

MINUTES

1. Call to Order

Mayor Evans called the Work Session of May 8, 2018, to order at 6:01 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 and Mission Statement

The Council and audience recited the Pledge of Allegiance and Vice Mayor Whelan read the Mission Statement of the City of Flagstaff.

MISSION STATEMENT

The mission of the City of Flagstaff is to protect and enhance the quality of life for all.

3. Roll Call

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

PRESENT:

ABSENT:

MAYOR EVANS
VICE MAYOR WHELAN
COUNCILMEMBER BAROTZ
COUNCILMEMBER MCCARTHY
COUNCILMEMBER ODEGAARD
COUNCILMEMBER OVERTON
COUNCILMEMBER PUTZOVA

Others present: Interim City Manager Barbara Goodrich and 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.

None

5. Review of Draft Agenda for the May 15, 2018, City Council Meeting.

**Public comment on draft agenda items may be taken 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.*

None

6. Information about the possible funding and installation of a Peace Pole.

Community Design and Redevelopment Manager Mark DiLucido provided a PowerPoint presentation that covered the following:

PEACE POLE
PHOTO
NIGHT TIME PHOTO
6 POLE SIDES

Ms. Rebecca Durrenberger with Flagstaff Peace Day continued the presentation and referred to several handouts provided to the Council.

Councilmember Odegaard thanked Ms. Durrenberger and asked if the frog would replace the globe that was shown in the agenda packet. Mr. DiLucido replied that it would. Mr. Odegaard thanked staff and stated he liked the wording "may peace prevail on earth." Mr. DiLucido mentioned that Legal staff had asked him to poll Council about the frog. The frog was proprietary artwork and the City needs a license agreement to use it. Staff did not anticipate any issues as the owner was excited and willing to cooperate.

Council was supportive of the frog.

Vice Mayor Whelan thanked staff for their hard work and was happy that a local artist was selected. She expressed concern about the placement of the pole, as it was something that should be showcased. Mr. DiLucido indicated that staff looked at other sites in Heritage Square but ran into issues with other areas. One of the reasons for putting it close to the edge of Aspen Avenue was visibility.

Councilmember Barotz commented that she loved the project and thought it was exquisite and

beautiful. Councilmember Putzova added that she had seen many peace poles around the world and was excited to have one in Flagstaff. Councilmember McCarthy expressed that he also liked the project.

Andy Fernandez addressed the Council with complaints about the expense of the artwork around Flagstaff and felt it needed to fit the community.

Mayor Evans was excited to see this project come to fruition and was looking forward to having it installed.

Ms. Durrenberger thanked Mr. DiLucido for his work. She also thanked and recognized the Flagstaff Peace Pole Committee.

7. Review of Apartment Rental Applicant Fees/Prior to Notice to Applicants of Available Units and/or Number of Applications

Senior Assistant City Attorney Christina Rubalcava stated that she was there to take any direction if Council wanted to move this item forward.

Mayor Evans stated that one of the things she would like to consider was some mechanism to require apartments to provide notice about the number of available units and the number of other applicants. Fees might be \$25-\$85 and were not refundable. Having this information up front could help possible applicants determine whether to submit an application or not.

Council was interested in moving this forward.

Ms. Rubalcava stated that staff would do some research and bring something back to Council for review. She clarified that the request was for notification to the prospective tenant of the number of units available and the number of applications submitted. Mayor Evans agreed.

8. Discussion of license agreements, leases, and easements allowing other parties to cross or use City-owned property.

Assistant to the City Manager for Real Estate Charity Lee provided a PowerPoint presentation that covered the following:

LICENSE AGREEMENT DISCUSSION
LICENSE
LEASE

Vice Mayor Whelan asked if all leases were approved by Council after a public competitive process. Ms. Lee responded that sometimes there were leases that were of minimal value that were approved by the City Manager, such as anything under \$50,000.

EASEMENT
LEASE, LICENSE, EASEMENT COMPARISON
TYPES OF LICENSE AGREEMENTS
HOW ARE LICENSE FEES ESTABLISHED?
QUESTIONS?

