

## MINUTES

### 1. Call to Order

Mayor Deasy called the Work Session held June 28, 2022, to order at 3:32 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. ROLL CALL

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

PRESENT:

MAYOR DEASY  
VICE MAYOR SWEET  
COUNCILMEMBER ASLAN (virtually)  
COUNCILMEMBER HOUSE  
COUNCILMEMBER MCCARTHY  
COUNCILMEMBER SALAS (virtually)

ABSENT:

COUNCILMEMBER SHIMONI

Others present: City Manager Greg Clifton; City Attorney Sterling Solomon.

### 3. Pledge of Allegiance, Mission Statement, and Land Acknowledgement

The Council and audience recited the pledge of allegiance, Councilmember McCarthy read the Mission Statement of the City of Flagstaff, and Mayor Deasy read the Land Acknowledgement.

#### MISSION STATEMENT

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

#### LAND ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

*The Flagstaff City Council 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. 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.*

Cheryl Wahlgren addressed Council about flood mitigation and expressed concerns that the drainage easement near her house was not being maintained.

Kayla Rigney addressed Council about a discrepancy between the City and FEMA flood designations. Her home was classified as high risk by FEMA but the City shows a determination of no risk. This was impacting her ability to get flood insurance for her home.

#### **5. Review of Draft Agenda for the July 5, 2022 City Council Meeting**

*Citizens wishing to speak on agenda items not specifically called out by the City Council may submit a speaker card for their items of interest to the recording clerk.*

None

#### **6. Proclamation: Flagstaff Rotary 100th Anniversary**

Mayor and Council approached the dais and Mayor read and presented the proclamation to the Rotary Club of Flagstaff.

#### **7. City Manager Report**

Mr. Clifton briefly reviewed his report and IT Director CJ Perry briefly reviewed the IT Monthly Report.

Deputy City Manager presented the June work anniversaries.

#### **8. Care Unit Update**

Fire Department Captain Mike Felts and Brian Gest, with Terros Health, provided a PowerPoint presentation that covered the following:

CARE – COMMUNITY ALLIANCE, RESPONSE & ENGAGEMENT  
CARE UNIT OVERVIEW  
IN OPERATION MARCH 28<sup>TH</sup>, 2022  
CLIENT CONTACT FREQUENCY  
DISPATCH OUTCOMES  
POINTS TO TAKE HOME

CALL EXAMPLES SUPPORTING MISSION  
COLLABORATION WITH FLAGSTAFF SHELTER SERVICES  
COLLABORATION WITH OTHER FLAGSTAFF IDENTITIES  
MOVING FORWARD  
IN CLOSING

Council expressed appreciation and excitement for the program. They were eager to see the program expand over time.

Councilmember McCarthy asked who people should call should they see someone in need. Captain Felts stated that calling 911 was the best option; they can triage calls appropriately and dispatch the CARE unit.

Vice Mayor Sweet asked if there are challenges that they see coming up in the future as the program continues. Mr. Gest offered that there will no longer be a single point of contact from the Flagstaff Fire Department and suggested that a permanent point of contact be considered.

Mayor Deasy asked where they see the most need and how they would like to expand the program. Mr. Gest stated that it was still really early and as they got more data they would be able to compare that with the Police Department. There may be a need for the unit to operate later in the day. It currently runs from 9:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m. and there could be some benefit by staying on beyond 7:00 p.m. Also, there are times when a person needs more follow-up, and they currently did not have the ability to keep track of and follow up with some of the more high-need individuals; having a position that can focus in that area would be helpful.

## **9. Museum Flooding and Spruce Wash updates**

Public Works Streets Section Director Sam Beckett, Brian Klimowski with the National Weather Service, Fire Chief Mark Gaillard, Sustainability Volunteer Event Coordinator Steven Thompson, Finance Director Brandi Suda, Senior Project Manager Christine Cameron, and Public Affairs Director Sarah Langley, collectively provided a PowerPoint presentation that covered the following:

FLOOD MITIGATION UPDATES  
AGENDA  
MONSOON 2022 FORECAST  
YOUR NATIONAL WEATHER SERVICE  
THE 2022 MONSOON BEGINS EARLY  
NEXT THREE TO FOUR WEEKS  
OUTLOOK FOR MONSOON (JULY-SEPT)  
EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT  
AUTHORITIES  
CITY SERVICES CONTRIBUTING TO THE PHASES OF EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT  
WHAT IS ICS?  
ICS – WHO DOES WHAT?  
ROLE OF FLAGSTAFF ELECTED OFFICIALS  
MAYOR AND CITY COUNCIL  
POLICY GROUP  
INFORMATION RELEASE  
JOINT INFORMATION SYSTEM (JIS)  
MANAGING PUBLIC INFORMATION  
COMMUNITY VOLUNTEER EVENT  
MUSEUM FLOOD FINANCIAL FOCUS GROUP

