

1. What type of development applications and services are you familiar with and what has been your role? (Ex: rezone, site plan, subdivision plat, civil plans, building permit, impact analysis, inspections...)

- Rezoning, everything under the sun
- Experience is across the board with the City – A to Z
- Home builder, single family, multi-family, rezone application.
- Lot splits, subdivision and master planned projects
- Residential and commercial projects in city and county, small subdivisions.
- Has done a lot with the City – most everything except subdivision
- Rezone, site plan, civil plans, building permits, Transportation Impact Analysis (TIA)
- commercial contractor (all over the country)
- Architect (commercial and some residential). 20+ years here in Flagstaff.
- Contractor and design professional – commercial contractor, office, business condominiums, restaurant rehabilitation, residential condominium
- Multi-family apartments, condominiums, restaurant interior tenant improvement (TI), and some other TI
- Concept plan, site plan, building permits
- Do most of the applications listed, typically not subdivisions
- Rezones, site plans, building permits, civil plan review and inspections
- Has experience in working through all of the development applications with the City
- Have not worked on high density, but have done single family

2. **How would rate the overall experience working with the City of Flagstaff from 1-5? (1 lowest to 5 highest)**

- 2.5 - getting better, 14 years – seen a change from engaging to less closed off
- 2.5-3 for overall experience
- 3 – hard to get somebody, get the permit ready, then you need to go through the steps, to pay for etc...
- 3 - Hard to get someone
- Rating a 3 because of the sheer complication of getting through the process to secure a permit. Scheduling issues – critical people just not available.
- 4 – everyone is really good to work with, want to help get you through the process
- 4 – 4½
- Academic, talent, etc... city staff is rating at 5; but, feels thought that there is way too much emotion expressed by staff. City staff takes it too personally. Not sure where that kind of pressure is coming from to create an environment where staff has to approach things as a win-lose proposition. Why can't staff work to a win-win outcome?

3. Please explain why you chose the rating you did.

- Very appreciative of Becky (Cardiff) and ability to get permits out
- Saw great improvements since COVID. Electronic payments and the ability electronically submit plans and permits have really been amazing. Really appreciates these changes to improve services.
- Hardest thing is finding someone who is available
- Thank you for having Brian (Gall) involved with projects, did improve customer services
- Not where we were 7-8 years ago, would sit with Building Official and talk about plans during construction
- Spoke to an experience where the bottom line is that a planner had some problems with the plat language, and said that the plat had to be taken back to the beginning rather than just coordinating that clean-up language with the appropriate Stormwater folks and the developer.
- Becky Cardiff does a great job, responds to customers
- Depends on who you get, who you deal with and the complexity of the project
- Availability or responsiveness to inquiries, e-mails or calls, need better response, days or week to hear back. Under the gun with the project and client, need timely response
- Would prefer to engage with the county in terms of responsiveness and code issues, years ago it was the reverse
- COVID response has been awesome, electronic submittal is great
- Digital copy is great, but on a particular project had to submit the civil and building permit all separate, very messy for us, why not one package, then we send it on its way
- If department heads could grab what they need and be on our way, that would be great
- Worked all over the country and all over Arizona, PHX, Tucson, Flagstaff the most difficult city to work in, from start to finish, pre-app to CO, 25 years, if did not need the money, would not do any more projects in Flagstaff
- Separate submittal for retaining walls – permit to building department, sat for some item until told we need a separate permit
- Open door discussions, the Interdivision Staff (IDS) process is closed, no chance to discuss a why, need to assist collaboratively during the process, back and forth takes a lot of time, too much back and forth, drawn out process, enjoy the standards, want to build nice projects, not ugly boxes, but the exactions take away from the quality of the building,
- Participated in both Development Review Board (DRB) and IDS, we can work together collaboratively
- Some staff more collaborative than others, noticed changes with staff, do get different interpretations, make sure any staff in decision making seat is consistent, but interpretation and implementation needs to be consistent
- Look at other projects and wonder how it was approved
- Other requirements take away from the building
- Takes really long time and hard to get things through Traffic. Always feel as though Traffic is always trying to get everything possible from the developer.
- IDS is where projects go to die. IDS has gotten a lot better recently.
- Team is always available for questions