Mr. Solomon stated that this issue was brought to the Council as a FAIR. Staff was seeking direction from at least four members of Council if they wanted to make any changes.

Council was not interested in any changes.

9. Discussion/Direction: Staff Proposed Amendments to Chapter 3-01 Business License Regulations

Senior Assistant City Attorney Anja Wendel and Revenue Director Sandy Corder provided a PowerPoint presentation that covered the following:

INTRODUCTION

DISCUSSION ON STAFF PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO THE CITY'S BUSINESS LICENSE REGULATIONS

WHY ARE WE HERE?

KEY BENEFITS TO BUSINESSES, CITY, AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

CHANGES IN CODE; POLICY QUESTIONS THAT WE WANT TO ADDRESS REGARDING PROPOSED AMENDMENTS

CHANGES IN USER FEES; POLICY QUESTIONS THAT WE WANT TO ADDRESS REGARDING PROPOSED AMENDMENTS

THE ISSUE OR PROBLEMS TO BE RESOLVED

PROPOSED UPDATES

WHO NEEDS A LICENSE?

WHO IS EXEMPT?

WHAT IS ANNUAL LICENSE FEE?

WHEN IS LICENSED RENEWED?

WHEN MAY LICENSE BE REVOKED?

HOW IS LICENSE ENFORCED

WHO NEEDS A PERMIT? VS WHO NEEDS A LICENSE?

Vice Mayor Whelan asked what was considered a peddler. Ms. Corder responded that the ordinance defined peddlers as transient merchants. Vice Mayor Whelan asked if a food truck would be considered a peddler. Ms. Wendel believed the current ordinance classified them as peddlers. There was a new state law specifically about mobile food trucks, and the State would now be licensing those trucks. The law also indicated that cities could license them if they did a background check along with fingerprinting, but they needed to have further internal discussions on that issue. Mr. Solomon added that was a question staff was researching now.

Council took a break from 6:56 p.m. through 7:00 p.m.

Councilmember Odegaard asked whether each vendor participating in a show needed a license or if it would be covered under the event umbrella. Ms. Wendel pointed out a typo on the slide indicating a transient merchant included a fair vendor. She stated the City was not requiring a fair vendor to get a business license. For participating vendors at an event, if the organizer had obtained a special event permit, then those vendors would not need to obtain a business license in Flagstaff, but they would need to get a local transaction privilege tax (TPT) license as that was required by the State.

WHO IS EXEMPT? (PERMITS)

Mayor Evans mentioned that if you had a festival, and the organizer of the event had a special event permit, then the individuals selling at the event would be exempt. She asked if that included private property as well as City property. Ms. Wendel indicated that a special event permit via Parks and Recreation would be required for public property, and a use permit via

Community Development for private property. The requested information was the same, but the permitting process just went through different divisions. Mayor Evans then asked if the type did not matter, and if it was just a special event permit that was covered. Ms. Wendel responded that was correct. The organizer would get the list of vendors and staff would make sure they all had TPT licenses. Ms. Corder added that Community Development and Parks and Recreation were already providing the Revenue Section with that list of vendors, otherwise, for event dates scheduled further out, they required the lead vendor to follow-up with the Revenue Section to ensure they received that list.

WHAT ARE APPLICATION REQUIREMENT[S]?

MAY VENDORS AT A SPECIAL EVENT PAY A FEE IN LIEU OF LOCAL TPT?

WHAT ARE RESTRICTIONS ON SOLICITATION?

LICENSE FEE

PENALTY FOR LATE RENEWAL

LOCAL TPT/USE TAX LICENSE

NEXT STEPS

QUESTIONS

Vice Mayor Whelan commented that when the City previously collected their own taxes, it had a department that did that, and charged a \$46 one-time fee. She questioned how going to a \$38 annual fee with less people and less time made sense. Ms. Corder responded that the City is now paying \$150,000 to the Arizona Department of Revenue (ADOR) for administration. There are still some staff on hand who do training and outreach with ADOR. Even though staff had decreased, the work had not gone away.