DFFM-FUNDED RESOURCES  
CEDAR TO DORTHA CHANNEL AND INLET  
PONDEROSA PARK  
NRCS MOUNT ELDEN ESTATES FAN  
COMMUNICATIONS

Dawn Rodriguez addressed Council stating that there needed to be more outreach to the neighborhood on how to get assessments for their homes. She asked about more volunteer efforts and expressed concern with the improper placement of jersey barriers.

Councilmember McCarthy stated that there were many washes and drainage ditches full of debris and trash. He asked if there was a city program that monitors the ditches to make sure they are cleared appropriately. Stormwater Manager Ed Schenk stated that there was a maintenance program that was delegated to cleaning 26.2 miles of FEMA-designated areas and over 100 miles of small minor ditches. They are restricted to city parcels, city right-of-way, and city easements. If there were issues on private property, there would be limitations on what the city can do. He added that the maintenance program has two Water Services Operators, and they often call upon other divisions to assist in cleaning operations.

Mayor Deasy thanked the team for completing the Dortha Inlet project, there were more projects ahead and the efforts to keep things moving were greatly appreciated.

A break was held from 5:18 p.m. through 5:41 p.m.

#### **10. Pipeline Fire West Flood Risk Update**

Stormwater Manager Ed Schenk introduced Joe Loverich with JE Fuller who provided a PowerPoint presentation that covered the following:

PIPELINE FIRE WEST FLOOD UPDATE  
PIPELINE FIRE WEST  
FLOOD RISK ASSESSMENT PROCESS  
FLOOD RISK ASSESSMENT OVERVIEW  
RESULTS  
RIO DE FLAG FLOODING  
MITIGATIONS NEAR HWY 180  
SHORT-TERM MITIGATIONS  
WEST-SIDE SELF-FILL SANDBAG STATIONS  
FLOOD DIRECTOR/EMERGENCY NOTIFICATIONS  
RAIN GAUGE WEBSITE  
FLOOD INSURANCE  
STAY CONNECTED/QUESTIONS

A written comment was submitted by Oksana Dresner asking about metrics for debris removal for the Highway 180 culvert and asked about the possible use of BBB funds for flood mitigation.

#### **11. Fiber Update and Smart Cities Discussion**

IT Director CJ Perry provided a PowerPoint presentation that covered the following:

SMART CITY INITIATIVES FOR THE FLAGSTAFF REGION  
AGENDA  
FIBER UPDATE

CURRENT FUNDING  
DEFINING OUR GOALS  
DEFINING OUR TOOLS  
LESSONS LEARNED: GRANTS  
DEFINING OUR STRATEGY  
OPTION 1 – CONTINUE BUILDING AS-IS  
OPTION 2 – PARTNER WITH AN ISP THROUGH A PUBLIC PROCUREMENT PROCESS

Vice Mayor Sweet asked the amount of revenue that would be lost with going with Option 2. Mr. Perry stated that he was not sure. In looking at other cities and their revenues, it was not very consistent, and it was all over the place, which made it difficult to estimate. The other thing was that it was a timing issue; there was not enough infrastructure to lease, and it would take at least five years to make it viable.

Mayor Deasy stated that it was important to maximize the dollars the city could get from the federal government. He would like to see which ISPs are out there and what they have to offer, but some projects should continue as-is.

Councilmember Salas suggested developing a strategy that combines both options. Option 2 is more exploratory and identifying public/private partnerships with an internet service provider that shares both cost and revenue.

Councilmember McCarthy expressed a desire to have an executive session at some point to understand any legal implications. Mayor Deasy agreed but added that in the interim it would be good to send out a solicitation to understand what was out there in terms of opportunity and partnership.

Mr. Perry continued the presentation.

SMART CITY DISCUSSION  
WHAT IS A SMART CITY?  
TECHNOLOGY AND INFRASTRUCTURE  
DATA TRANSPARENCY  
CITIZEN INTERACTION  
STAFF EFFICIENCY  
WHAT ARE WE ALREADY DOING?  
WHY ARE WE TALKING ABOUT THIS?  
WHAT DO YOU WANT IT TO BE?  
WHAT RESONATES WITH COUNCIL?