4. What can the City of Flagstaff do to improve our customer service?

- Rezone – Sedona, Cottonwood, done in under a year, disconnect between the elected officials, affordable housing emergency, overlay for workforce housing, new impact fees on work force housing, don't put it on the work force units, put on higher end homes
- Look at real estate transfer fees, have not changed in a long time
- Amend building codes to eliminate the Traditional Neighborhood Design (TND)
- Culture, technology & policy
 - Technology – having a digital submission & tracking system in place for payments, etc...
 - Culture & policy – street widening needed for project – 3 separate sections of code that applied, they were not connected, where does the responsibility between policy and enforcement lie? figuring out the solution, 4-6 months on the schedule. Comes down to a culture of the organization, staff needs to own the code, the specific standards need to be owned by staff. Council does not know the right number for the standard.
- Things should only go wrong once, need to fix it. Tiffany did take ownership and worked through the issues, found a solution. Need to get the next level, what formal process to translate in to changes so it does not happen again.
- Preferred DRB process where applicant can talk to staff
- Need the Single Point of Contact (SPOC) to help shepherd comments through, rather than applicant gets the comments from staff and work with each program to solve the problem
- Staff is green and need folks with more experience to understand how to work out problems
- Understand slope easement is holding up plats, need to work on slope easements
- Right-of way (ROW) width, subgrade goes outside of ROW, require easement for subgrade. Added a note on the plat – at time of Certificate of Occupancy (CO), can get rid of easement, but adds a lot of time. Need to figure out a better way to work through these things
- Preliminary Plat issue - City of Sedona – not requiring slope easement adjacent to road, going to allow homes there
- Zoning code difficult to work with
- Hard to get through concept plan – concept plan getting in to more and more detail, than in site plan we get a comment that really impacts the project
- Annexation project – 3 concept plans, rezone question about uses, bounced from engineering to planning, keep adding on new requirements, cul-de-sac, etc...
- Does appreciate the coordination between the City and the School District. Specifically spoke to Brian's (Gall) effort.
- Also mentioned the good teamwork and service between Jeff (Bauman) and Rick (Barrett) on coordinating transportation/traffic needs.
- Flagstaff is the most difficult city to work in, from ground up. If didn't need money, he wouldn't do work in Flagstaff. The process is very difficult.
- Similar project in Phoenix (started 9 months after beginning the one here in Flag) - the one in Phoenix will likely finish before the one here in Flagstaff.
- Heritage Preservation requirements (staff is really good to work with) are much more cumbersome than in other cities.

- Rick (Barrett) has been great over the years
- Becky has been a huge resource and a bright star for the City.
- Think of the customer experience, how do you get them to come back and do more.
- If staff was more part of the team, how to facilitate to move forward rather than adversarial
- Work as team, get this done, then move on to the next project
- Timeliness of response
- Streamline process
- Anything to improve the back and forth with staff
- Pre-application meeting (PAM) is very helpful – round table setting to have a discussion, like the PAM very much
- Could you consider rolling concept and site plan in to one permit?
- Having full blown grading and drainage plan at concept is too much, much of the information is redundant, develop a streamline set of drawings
- Going from concept to site plan is messy and cumbersome, could it be one bucket?
- Becoming cost prohibitive to do city project because of time it takes to get through the whole process
- Concept has become more costly and takes too long, caught up on minor details
- Very high level of engineering at concept plan
- Could the pre-app and concept plan be merged, then roll in to site plan?
- Time is money – completeness review is a waste of time, it should be a box check, but gets in to detail, substantive review, kicked back for a cover page, cost the project 6 weeks
- Amount of information required for a concept approval is too much, why full landscaping plan, building elevations, lighting. Need to ask the basic questions at concept plan to allow owner make decisions.
- For developer to get buy in on the idea, it requires a huge investment up front, frustrating point at concept plan, stumbling block should be a true concept, need to have a happy medium
- Concept zoning needed development approval first
- Demonstrate to staff or have them experience what it is like to be an applicant/client, need to learn what the effect is of these decisions, Staff training to better understand the challenges
- Process to have all parties gather around a table to understand the process, after concept plan here is how the process will work
- Would be appreciated for staff to make stronger recommendations - “Council this is a strong engineering or planning solution...” A project has an approved site plan – for Council to now be pushing a bunch of changes on the infrastructure at this point – it's very difficult. Due to these changes by the Council, they lost a builder who was all set to deliver the project. Staff should have spoken to all the work, legal, public participation, and otherwise, that went into the TIA and ultimate ped/bike safe use and solution in the approved project.
- Still struggles to know whom the team leader or Single Point of Contact (SPOC) is on projects. Still gets comment, “I don’t know – that’s a Fire thing or that’s an Engineering thing!” SPOCs don’t seem to be empowered to help! They need to be able to tell other internal stakeholders, “You’re being ridiculous in your asks!!” and make a call to help get a

