Neighborhood Ass’n v. Episcopal Cmty. Servs. in Ariz.*, 148 Ariz. 1, 5 (1985). Today we hold, as a matter of law, that environmental damage to public land with religious, cultural, or emotional significance to the plaintiff is not special injury for public nuisance purposes.” ...

¶14 Primarily relying on *In re Exxon Valdez*, 104 F.3d 1196 (9th Cir. 1997), Snowbowl contends that the alleged injury here is to the Tribe's "desire to enjoy 'pristine natural surroundings,'" *see id.* at 1198, which "is a right shared by the public generally." Snowbowl argues that injury is not transformed into "special harm" "[j]ust because [the Tribe's] members . . . wish to access the Peaks for religious reasons" when "others' motivations are environmental or recreational." The Tribe counters that "the reclaimed wastewater has directly and significantly impeded [its] use and enjoyment of a place of special importance to the Tribe by thwarting [its] religious practices" on the Peaks. According to the Tribe, such "significant interference with its use of sacred places that have formed a central component of its cultural and religious life since before recorded history" constitutes "injury [that] is clearly different in kind [from] that suffered by the public." The Tribe maintains that recognizing its injury as "special" "fits squarely within long-established Arizona and other applicable precedent," including *Armory Park* and *Beatty*, and supports its public nuisance claim...

¶15 We [the Arizona Supreme Court justices] agree with Snowbowl. Contrary to the Tribe's assertion that the place-of-special-importance form of special injury is consistent with Arizona law, the only public nuisance cases in which we have recognized special injury involved property or pecuniary [monetary] interests not present here." ...

¶19 *Lyng* illustrates this well. There, various parties, including "an Indian organization, individual Indians, nature organizations and individual members of those organizations, and the State of California," brought a religious-freedom-based challenge to a proposed road upgrade and timber harvesting in California's Chimney Rock area. 485 U.S. at 443. The plaintiffs claimed that those projects violated their rights under the First Amendment's Free Exercise Clause and various federal statutes. *Id.*

¶20 The United States Supreme Court rejected the challenge, *id.* at 453 [*Lyng*], despite recognizing that "the logging and road-building projects at issue in th[e] case could have devastating effects on traditional Indian religious practices" that are "intimately and inextricably bound up with the unique features of the Chimney Rock area," *id.* at 451.

¶21 As the Court in *Lyng* observed, "[w]hatever rights the Indians may have to the use of the area, . . . those rights do not divest the Government of its right to use what is, after all, *its* land." ... Although this case does not involve First Amendment or federal statutory claims, it similarly illustrates how the place-of-special-importance category the Tribe urges (and the court of appeals embraced) would essentially empower a lone plaintiff to interfere with decisions by public officials (made here after extensive input from interested parties, including the Tribe) concerning the best use of public lands...

¶22 The reclaimed water contract at issue here went through a nearly decade long review process in which the Tribe participated and actively voiced its opposition. That process included a series of public hearings at which the City considered alternatives to reclaimed water. And after approving the contract

with Snowbowl, the City considered, held public comment on, and ultimately denied a motion to reconsider its decision. ...”

For the reasons stated above, we affirm the trial court’s judgment in favor of Snowbowl and the City on the Tribe’s public nuisance claim, vacate the court of appeals’ opinion, and remand the case to the court of appeals to determine whether the trial court’s fee award is supportable and appropriate...”

Quotations from media coverage of the Arizona Supreme Court ruling are instructive. From the November 29, 2018, Arizona Republic, in “Hopi lose arguments on Snowbowl snowmaking in state Supreme Court ruling,”:

“‘A sad comment on our law’

In their dissent, Chief Justice Bales and Justice Bolick argued that the majority’s ruling “largely ignores the distinctive harms alleged by the Hopi” and undermined the very purpose of the public nuisance law.

“The majority fails to appreciate that the wastewater will affect the Hopi’s use and enjoyment of ancestral lands that have played a central role in Hopi culture and religion since before the Coconino National Forest was of concern to the broader public,” the dissenters wrote...

“We may live in a material world,” they wrote, “but it is a sad comment on our law to suggest that other interests — such as religious traditions and practices manifest through millennia and recognized by federal law — cannot support a claim of special injury for purposes of the public nuisance doctrine.”⁶

From the November 30, 2018, Arizona Daily Sun and the Associated Press, in “High court rules against Hopi Tribe in snowmaking challenge,”:

“The city of Flagstaff declined comment on the ruling. ...