Councilmember Odegaard indicated that the \$50,000 less annual charge, along with the \$150,000 charge, only left \$100,000 that needed to be made up. He asked if the \$38 per year was calculated on the \$150,000. Ms. Corder replied that they had taken current staffing costs and current ADOR costs and divided it by the 6,644 estimated licenses. Councilmember Odegaard commented that they had never done a cost recovery of that proportion before. Management Services Director Rick Tadder responded that he did not believe the sales tax license was a full-cost recovery. Council could make the decision to not cost recover, staff was just providing a recommendation to have an annual fee to help cover the cost of service and the annual ADOR fee.

Vice Mayor Whelan commented that if the City was not matching up expenses or services, then they were not providing the previous level of service, such as providing data that businesses wanted to know. That data was no longer accessible. Mr. Tadder indicated that was correct. Because it was not in the City's licensing system, staff did not have the details. Ms. Corder added that once the new software was implemented, they could provide the same data as before.

Ms. Wendel stated that when ADOR took over tax administration, they did not have the software and were not ready. The City now had an IGA with the City of Phoenix and were trying to use their software to further collect more information. Staff had also suggested to the business community that they reach out to ADOR directly.

Councilmember Overton commented that it was odd to him that the State charged no fee for a TPT license, yet the City was going to charge businesses. He would prefer not to charge anything, but understood the City had to pay ADOR to run and administer that program. Mr. Tadder responded that they were doing cost recovery versus the fee that was in place. Council could provide staff with direction on which way they would like them go with the fee.

Councilmember Overton inquired if it was correct that the State was not charging a fee. Ms. Corder responded that she thought they charged \$12 per year.

Mayor Evans asked if ADOR took a percentage of the collection before sending it to the City. Ms. Corder responded that they did not.

Amanda Shankland with the Chamber of Commerce addressed the Council and stated they were not really for or against this. It was very early in the process and staff had done a great job canvassing businesses. They wanted a collective win. There were issues that could be solved quickly, and they wanted to be part of the solution.

Councilmember Overton thought the biggest concern was the annual fee. He would prefer not to assess a fee to a business.

Councilmember Odegaard was not in favor of the \$38 fee that was suggested. He would prefer no annual fee.

Ms. Wendel mentioned the State had a \$12 annual fee, and the benefit to having an annual renewal was to make sure people were still in business. The other option would be a smaller upfront or renewal fee that helped provide information about what businesses were active in the community.

Councilmember Odegaard suggested making the one-time fee go away and replacing it with a small annual fee to keep tabs on businesses in the community.

Councilmember Overton thought that was a good point. If a business filed a final return, he asked if there was a way to generate a report from ADOR. Ms. Corder responded there was not at this time. In the past, the City was able to track it with the annual revenue, but are no longer able to do that.

Councilmember Odegaard asked what the current 100% cost recovery would be. Mr. Tadder thought about \$240,000, although they were collecting about \$24,000. Councilmember Barotz asked where the subsidy was coming from if the cost recovery was not 100%. Mr. Tadder stated it was an expenditure from the general fund. Revenues were projected at what is being collected now. Any additional revenue would go back into the general fund for future appropriation.

Councilmember Putzova commented that the sales tax was paid by customers. It did not affect the business at all, but the City still had costs associated with having a business in town. If the customer paid the sales tax, then they also had to subsidize the business. There was a cost to the City for having all kinds of customers. There was a cost to managing business licenses. She was supportive of the proposal.

Ms. Goodrich thanked the Council for the conversation. Staff would bring this issue back on June 5, 2018 along with a few options for consideration.

Written comments against the proposed amendments were received from Heidi Kruger.

10. Discussion of Camping Ordinance

Interim Police Chief Dan Musselman mentioned that there were two representatives—Duane Tewa and Andy Peterson—from the U.S. Forest Service in attendance if Council had any questions for them.