project/development across the finish line. Who's the friend to the development process? Most of the time (90%+) it's not a code issue, it's more about what a staff person wants to have – requiring stuff that is not backed by an approved code or policy document.

- Related to above - Not uncommon in having 5 – 10 submittals in before we are finalized. That is time and an extreme amount of expense that all end up in the cost of housing or projects just not coming to fruition.
- Administrative Completeness should be, do you have the TIA? Did you include it? This is different from Substantive Completeness.
- The Regional Plan analysis that staff does is way too detailed. The Regional Plan represents a target – there's no way that a project should be expected to hit every point in the Regional Plan.
- The present environment rewards the regulation and not the good work is being done.
- Staff is terrified, due to the tough political environment, to make a choice and decision.
- Provide back-up plan reviewers/inspectors (no redundancy in the system).
- Too reliant on effort of individuals.
- Longs for the personal relationships he used to have. Wants more informal meetings to develop relationships. Working on a plat, COF wanted to change the language, felt like staff thought it was a waste of time to meet, arguing about access easement, wanted new easement in the same place. Don't want to be adversarial relationship with staff.
- Seen culture flip, from we don't want density to we want density, the zoning code does not match up with city council goals, fire code and engineering does not match the new culture, transect zoning has screwed up subdivisions, lot standards don't match the property that is left.
- City has a good building permit process, succinct comments. Maybe a 3rd party review could be offered to help accelerate if applicant is willing to pay.
- Really tries to address issues at the lowest level possible with staff. Tries not to bother City Engineer /Community Development Director unless absolutely necessary. Enjoys strong relationships with city staff.

5. **If you controlled the City of Flagstaff codes and procedures what 3 things would you change, eliminate or supplement?**

- Traditional Neighborhood Design (TND) standards
- Rezoning process – overlays for exceptions for workforce housing
- No Impact fees on work force housing
- Felt that City hydrology services should be consolidated with City Engineering to help with efficiencies and continuities in the process. Of all the places they've built in, they've never seen hydrology outside of the Engineering group.
- Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) is a real pain and is very expensive. That continuity in communication would be really beneficial for the person trying to work with the City. Feels that Stormwater (hydrology) is really an engineering function.
- Impact fees v. exactions
- Can do better on 1 acre lots financially, than what the codes allow, more density.
- Time it takes to get projects through the process, zoning code has not improved the process. We submit best project, completely changed by the zoning code. No building type for the zone requirements, can't hit minimum densities when you put in streets, slope resources, Low Impact Development (LID), Fire Department requirements, not enough left to get a home in.
- Engineering has the ability to fix the standards, but planning & resources cannot get adjusted.
- What is the #1 goal City of Flagstaff wants from projects? Can help with planning priority, resource protection and density are priorities, but nothing left to develop.
- If you are giving relief on resources, what is the priority on the City of Flagstaff side?
- If you want to control cost of housing in Flagstaff, need to build more units than less, Land Trust won't make an impact, thousands more units
- Down in the details, dimensions on standards, cul-de-sacs, setbacks, building orientation
- Resource protection should be a low priority, health and safety first, design next, unless you have an iconic tree, that has value for us, want to keep big trees, trees drive the entire zoning code, slope and stormwater, trees define everything we do in new development.
- Tree resources tougher to work with wider roadway requirements, can't count the trees bladed out for right-of-way (ROW), stop counting trees on slopes, some credit, have to make up for the ones in roadway and slopes, trees in slope protection cannot be counted as resource trees.
- Require more tree resources in residential than commercial, yet residential folks plant trees.
- Spoke to the struggle in meeting the Dark Sky codes because the owner feels the "safety" aspect should be more important than the interest to protect against light pollution.
- Dark Sky lighting – cannot risk safety over dark sky lighting
- Combine pre-application and concept plan
- Less minutia, every little bit of the code needs to be followed
- Building forward, if you could swap location, can save more trees