In a dissenting opinion, Chief Justice Scott Bales said the court has long recognized that special injury can extend beyond property and monetary rights. He said it’s ironic that if the Hopi sold pine boughs or pinon nuts gathered from the mountain, the majority would allow a special injury claim.

“The general public does not have millennia of religious practice in the area that will be covered in a fine film of reclaim sewage,” Bales wrote. “Nor does the general

⁶ “Hopi lose arguments on Snowbowl snowmaking in state Supreme Court ruling, Arizona Republic, November 29, 2018, <https://www.azcentral.com/story/news/local/arizona/2018/11/29/hopi-lose-arguments-snowbowlsnowmaking-state-supreme-court-ruling/1997219002/> .

public have rights of access and use, rooted in Hopi tradition and cultural practices, recognized by federal statutes."

"I'm disappointed and I'm frustrated," said Leigh Kuwanwisiwma, who retired as the Hopi's longtime cultural preservation director last year and was heavily involved in the case. "But I think indigenous people like Hopi people are always going to be at a legal disadvantage when they put something like that in a white man's court."⁷

For more information:


Robin Silver, M.D.
Co-Founder and Board Member
Center for Biological Diversity
Email: rsilver@biologicaldiversity.org
Phone: 602-799-3275

⁷ "High court rules against Hopi Tribe in snowmaking challenge," Felicia Fonseca, Associated Press, Arizona Daily Sun, November 30, 2018, https://azdailysun.com/news/local/high-court-rules-against-hopi-tribe-in-snowmakingchallenge/article_1cad9758-a74e-539a-872a-5fb3b939aaaa.html#tracking-source=home-top-story-1.




Renaming Agassiz Peak

By: Indigenous Youth Leaders



History of Jean Louis Rodolphe Agassiz

- Jean Louis Rodolphe Agassiz was a Swiss- born American biologist/ geologist.
- Agassiz was also an opponent of miscegenation. At a lecture at the Charleston Literary Club in South Carolina in 1847, **Agassiz announced that blacks constituted a separate species**. In a letter to American abolitionist Samuel Gridley Howe in 1863, **Agassiz stated that sexual relations between blacks and whites were “immoral” and “destructive to the social equality.”**
- Agassiz peak, is named after a biologist who used his studies to legitimize racist beliefs of white superiority. So, keeping the name the same deeply affects the indigenous as the meanings behind each of their names are important to us. This also creates a culture of racism colonization that should be deemed unacceptable.




Why is this is an important issue to indigenous people?

- The peaks is considered sacred to 13 indigenous nations which sadly, some have been pushed out of Arizona. **13 Tribal Nations which include; Pueblo, Mohave, Havasupai, Yavapai, Hualapai, Navajo, Hopi, Apache, Zuni, Salt, Gila, Paiute, and Ute**
- The peaks still remain sacred and holy to many Indigenous nations therefore, the **current names of the peaks is viewed as inappropriate and misrepresenting.**

Cultural significance to local Native tribes

The peaks are associated with 13 indigenous nations. The Peaks is associated with spiritual deities, ancestors, emergence, ceremonies, climate conduit, and is still integral to indigenous daily practices.



Native names for Agassiz Peak

- Dook'o'oosłíid (Navajo) (Abalone Shell Mountain) (The Mountain that reflects)
- Pavoyoykyasi (rain tablet) Nuva'tukya'ovi —(Hopi)
- Dził Tso—Dilzhe'e—(Apache) (Big Mountain)
- Tsii Bina—Aa'ku—(Acoma)
- Nuvaxatuh—Nuwuvi—(Southern Paiute)
- Hvehasahpatch or Huassapatch—Havasu 'Baaja—(Havasupai)
- Wik'hanbaja—Hwal'bay—(Hualapai)
- Wi:mun Kwa—(Yavapai)
- Sunha K'hbchu Yalanne—A:shiwi (Zuni)
- 'Amat 'Tikwe Nyava—Hamakhav—(Mojave)
- Sierra sin Agua—(Spanish) (The mountain without water)

Quotes from Native Elders

- “Dook’oosliid has been a part of our sacred circle of life since the beginning of life for the Diné people. We as Diné utilize sacred plants, water, & minerals from this sacred mountain. Our medicine men go to the mountains to gather ceremony bundles & give offerings to the Diyin Dine’e & give their offerings/ thanks for protectings us. The mountain have the power to cure our ailments. That’s why the mountain are sacred to us. We must not abuse the mountains”- **Navajo Elder**
- “[The peaks are one of the] sacred places where the earth brushes up against the unseen world,” said **Yavapai-Apache Chairman Vincent Randall**.
- “To us Hopis, the Peaks is a sacred home and resting place for our spiritual beings, kachina spirits. The kachina spirits serve as guides to the Hopi people.” - **Hopi Elder**

Louis Agassiz loomed large in the world of natural sciences in the 1800's. He

Press Release continued..