Chief Musselman provided a PowerPoint presentation that covered the following:

DISCUSSION OF THE FLAGSTAFF CAMPING ORDINANCE
HOW WE GOT HERE
FLAGSTAFF CITY CODE 6-01-001-0022
WILDLAND FIRES BY YEAR 1991-2017
ARRESTS BY YEAR

Senior Assistant Attorney Marianne Sullivan continued the presentation:

SAFEGUARDS ALREADY WRITTEN INTO THE ORDINANCE

Chief Musselman continued the presentation:

CONCERNS WITH AMENDMENT OR REPEAL

Councilmember Odegaard commented that there were people sleeping in their vehicles and asked if there were safeguards in the ordinance concerning that. Ms. Sullivan responded that it was in the ordinance under section B5. Activities that constituted camping took various circumstances into consideration, such as whether the area was being used for living accommodation purposes or distinguished from short-term uses such as napping, picnicking, or intermittent recreational purposes during daylight hours. Someone sleeping in their car during daylight hours and not using their car for living purposes would not necessarily constitute a violation.

Councilmember Odegaard inquired if that applied to someone passing through town that pulled over to sleep in the car for eight hours. Ms. Sullivan responded that would depend; the eight hours would factor into whether it was for living accommodation purposes or intermittent use for napping. Councilmember Odegaard mentioned he had seen parked RVs on the street and asked if that could be an offense. Ms. Sullivan indicated that it could be if they were being used for living accommodation purposes, but she believed there were other ordinances that covered RV parking when it was not being used for those purposes. Interim Deputy City Manager Treadway reminded Council that a warning was built into the ordinance, so there would initially be a discussion and a warning, and not necessarily an immediate enforcement issue.

Councilmember McCarthy asked for clarification about someone sleeping in their car during the day and whether that it was a violation. Ms. Sullivan responded that it depended on circumstances and whether it met the definition of camping for the purposes of living accommodations. Councilmember McCarthy asked if that was defined in the City Code. Ms. Sullivan read the section from the ordinance.

Deputy Police Chief Frank Higgins continued the presentation:

OTHER CITY ORDINANCES
SIMILARITIES

DIFFERENCES
PORTLAND, OREGON
COLORADO SPRINGS, COLORADO
BOULDER, COLORADO
UNIQUE IDEAS
ROTATING PARKING LOTS – EUREKA, CALIFORNIA
30 HOMELESS IN 60 DAYS – EUREKA, CALIFORNIA
GREATER EUREKA COMMUNITY OUTREACH PROJECT'S (GECOP) SHIPPING
CONTAINER VILLAGE

Mayor Evans inquired about the blue angel container village. Chief Musselman responded that activist Betty Kwan Chinn had Connex boxes cut into apartments to house people.

Chief Musselman continued the presentation:

MAYOR HALE'S HOMELESS EXPERIMENT – PORTLAND, OREGON
JOINT INTERVENTION PROGRAM – FARMINGTON, NEW MEXICO
TEMPORARY HOMELESS SHELTER TENTS, SAN DIEGO, CALIFORNIA
SERIAL INEBRIATE PROGRAM – SAN DIEGO, CALIFORNIA

Deputy Chief Higgins continued the presentation:

LOCAL INITIATIVES
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT HOUSING SECTION – CITY OF FLAGSTAFF
SUNSHINE RESCUE MISSION
FLAGSTAFF SHELTER SERVICES
CATHOLIC CHARITIES COMMUNITY SERVICES
THE FRONT DOOR PROGRAM
ANEW LIVING (NOW A PART OF FRONT DOOR)
OTHER AVAILABLE SERVICES (NOT ALL-INCLUSIVE)

Councilmember Putzova stated that in the past she had heard that camping on Forest Service land was limited to approximately two weeks and then a person had to leave. She asked for clarification. Mr. Higgins responded that there was no residential camping. People were not allowed to permanently camp anywhere on U.S. Forest Service lands or State Trust property. There was a 14-day camping limit on all Forest Service lands nationwide. Councilmember Putzova then asked where they could go from there. Mr. Higgins responded that when officers encountered them, they provided a list of social service agencies in the area that could assist them, and depending on their needs at that time, they could point them in the right direction. Individuals were typically referred to Flagstaff Shelter Services; families were usually sent to Catholic Charities. The Front Door Program gave them one point of contact to hopefully get them the help they needed in a faster manner.