- Allow staff to balance standards, location for tree protection – for example
- Call up staff and have a discussion, empower staff to make those types of decisions
- Have a dialogue and arrive at a solution that is mutually beneficial
- Resource protection amount is challenging – not that we don't want to save trees, but sometimes, unachievable and can kill a project, option to plant new trees vs. protecting
- Challenging when stipulations are so rock solid, the owner has to bear the cost of the standards
- Had to negotiate the Flagstaff Urban Trail System (FUTS) trail over the back of the property, requires retaining wall, had to change roof design
- Share the costs may be a good solution
- City should bear the costs for FUTS
- Building forward – fake doors and forces designers in to doing things that are not real, or honest, Disneyland fake
- Understand trying to get a good design
- Simplify concept plan
- On recent project staff comments told the engineer what to do, approve with comments should be used more, had a third review because the font was different on the plan sets
- 4-6 weeks on every resubmittal
- Not consistent when approve with comments vs. resubmittal
- Need to be able to talk to the staff and ask them to approve with comments
- Confusing to understand which commission or Board will be required for approval, for example Heritage Preservation, need to understand how to get that information
- Architectural standards, the offsets, not sure they work, most buildings don't look like mountain town.
- Will get better architecture when you work closely, not drawn-out process.
- 10-15% more expensive to build in Flagstaff to begin with
- Horizontal/vertical setbacks, architects cringe when they see the requirement on setbacks, need to allow some liberties
- Too restrictive on everything
- Stifles creative architecture
- But do not want subjectivity from staff, concerned about cronyism and lack of consistency
- Architectural presentation of the community is much better than it was.
- One size fits all - same process regardless of size, type complexity of application
- Always a new code being added that may make sense if you look at it by itself but can impact the overall process
- Example: rough grade has to be within 0.1' before utility installation. This impacts how a project can be phased.
- What can we do to improve our rezoning process? Flagstaff is far better than Tucson. A lot can be done. There is some old stuff from the late 90's and early 2000's that aren't applicable any longer. You can get rid of some of that stuff and still have good looking project

6. Do you have an example of how other communities complete an application or process that you would like to see in Flagstaff?

- Parcel split process in Phoenix was far easier than here in Flagstaff. Flagstaff required a “speculative development” before being able to proceed. This was not a hurdle required in Phoenix. Had to really jump into speculative detail that was time and money.
- Other places use variances more frequently than Flagstaff, combination of administrative and going to a commission. Codes need to work together.
- Sometimes there are competing asks/requirements. The Single Point of Contact (SPOC) could be helpful in that this person could take these competing demands and wrestle with them internally so that when the final review write-up is offered externally to the applicant the conflicts have already been resolved.
- Competing rules, some of the avenues are against each other, fire competes against another requirement.
- City of Phoenix – could parcel some land off and sell it. In Flagstaff want to parcel off 2-3 acres, labeled it commercial pad, staff wants to know what are you going to do on the parcel? Applicant does not know, staff insisted on showing some use, so we showed restaurant, then wanted parking, then can’t park in front of building, then landscape calculations, insisted on showing a speculative restaurant. Had to do a cultural resource survey.
- Fast track process in Phoenix, demonstrate the firm has the ability to get through the process, for local firms that are more familiar with the process.
- Provide some advantage for local firms, Registrant is taking the liability for design and inspection
- Use to be that way for residential permit, still gets permit, but now the level of review is greater
- On-line portal will help
- Building Department – feels back of house, closed door.
- Yuma has efficient process (they get a 5). Gilbert, Prescott and Chandler get a 1. Flagstaff does a pretty good job (4)
- Worked in San Francisco & New Orleans regulations & loopholes to jump through, standard thing to complain about each other, compared to SF or NO, Flagstaff is walk in the park, but they get an F. Interested to hear how we compare to others. Looking for solutions, not just sharing problems.