☰

Daily Sun

Flagstaff High School students advocate for renaming the Peaks


SHARE THIS [f](#) [t](#) [e](#) [b](#) [37 comments](#)

ALERT TOP STORY

Flagstaff High School students advocate for renaming the Peaks

Kaitlin Olson Apr 14, 2020 Updated Sep 24, 2020 37

\$1* for 6 mos | EDITOR'S SPECIAL 3.0



Members of Flagstaff High School's Native American Club stand with Flagstaff City Councilmember Jamie Whelan, right, in this March photo. The students are seeking support from local jurisdictions in renaming the San Francisco Peaks to better represent their indigenous history.

Kaitlin Olson

[f](#) [t](#) [e](#) [b](#) [b](#)

Early last month, rather than being distracted by their upcoming spring break, a group of Flagstaff High School students decided to add a higher issue to their list of spring semester to-dos: advocating for the renaming of the San Francisco Peaks.

In a press conference March 11, representatives from Flag High's Native American Club explained these mountains have long been sacred to 13 tribal nations, so names like Agassiz Peak, in particular, are out-of-line.

Although Louis Agassiz was recognized for his

Ads by Google

Send feedback Why this ad? >

Close Ad

Personal Statements from Students

We will be hearing from the following students:

Mashayla Tso, Makaius Marks, Danell Lipscomb, etc.

Closing Statement

Agassiz's science was used to try to legitimize racist beliefs of white racial superiority. Therefore, naming a peak after him is not appropriate and antagonizes the beliefs and acknowledgments of the indigenous nations and other communities of color. **This creates a culture of Racism and colonization that we deem as unacceptable.**

- **Keeping the name, Agassiz Peak, deeply affects Indigenous people as the cultural names of the peaks describe the spiritual healing and power that the mountain withholds.. This also creates a culture of racism and colonization that should be deemed unacceptable.**



Works Cited

Fenlason, G., Fenlason, P. by G., & Fenlason, P. by G. (2016, March 25). *Flagstaff's sacred mountain: the economic, political and spiritual power of the San Francisco*

Peaks. The Lumberjack.

https://www.jackcentral.org/culture/flagstaff-s-sacred-mountain-the-economic-political-and-spiritual-power/article_e8c827f8-f06f-11e5-a4c0-83d92de048e1.html.

Heinsius, R. (2020, November 18). *Earth Notes: Flagstaff To Rename Street Linked To Racist History*. KNAU Arizona

Public Radio. <https://www.knau.org/post/earth-notes-flagstaff-rename-street-linked-racist-history>.

Olson, K. (2020, September 24). *Flagstaff High School students advocate for renaming the Peaks*. Arizona Daily Sun.

https://azdailysun.com/news/local/flagstaff-high-school-students-advocate-for-renaming-the-peaks/article_6772e469-d09b-5794-bbea-9971d5780e1a.html.

United States Department of Agriculture- Forest Service. (n.d.). *History of the San Francisco Peaks and how they*

got their names. Coconino National Forest - About the Area.

<https://www.fs.usda.gov/detail/coconino/about-forest/about-area/?cid=stelprdb5340115>

Land Acknowledgement Recommendation for Flagstaff City Council

By the Commission on Diversity Awareness

September 21, 2021

Out of respect for the ancestral lands occupied by multiple Indigenous tribes and with respect for current residents of the Flagstaff community who are tribal members and/or descendants of Indigenous peoples, the Commission on Diversity Awareness strongly supports the proposal presented to City Council to incorporate a land acknowledgement on the City website. We also recommend that the land acknowledgement be read at the opening of City Council meetings.

Jessica Vigorito

From: Jessica Vigorito
Sent: Monday, October 4, 2021 2:58 PM
To: DD; Jean Toner; J and D Wegwert; Marcela Pino; Mandy Gebler; CTucci127@gmail.com; hardi.claire@gmail.com
Subject: Flagstaff Water Resources information
Attachments: IPD2021_Final.pdf

Hello All,

I am passing along some Flagstaff Water Resources and Reclamation information that I have been able to find since the last conversation on this topic. Attached you will find a flyer for Indigenous Peoples Day which includes a section on Water that I thought might be helpful to the Workgroup discussion. I also copied links below to case studies and information available on the City website. Erin Young, Water Resources Manager, did offer to attend a Commission meeting to present or answer questions.