QUESTIONS AND DISCUSSION

Councilmember Odegaard thanked staff and said the presentation was thorough.

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

- Emily Melbourne
- Michael Caulkins
- Andy Fernandez
- Klee Benally

- Shane Russell
- Oney Store
- Antoinette Avery-Lopez
- Danley Bahe
- Evan Hawbaker
- Jody Clements
- Reynold Jim
- Jessica Martini
- Quenby Cody

The following comments were received:

- The ordinance criminalizes people who did not have an address.
- Reconsider the ordinance, social justice and safety needed to be addressed.
- Change the penalty from criminal to civil and make the ordinance more humane.
- Reconsider the limitations that Title 10-50.80 placed on RVs parked on private property.
- If someone owns property, they should be able to park a trailer there.
- There is no compassionate way to enforce the ordinance; it was anti-homeless and anti-humane.
- Repeal the ordinance in its entirety.
- Even working people live on the street because they cannot afford housing; this ordinance criminalizes sleeping.
- There needs to be respect for each other and for the homeless.
- The City and County has plenty of laws to enforce littering, trespassing, and dangerous campfires, and this ordinance criminalizes a basic human need.
- The campgrounds in town are expensive and the national forest does not allow stays longer than 14 days.
- Having a criminal record makes it difficult to find jobs and housing.
- Lack of sleep and anxiety due to police harassment had physical and mental ramifications and made it hard to find and maintain employment.
- Please take care of the homeless people.
- It is understandable to enforce campfires but enforcing against someone who lived in their car and had never started a fire made no sense.

The following people addressed Council in favor of keeping the current ordinance:

- Roabie Johnson
- Terry Madeksza
- Rick Moore on behalf of Charlie Silver

The following comments were received:

- If the ordinance is repealed, anyone could park an RV in front of any house in Flagstaff and live in it or use for Airbnb purposes.
- Concerned about open spaces and the danger of those areas being filled with trailers and tents.
- Consider the consequences of removing the non-camping ban in city limits.
- Keep the ordinance as it is.
- The Flagstaff Police Department's approach has been to educate.
- The ordinance is necessary because it is one of the only tools available for dealing with recurring behavior.
- Litter and risk of fire would affect how people recreated in the parks and public spaces. The camping ordinance in its current form is prudent; it helps enhance public safety and general welfare within the city.

- Fire safety is a great concern.
- The focus should be on safe homeless shelter situations, attainable housing, and permanent solutions.

Written comment cards in opposition to the camping ordinance were received from the following:

- Emily Davalos
- Frankie Beesley
- Ari Burford
- Mara Pfeffer
- Lynca A Maldonado
- Quenby Cody
- Heidi Kruger
- Laura Moir
- Nicholas Humphries
- Dawn Dyer
- Farrah Townson

Written comment cards in support of the camping ordinance were received from the following:

- Chamber of Commerce
- Brittany Montague
- John Vanlandingham
- Suzanne Tackitt

Councilmember Putzova stated she had not changed her position on this issue. She felt that this ordinance was unnecessary; there are other laws that prohibit arson and littering. The ordinance is supposed to protect the community against wildfire, but what it is really doing was policing sleeping, and sleeping should never be illegal. She hoped Council would considering repealing it, but at a minimum hoped that the criminal charges could be reduced to a civil charge.

Councilmember McCarthy mentioned that camping was a Class 3 misdemeanor. He asked if there was another class that was a petty offense. Ms. Sullivan responded that a petty offense was a civil offense. Councilmember McCarthy asked if there was a \$300 max fine for a petty offense. Mr. Solomon indicated that was correct.

Councilmember McCarthy stated that he understood that sleeping should not be a crime. He had empathy for people who have a hard time finding a place to sleep. He would support the City doing more for that population. However, he had other people talk to him about people sleeping in their cars or on the ground around their homes and using their side yard for a bathroom, so he is torn on this issue. He thought it might be a good idea to reduce the penalty to a civil petty offense.