7. What ideas do you have to improve the efficiency and cost of subject applications?

- As the city drives more density, the off-site costs put on the private side of development increase, acts as an incentive to do 1 acre lots.
- Staff is willing to meet, do get along with everybody, solve it internally, then let us know, Single Point of Contact (SPOC) does not have authority to make decisions with review partners.
- Delays cost applicants! Any time the City could make first round of communications more comprehensive of the demands from the City. This would prevent the back and forth and changes in direction that often lead to delays.
- Lay it out from the beginning, this is what we need. Find out you need this permit, then find out something else you need, lay out a timeline for the entire process.
- On our project, find out you need this, then told something different, understand what you need from day one.
- Delay may cost \$250,000 in costs due to rising material costs
- You cannot get a ground-up permit in Flagstaff in under 12 months. You don't get "what you can do" from Flagstaff – you only get "what you can't do."
- The length of the process involved from going from concept plan to design. It just takes way too long.
- Too often have had City planners actually design projects. It's not right.
- The building department is reviewing the developer's Request for Information (RFI), should not have to have them reviewed. That's liability that the City shouldn't assume. Those RFIs are stamped by the Architect and Engineer of record. Other cities don't do this.
- Division between Engineering and Building
- The Engineering side of this process is so difficult
- No consistency. (Staff right now is better, but the process is very difficult to deal with). Issue with the "router". Ground up projects are much more difficult. One person wants it one way, and another person wanted something different.
- On a recent project Traffic Control study required on a road that is privately owned, before permit can be issued to connect to sewer.
- Fees are piece-mealed (why can't all the fees and permits all be paid at once?) One payment would be great!
- If the City where to put greater focus on the Customer's experience and view the process through the lens of the customer so that the customer wants to come back again – great improvement would occur.
- City to try to find ways to get to 'yes'.
- You don't get help to make a project work, you only get why it won't work, need to tell you what you can do rather than what you can't do.
- On the concept and site plan process is so lengthy, need to do something to speed it up, 3000 square feet takes a year to get a permit.
- Planners need to guide them through the process, planners want to design the building, nothing throws me for more of a loop.

- Division between engineering and building very difficult, Engineering – nothing is ever consistent, fees come in pieces, why not get all the permits together and pay at once, instead of each individually, need to be able to show client the fees up front.
- Engineering – personnel are good Development Engineer Project Manager (DEPM), but the process is difficult, the router is started by the DEPM, getting the router around seems better by building, but more difficult in engineering, they need so many, it varies from staff to staff, had to write 10 letters to get the router started, on another job, one letter got it started.
- Deadlines are everything – it costs money, hard to get the Certificate of Occupancy (CO)
- During design had to dedicate 7-foot easement on Beaver Street to move sidewalk to create a parkway, designed so water meter is just inside property, then had to move so it will be in the parkway, but in the sidewalk to begin, had to hammer rock to get it where they are, then it moved again behind the sidewalk, after we removed the rock.
- During design asked for 7 feet for 5-foot parkway, asked why didn't the City of Flagstaff build it that way? No response from COF on the question. Felt like it was stalling, let's give it to them, but we should be compensated. Had to get easement recorded – cost \$\$, is it realistic to get the parkway ever built along all of Beaver?
- The code in terms of volume and thickness Flagstaff is winning
- Code says you have to have 18-inch stoop, had to raise the building because it says to in the book, after raising was told the building is too tall.
- Conflict between zoning code and building code on live/work amount of commercial space.
- A reasonable clause – one size does not fit all, need a staff variance to allow the project to proceed.
- Opportunities to combine applications
- Do have staff that are easier to work with than others
- Would be interesting to see it from staff side
- The list of things you have to provide is a lot- TIA, etc..
- Do like the SPOC, did create efficiencies
- SPOC has done a good job of bringing staff together
- Application costs are passed on to client, it is what it is based on built in city costs
- Single Point of Contact (SPOC) is the bearer of bad news from other Departments
- Projects need to have a “champion” to be successful
- Have a predictable schedule where the champion acts to achieve timeliness on behalf of applicant