Councilmember McCarthy stated that he would like to focus on a few things rather than taking it on all at once. He offered that coordinated stop lights might be a good focus or something that focuses on traffic flow. That type of information would be helpful for planning purposes.

Councilmember Aslan indicated that he is interested in traffic management; it was a good place to start, and it would send a message to the public that they are taking modality conversations seriously and bringing technology in that helps with data management. He would support going all in on smart city approaches.

Vice Mayor Sweet expressed that she was all in. She recognized the need to take the time it needed but wanted to see continued conversation. She stated that she would be interested in a smart city strategic plan even if it could not be implemented immediately.

Councilmember House stated that there were a lot of places for overlap and potential partnerships. She too, would support the development of a strategic plan that would identify partnerships and strategic approaches.

Mayor Deasy and Councilmember McCarthy expressed their support for the development of a strategic plan and suggested that it include input from public and a prioritization of strategies.

Mr. Perry summarized the direction of Council to explore a standalone strategic plan and to begin to look at traffic management opportunities.

A break was held from 7:18 p.m. through 7:27 p.m.

## **12. JWP Extension, Phase I and II - Proposed Alignments**

Senior Project Manager David Pedersen provided a PowerPoint presentation that covered the following:

JWP EXTENSION PROPOSED ALIGNMENTS PROJECT UPDATE  
VICINITY MAP  
KEY STAKEHOLDERS  
JWP EXTENSION TEAM  
BASIS FOR JWP ROADWAY EXTENSION  
ROADWAY FUNCTIONAL CLASSIFICATION MAP  
ARIZONA NATIONAL SCENIC TRAIL (AZT)  
FOCUSED PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT  
ALTERNATIVE ALIGNMENT CONSIDERATIONS  
NEXT STEPS  
J.W. POWELL BLVD PROPOSED ALIGNMENTS

The following individuals addressed Council in support of the original alignment of John Wesley Powell:

- Ken Kotalik
- Ryan Southworth
- Natalie Wiseman
- James Newberry
- Dave Chapin
- Joan Abbott
- Rick Natenberg
- Maris Fisler
- Ed Farnam
- JoAnn Miller
- Jennifer Kotalik
- Jonathan Southworth
- Ruth Naliborski

The following comments were received:

- The new alignment is not fair or safe.
- The Fourth Street realignment has been on the books for years and the entire neighborhood has been aware of the project.
- The new alignment would not have a connection to our neighborhood for a long time if at all.
- Flooding will become a bigger issue with the alternate alignment and there is no promise of correction.

- The original alignment has been known about and planned for many years, we have been counting on the alignment for 30 years and now it is changing.
- The alternative alignment goes through a riparian area and there is too much wildlife at stake.
- Please keep the original alignment.
- The alternative alignment goes through the flood zone that floods every year, it does not make sense to do that.
- There has not been enough time to consider the alternative, the original should be honored.
- There was common knowledge that Fourth Street would be connected to JWP. New property owners either shrugged it off or did not do their due diligence before purchasing their property.
- In 2018 the voters approved Proposition 419 with a specific alignment, now the funding and studies that have gone into that alignment seem to be dismissed.
- A bridge would be required with the alternative alignment and that is just more cost added to the project.
- Stay with the long-term plan that everyone has been planning for and what was approved by voters.
- The road in and out is detrimental and is often closed, people need access into the subdivision and the original alignment provides that.

The following individuals addressed Council in support of an alternative alignment:

- Peter Burger
- Brian Rhoton
- Christy Maycumber
- Christina Talley
- Andrew Richardson
- Vicki Shepard
- Kyle Maycumber
- Peter Birch
- Ed Shaw
- Jim Hill
- Darrin Smith
- Vicki Shepard

The following comments were received:

- There are other alignments to consider that would not impact families.
- The current and alternative alignment impacts homes, a road further east is more appropriate.
- The decision seems premature, and more time is needed to evaluate the alternative alignment.
- There are large property owners who are supportive of the alternative alignment to lessen the impact on smaller property owners.
- The alternative alignment provides a traffic scheme that provides appropriate access to JWP.
- An alternative that routes through undeveloped land and does not impact established homes should be considered.
- More alternative routes should be considered, ones that do not pit neighbor against neighbor and preserves the safety of the area.
- More time is needed to consider all the options.
- It makes sense to consider not impacting small property owners.
- Support the alternative alignment.
- A 40 mph arterial will be a major trucking route right in the middle of a neighborhood, more

options need to be developed.