Vice Mayor Whelan commented that over the past five years, 23 arrests were made under the ordinance, and 266 warnings were given. She thought the City could do better at their programs, along with figuring out what needs to be done, but did not think taking away the camping ordinance was part of that. She thanked staff for the work they had done and commented that the list of services for Flagstaff was amazing, but if it was not enough, then the Council needs to know where to focus.

Council took a break from 9:03 p.m. through 9:09 p.m.

Vice Mayor Whelan commented that in her short time on the Council, she had witnessed people coming together and trying to figure things out. She had seen the Police Department go to great lengths to address chronic recidivism. She asked what it would cost, what was need, and what options should be considered. She suggested maybe creating a forum for everyone to come together and discuss options. She supported the ordinance staying as is and supported the City being teachable and looking at as many options as possible.

Councilmember Putzova commented that she saw this as a huge disconnect. On one hand, Council was not willing to change the ordinance to make it easier for people who lived in cars. If someone only made \$10,000 a year, there were no housing options available, and if Council was not discussing the creation of some kind of program or situation where people could park their RVs and be safe, there was a disconnect. No one was coming to the table to invest in programs to address homelessness; those programs were minimal. No one is willing to put money behind sentiments to do better nor to decriminalize sleeping. It seemed to her that the Council did not want to do anything about this. She hoped Council was not done talking and would be open to discuss designating a parking lot where people could park their cars and RVs and live there and be assured they would not be harassed, fined, or chased out. City property is used for staging construction companies for months and months at no cost; there is something that can be done and many cities had designated places where people could live without being harassed.

Vice Mayor Whelan requested a future work session to discuss the services that are being provided in the community and how they might be improved.

Councilmember Overton stated he was comfortable with the efforts that have been provided through CDBG funding and the additional housing assistance this year. He would prefer to leave the ordinance as it stands.

A majority of Council was supportive of keeping the ordinance as is.

Ms. Goodrich stated that she thought at the top of the list was to talk to the community service providers to understand what services were being requested that they could not fulfill or what gaps in services might exist. She could work with Housing staff to coordinate with the City's partners and perhaps they could identify individuals that could assist in preparation for a work session.

Councilmember Putzova suggested a meeting to understand the issues that people without shelter encountered. People on the street are approached by police and the dynamic of policing poverty needs to be changed. The City needs a culturally sensitive approach to homelessness and to shelters, and maybe some kind of roundtable where indigenous people could come to the table including those at different levels of homelessness.

Mayor Evans stated the community discussion needed to have three parts. The first part was to hear from a broader representation of people who were homeless. The second part was to determine how to address this and talk to the broader community about how to deal with the situation. Then third was the current process and what to do going forward. This would take a community conversation on a broader level.

A majority of Council were in favor of moving forward with that type of discussion.

Moved by Councilmember Charlie Odegaard, **seconded by** Councilmember Eva Putzova to continue the meeting, in accordance with the Rules of Procedure.

Vote: 7 - 0 - Unanimously

11. Public Participation

Andy Fernandez addressed Council regarding complaints with City personnel.

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

Councilmember Putzova mentioned she was on the board of NAIPTA, but said she had a permanent conflict with the time the Board meetings were scheduled. The Board would soon determine whether the meeting time would be changed or if they needed a different representative.

Councilmember Barotz asked if Council could get a CCR regarding the status of the grading permit for the apartment complex in front of University Heights.

Councilmember Odegaard said he would be at the Family Food Center tomorrow morning if anyone wanted to join him.

Councilmember McCarthy mentioned that he went to the climate change awareness competition involving high school and grade school students. One of the teams put together a brochure and he passed them around. He thought Council might like to see what the kids were up to.

Mayor Evans stated she forwarded an email from Living Christ Church to the City Manager. They wanted to install a playground for residents on the east side of town and then turn the maintenance over to the City. She also mentioned that this Saturday was Stamp Out Hunger, which was in its 26th year. There was a major issue with food security in Flagstaff. She asked that people put non-perishable items out at their mailboxes and their mail carriers would pick up those items. Anything we could do to help would be appreciated.

13. Adjournment

The Flagstaff City Council Work Session of May 8, 2018, adjourned at 9:40 p.m.

MAYOR

ATTEST:

CITY CLERK