<https://www.flagstaff.az.gov/2328/Reclaimed-Water-Is-It-Safe>
<https://www.flagstaff.az.gov/21/Reclaimed-Water>
<https://www.flagstaff.az.gov/4522/Case-Studies>

To ensure compliance with the Open Meeting Law, recipients of this message should not forward it to other board members and board members should not reply all to this message.

Jessica Vigorito, MPA
City of Flagstaff
Human Resources Analyst

Office Phone: (928)213-2099
Website: www.flagstaff.az.gov/humanresources



Please consider our environment before printing this e-mail





Commission on Diversity Awareness

10. C.

From: Jessica Vigorito, Human Resources Analyst

DATE: 09/21/2022

SUBJECT: **Equitable Restroom Recommendation**

STAFF RECOMMENDED ACTION:

The item is currently in the Staff Future Agenda Items queue which means it is waiting for some research and staff work before it moves forward again.

Executive Summary:

Commission recommendations are important to the City Council and they are taken under consideration for possible action. The City Council has several options and may:

- Accept the recommendation and give further direction.
- Change the provisions of a recommendation before giving further direction.
- Send a matter back for further consideration.
- Not accept the recommendation.

Previous Council Decision on This:

FAIR item for September 7th Council meeting

Chair Wegwert presented the CODA recommendation to City Council on January 11, 2022.

Attachments

Equitable Restroom Recommendation

Recommendation to the Flagstaff City Council for a city ordinance regarding equitable restroom availability

The Commission on Diversity Awareness for the City of Flagstaff recommends the creation and passage of a city ordinance requiring that all single occupancy public restrooms be available for use for everyone regardless of gender. It is our recommendation that the ordinance include the following elements:

1. Restrooms affected by this ordinance would be those intended for use by one person at a time, or for family or assisted use, and located in buildings owned by the City of Flagstaff.
2. Signage on such restrooms would include words such as “gender neutral,” “all gender,” or simply the word “restroom” without reference to the gender of the occupant.
3. Responsibility for ensuring that signage is updated to meet these requirements would be determined by the City Council.
4. The ordinance would affect all existing and future single occupancy restrooms.
5. The ordinance would include an effective date determined by the City Council.

Furthermore, the Commission on Diversity Awareness requests that the Flagstaff City Council recommend the practice of using nongendered signage for single-occupancy restrooms used by the public but not owned by the city (such as restrooms in educational facilities, healthcare facilities, and businesses that are open to the public).

Reasons for consideration of this ordinance include:

1. Promoting the safety of gender non-conforming persons
2. Creating a welcoming environment for gender non-conforming persons
3. Increasing restroom availability for all



Commission on Diversity Awareness

10. D.

From: Jessica Vigorito, Human Resources Analyst

DATE: 09/21/2022

SUBJECT: **Municipal Equity Index**

STAFF RECOMMENDED ACTION:

Discuss next steps for this item or wait until the next report comes out.

Executive Summary:

The Human Rights Campaign uses the Municipal Equality Index (MEI) to examine how inclusive municipal laws, policies, and services are of LGBTQ people who live and work in Flagstaff. Cities are rated based on non-discrimination laws, the municipality as an employer, municipal services, law enforcement, and the city leadership's public position on equality. Flagstaff is one of 506 cities that have been rated on 49 different criteria. [View city's scorecards](#)

Previous Council Decision on This:

January 11, 2022 Council meeting - Chris Rhode presented the Municipal Equity Index to City Council.

Attachments

November 2021 MEI presentation to CODA

Municipal Equality Index

Recommendations to improve services
to services to LGBTQ+ community





Summary



What is the Municipal Equality Index?

- Evaluation of inclusivity of municipal laws, policies & services
 - Sexual Orientation
 - Gender Identity
- Published by the Human Rights Campaign
- 506 municipalities
 - 11 in Arizona



Summary



Contents of Scorecard

- 100 points is max score
 - Additional 22 “Flex Points”
- 5 Categories
 - Non-discrimination Laws
 - Municipality as Employer
 - Municipal Services
 - Law Enforcement
 - Leadership on LGBTQ Equality



Flagstaff 2020 Scorecard

Overall Score

- 88/100
- Same score since 2018

CATEGORY	SCORE	FLEX PTS
Non-discrimination Laws	20/30	+0
Municipality as Employer	22/28	+1
Municipal Services	10/12	+4
Law Enforcement	22/22	N/A
Leadership on LGBTQ Equality	7/8	+2
TOTALS	81/100	+7