- The original alignment would be 45 feet from my front door and would require a 12 foot high retaining wall on my property and I would have to get an easement from my neighbor for a driveway.
- Yes, we knew a road would be coming in but we did not know that it would be this large and with a speed limit of 45 mph.

Written comments in support of the original alignment of John Wesley Powell were submitted by the following:

- Jennifer Kotalik
- Maris Fisler
- Heather Smith
- Ken Kotalik
- Kristin Wiseman

Written comments in support of an amended alignment of John Wesley Powell were submitted by Ed Shaw and Vicki Shepard.

Councilmember McCarthy asked about the wildlife corridor and potential impacts. Mr. Pedersen explained that staff have met with Arizona Game and Fish and there is a wildlife presence in the area. They are at 30% design and are continuing to work with the state on further wildlife investigation going forward. Currently, there is no funding for a wildlife study.

Councilmember McCarthy asked if a collector road would be put in if the alternative route was not advanced. Mr. Pedersen stated that there was planning for a collector road to be supplemental in the future, but it was not currently funded. Councilmember McCarthy stated that he did not feel it appropriate to put a road on the original or alternative route options. He would like to see another alternate consideration; the parcels are not planned yet and the road and development could be built in conjunction with each other. A major road going through a development would be an asset rather than a liability, and a more direct route meant less driving distance and less impact on the environment.

Councilmember Aslan agreed. He stated that the alternate option presented the same issues as with the original alignment, just with a different group of people. Other options should be considered. He was concerned about the wildlife and stated that there needed to be investment in an environmental impact study.

Vice Mayor Sweet stated that she supported staff going back to the drawing board to find some middle ground in the route.

Mayor Deasy stated that when the matter was discussed back in October, they were looking for something between the bookend routes. Flagstaff needs homes, it takes developers to build those homes, and the city is mandated to build a road. He would like to see an alternative between the bookends.

Mr. Clifton stated that some parameters and constraints have not been articulated. There is development occurring by-right at Canyon del Rio. That development was at a point of deciding how to develop, according to alignment in the Regional Plan or the alternative. Staff have endeavored to get an alternative design, but the window would soon close on the alternatives because there was pending development. The city could not ask the developers to stop when they had a build-by-right plan that had been approved. A decision needed to be made; either the route goes as originally planned or it does not. Staff would gladly go back to the drawing board if that was the direction, but there are constraints that go beyond what has been discussed.

Councilmember McCarthy suggested an option where the alignment through Canyon del Rio was the alternative alignment and the alignment on the western side could be considered later.

Mayor Deasy expressed concern about the pressure to decide because there was not an Environmental Impact Study and not enough information in general.

Councilmember House stated that she was not comfortable deciding on the original or alternative. She was concerned with services not being available to those who needed it with the original alignment, and she was concerned about the wildlife impacts with the alternative. There needed to be more study done before a decision could be made. She requested more detailed information about connecting the pink line with the blue bookend line.

Councilmember Salas stated that even before the plan was approved by the voters that obligates the city to deliver the project, the John Wesley Powell extension was part of the Regional Transportation Plan approved by multiple partners. The city and MetroPlan have leveraged state and federal funding to complete the extension and there was a window of opportunity with Canyon del Rio getting ready to break ground. In the interest of time, she would consider an alignment that runs through Canyon del Rio and then meet with the developers again to see if there are other options for the alignment that goes west.

Mayor Deasy stated that there was so much that was not known and that the impacts to NAU need to be considered as well.

Councilmember Aslan stated that he would like to give staff the opportunity to meet with the developers and see what other alternatives may be available.

Councilmember McCarthy suggested a special meeting the following week. Council agreed to meet again on Thursday, July 7, 2022.

**Moved by** Mayor Paul Deasy, **seconded by** Vice Mayor Miranda Sweet to continue the meeting in accordance with the City Council Rules of Procedure.

**Vote:** 5 - 1

NAY: Councilmember Austin Aslan

### 13. Council Initiative Fund.

Mayor Deasy stated that there was \$17,000 in the Council Initiative Fund to use before July 1, 2022. He suggested that they allocate that funding to the CARE team to enhance their services.

Council agreed. Purchasing Director Patrick Brown stated that it would be necessary to get an amended contract and invoice dated June 30, 2022, in order to expend the funds before the end of the fiscal year. Mr. Solomon added that the amended contract with the CARE team would have to be ratified at a later date by the Council.

### 14. Public Participation

None

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

Councilmember Salas wished everyone a Happy Fourth of July.

**16. Adjournment**

The Work Session held June 28, 2022, adjourned at 9:52 p.m.

---

MAYOR

ATTEST:

---

CITY CLERK