8. **If you work on housing projects – what requirements would you change to lower the cost of dwelling units?**

- Affordable/Workforce Housing – Here’s the real problem in Flagstaff – there is no private land, which makes it the most expensive land market this participant ever seen across the country. More money, grants, isn’t the answer. Recent project has lost \$20K per lot due to the huge increases in material costs and land costs.
 - What’s going to solve the problem fastest is to rezone some of these light industrial areas to provide more housing. Microsoft, Tesla, and the like are not going to come – use these properties for this purpose. Should be an overlay zoning district applied so that a developer doesn’t have to spend \$\$\$\$ and a lot of time to get a rezone approved.... In part the City’s Zoning Code is part of this problem.
 - The land trust idea isn’t moving the needle fast enough or far enough. Futile effort. Folks aren’t going to buy in a land trust because they’re locked in and don’t have options. Folks want to build equity when they buy a home. A shared equity would be better than no equity. Feels that the 1X affordability model is the best option at this point for Flagstaff. Shared benefit of the equity between homeowner and the City’s trust. Most people are struggling to qualify for the affordable unit. Seen them move then to try to qualify for the market lots.
 - During the rezoning here’s what they tried to do with the City - to put the money that they would have lost in creating the affordable unit and just take that money to lower the permanent price of the market lots. Not sure they are going to be successful with their affordable housing contribution on this project.
- Need to rezone land, do an overlay if you do workforce housing, will approve like a normal plat, need to allow housing on industrial property
- Land trust – won’t buy an affordable land trust unit because the owner gets part of the appreciation, but does not get the full equity. Instead of losing money on the land trust units, let us put that money in to market units.
- Affordable rental \$300 bucks a month, not losing at the same rate as affordable for sale
- Not enough private land, the codes are the problem, regional plan amendment
- 1000 acres on east side, the code requirements for resource protection, Fire Department street widths, cannot accommodate the standards economically, forcing mid-rise, high-rise to get density, tree resources, pavement widths add too much cost. Council becoming more at odds with the zoning code. What is the higher priority, density or resources? Who takes the priority – Fire Department always takes the priority. Cul-de-sac at recent project required by fire code, city did not have to accept the model code. Planning drives the cost not engineering.
- Flagstaff is in a unique position. Demand is high to locate here from Phoenix Valley, California and other places.
- The amount of code and processes required, does add to the cost here.
- Really does come down to economics (supply & demand), and public housing/affordable housing where possible

- COVID has changed the housing market, with people moving to Flagstaff, did some HUD housing with scattered site housing
- Requires continuing to talk to stakeholders, the amount of code and review adds to the cost, have not mentioned lighting
- To lower the cost need public/private partnerships
- The market is the biggest influence on the cost of housing
- Streamlined
- High Occupancy Housing (HOH) standards is a problem for single family
- Have not worked on low income housing in Flagstaff
- Porch house – variety of cost, tried to pre-fabricate design
- Building offset, architectural standards, cannot look like Aspen Place
- The cost of water meters, Sewer/water impact fee high
- Cost of fees were double between Scottsdale and Flagstaff, came to sewer and water meter cost
- Master metering on multi-family, with a submeter for each unit,
- Rather than one meter per building, why not master meter for the project?
- Electric has extra expense compared to natural gas, more affordable for the tenant (gas)
- City and County hold the key
- Consider districts with lower tax base
- Isabel was a good example that should be repeated
- Put a cap/floor on impact fees for workforce housing