Where we lose points

- Housing NDO
- Transgender-inclusive healthcare benefits
- Enforcement of NDO
- Leadership's pro-equality policy efforts
- All-gender facilities
- Conversion Therapy
- Youth bullying prevention policy
- Services to unhoused LGBTQ people
- Services to LGBTQ older adults
- Services to the transgender community
- Testing limits of restrictive state law(s)





Flagstaff 2020 Scorecard

Housing Non-Discrimination Laws

- Points Received: 0/10
- City NDO covers “Public Accommodations” but not “Housing”
- Only Phoenix, Tucson, Tempe received full points in AZ
- Possible preemption from adding housing to NDO ([A.R.S. § 9-500.09](#))
 - Allows municipalities over 350k to adopt fair housing ordinance
- City stance: LGBTQ is included as federally protected class (sex)

Recommendation:

Research legality of including housing in NDO and if legal pass amendment to city’s NDO to include Housing



Flagstaff 2020 Scorecard

City provides Transgender-Inclusive Healthcare Benefits

- Points Received: 0/6
- Benefits set in coordination with healthcare provider
- Working with BCBS to include coverage options inclusive to transgender employees

Recommendation:

Continue working with provider to include transgender-inclusive coverage to City employees



Flagstaff 2020 Scorecard

Non-Discrimination Ordinance is enforced by CODA

- Points Received: 0/2
- NDO is enforced by City Manager's Office
- Existence of CODA satisfies separate area of scorecard
 - Commissions are primarily advisory and educational

Recommendation 1:

Revise mission of the CODA to include enforcing the NDO

Recommendation 2:

Actively seek points from HRC for current procedures



Flagstaff 2020 Scorecard

Leadership's Pro-Equality Legislative or Policy Efforts

- Points Received: 2/3
- Based on policy efforts and public stances of elected officials
- Subjective criteria

Recommendation:

None



Flagstaff 2020 Scorecard

Single-Occupancy All-Gender Facilities

- Points Received: 0/2
- CODA work to make city-owned facilities gender-neutral
- 2 Points for ordinance requiring all gender facilities citywide
- Gender-neutral restrooms added to 2019 update of IBC

Recommendation 1:

Adopt updated version of IBC

Recommendation 2:

Ordinance requiring gender-neutral facilities in all buildings in city



Flagstaff 2020 Scorecard

City Protects Youth from Conversion Therapy

- Points Received: 0/2
- Conversion therapy not banned at State level
 - No pre-emption on localities passing ban
 - Pima County is only jurisdiction to ban Conversion Therapy

Recommendation:

Ordinance banning conversion therapy for individuals under the age of 18.



Flagstaff 2020 Scorecard

Youth Bullying Prevention Policy for City Services

- Points Received: 0/2
- 1 point each for sexual orientation and gender identity
- Anti-bullying provisions currently done by each program
 - Language likely to vary

Recommendation 1:

Collect and evaluate anti-bullying rules of individual programs

Recommendation 2:

Ordinance prohibiting bullying in its youth programs on the basis of sexual orientation and gender identity



Flagstaff 2020 Scorecard

City Provides Services to LGBTQ People Experiencing Homelessness

- Points Received: 0/2
- Services provided through Northland Family Help Center
 - 24-hour crisis line, Domestic Violence and Sexual Assault shelter
 - Respectful of self-identified gender and sexual orientation
 - Assigns transgender youth to rooms within self-identified gender.
 - Provides transportation for LGBTQ youth to attend the one-on-one

Recommendation:

Document services provided by Northland Family Help Center



Flagstaff 2020 Scorecard

City Provides Services to LGBTQ Older Adults

- Points Received: 0/2
- Must be programs that target LGBTQ community directly
- No city programs identified that specifically target adult LGBTQ community

Recommendation 1:

Evaluate non-city programs to ensure community needs being met

Recommendation 2:

Begin offering city programs for the adult LGBTQA community



Flagstaff 2020 Scorecard

City Provides Services to the Transgender Community

- Points Received: 0/2
- Programs must target transgender community directly
- No city programs identified that specifically target transgender community

Recommendation 1:

Evaluate non-city programs to ensure community needs being met

Recommendation 2:

Begin offering city programs for the transgender community



Flagstaff 2020 Scorecard

City Tests Limits of Restrictive State Law

- Points Received: 0/3
- Designed as incentive for municipalities to push back on state laws that hinder LGBTQ inclusivity

Recommendation:

N/A