9. What topics have we not covered that you would like to discuss?

- Concerned that the institutional knowledge has left the City. This makes it tough for developers and people trying to do business with the City.
- Loss of institutional knowledge
- Presidio in the Pines fix, use to work with Mark Landsiedel and Mark Sawyers, don't see the give and take on working out issues. Don't know the City Manager, things have changed. Not good, only have relationships with Rick (Barrett), Gary (Miller), Tiffany (Antol) and Alax (Pucciarelli).
- When will hydrology (stormwater) be in Engineering?
- Builders are doing affordable housing for political reasons, not because the incentives work.
- Why do low density vs. high density – infrastructure costs, on-site and off-site, impact analysis results in more costs, more time, return on investment not comparable.
- Cumulative deal on the zoning code, FUTS, every bite adds up too much
- Development fees for infrastructure vs. offsites – would rather pay a fee on each unit than deal with offsites, water, transportation, etc...
- Off-sites end up paying for everyone else that uses that infrastructure
- Concept rezone vs. direct ordinance – always a drive to get to concrete answer and solution, major issue in infill – if we rezone with a site plan, we see Council process gets held hostage to political desires of council, write a check for the cause, arbitrary and capricious way to meet the goals of FRP 2030. Need a much simpler way to rezone without having a site plan.
- Staff sticks with the code, which if it does not support what council wants, if it goes to City Council, it turns into exactions or requests during the hearing.
- Comment coming during final plat, missed at preliminary plat, FUTS are expensive, required materials cannot be locally sourced.
- Recent plat - new dedication language asked for at final plat, asks from outside review partners, conversations need to continue each month, every decision by committee.
- Single point of contact, but not single point of decision
- The review fees are more than it costs for the work.
- Hard to get the City to make a decision
- Layers of comments, FUTS driving projects vs amenities, someone at the City to stand and say no to comments.
- FUTS: Use local materials, seems like building another street, it's a larger community need versus a project need
- Allowing non-residents with expertise on the Housing Commission
- Customer service to have one with more authority to make decisions and solve issues
- Regional Plan – density and grid not practical in Flagstaff, more professionals, architects and engineers to be involved in the process
- Tearing out existing infrastructure to provide a parkway – tore out landscaping and sidewalk to create sidewalk
- Need to remind staff to take some risks, and managers will support you

- Use of existing infrastructure capacity, and the last one in has to pay for the improvement, adds many costs.
- It would be helpful to have all the divisions know what the others are doing. Coordinating for the benefit of the applicant. (did express gratitude for the many things Flagstaff does do right in comparison to other communities.)
- For dilapidated properties, what can be done to allow this effort to be expedited. What qualifies as a maintenance fix vs. a new build?
- Make sure all the departments know what is going on, have talked to other communities about how we work together
- Want to address safety issues quickly
- Had to do mixed used in a residential neighborhood, staff insists that they include commercial on ground floor, only want to do residential
- How do our fees compare? - water fees are expensive, less than Williams, but more than Scottsdale and Phoenix. \$10,000 for ¾ inch water meter - pretty big cost
- \$40,000 seems rather expensive, but some are more some are less
- If we eliminated fees, would the cost of housing go down? The cost we sell is directly tied to the cost of the project, so if the permit fees were less than it would be passed on, \$40,000 for permits on a condominium project, not including the water fees - \$150,000 in fees, water, permits, etc....
- Living in unprecedented times, the great reshuffling is happening
- Expressed appreciation for this exercise and opportunity
- Expressed respect for the staff team that the City has in Legal, Engineering and Community Development
- Comments are shared in the highest respect all the way around.
- Views Flagstaff with a love-hate relationship. Some of the people in the industry he loves and respects the most are in Flagstaff. Spoke to the culture that has been built in Flagstaff as being very difficult, but again not something that can be fixed. Said that many developers are at a point in Flagstaff where rather than push against the challenges and try to make the process/experience better, they just put their heads down and go with the flow.
- Due to climate change, every subdivision should have reclaimed water system for non-potable use.
- Because the City never built an Impact Fee structure – everything is now done through exactions, which are totally subjective. Emotions are involved, which works against objectivity. At the very least, the City should seriously look to adopt Traffic Impact Fees, the larger development community would welcome it!! Doing so would really help the developer wanting to come into the Flagstaff market to better know what is expected. Impact Fees equalize everything – from by right-right projects to projects building in an area that isn't so built out.
- Jeff (Bauman) and Rick (Barrett) have been very helpful with student drop off and pick up
- Need a meeting to walk the public through the Citizen's Access portal