

MINUTES

1. Call to Order

Mayor Daggett called the Work Session of the Flagstaff City Council held June 24, 2025, to order at 3:00 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 discussion and consultation 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 through other technological means.

PRESENT:

ABSENT:

MAYOR DAGGETT
VICE MAYOR SWEET
COUNCILMEMBER ASLAN
COUNCILMEMBER GARCIA
COUNCILMEMBER HOUSE
COUNCILMEMBER MATTHEWS
COUNCILMEMBER SPENCE (arrived at 3:02 p.m.)

Others present: City Manager Greg Clifton and City Attorney Sterling Solomon

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

The Council and audience recited the pledge of allegiance, Vice Mayor Sweet read the Mission Statement of the City of Flagstaff, and Councilmember House 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. Open Call to the Public

Open Call to the Public enables the public to address the Council about an item that is not on the prepared agenda. Comments relating to items that are on the agenda will be taken at the time that the item is discussed. Open Call to the Public appears on the agenda twice, at the beginning and at the end. The total time allotted for the first Open Call to the Public is 30 minutes; any additional comments will be held until the second Open Call to the Public.

If you wish to address the Council in person at today's meeting, please complete a comment card and submit it to the recording clerk as soon as possible. Your name will be called when it is your turn to speak. You may address the Council up to three times throughout the meeting, including comments made during Open Call to the Public and Public Comment. Please limit your remarks to three minutes per item to allow everyone 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.

Matthew Dyer addressed Council on noise complaints and expressed concerns about information being withheld from his public records request. He stated that the police are harassing him and his business regarding the noise ordinance and that the overall process has left him mentally drained.

Steven Puhr addressed Council and raised concerns about local economic struggles, tax fluctuations, and delayed projects. He highlighted overdue updates to the water plan, the need to review the high local minimum wage, and lack of progress on the carbon neutrality plan.

5. Review of Draft Agenda for the July 1, 2025 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.

Councilmember Garcia made clarification on his request for the Council initiative fund stating it was for the Market of Dreams and not a Montalvo Stem Center Event.

6. June Work Anniversaries

Senior Deputy City Manager Shannon Anderson highlighted those employees who have work anniversaries in June.

Councilmember Garcia acknowledged Mr. Znetko for his guidance and assistance over the years.

7. City Manager Report

A. Discussion and direction on letter of opposition of the sale of public lands as outlined in the One Big Beautiful Bill Act

Public Affairs Director Sarah Langley presented the background and a proposed letter of opposition regarding the One Big Beautiful Bill Act. She outlined the steps the Senate is taking to advance the bill and emphasized the importance of sending the letter to protect the lands surrounding Flagstaff, which could be negatively impacted, particularly in terms of natural resources.

Councilmember Matthews asked whether national parks would be included in the bill. Ms. Langley clarified that the original version did not include them, but a recent update indicated that Bureau of Land Management lands might now be part of the legislation.

Councilmember House inquired about the possibility of amending the letter if needed, and Ms. Langley confirmed that changes can be made and brought back for ratification since this was a work session.

Mayor Daggett confirmed the letter would still be sent, to which Ms. Langley agreed, noting that any necessary adjustments would be made based on future changes to the bill.

Councilmember Aslan expressed strong support for the letter, stating the bill poses a threat to the character of Flagstaff and commended those advocating for the protection of public lands.

City Manager Greg Clifton moved the discussion back to his City Manager Report and briefly reviewed his report highlighting the Mary Jo Jenkins Leader of the Year Award winner Stacy Saltzburg.

Communication and Civic Engagement Division Director and City Clerk Stacy Saltzburg stated her appreciation for the recognition, thanked the leadership team, and stated her gratitude toward public service.

8. Flagstaff Airport Triennial Full-Scale Exercise After-Action Report and Improvement Plan Update

Grants, Contracts, and Emergency Management Director Stacey Brechler-Knaggs, Emergency Director Daniel Kelly, Airport Director Brian Gall, and Deputy Fire Chief of Operations Chris Fennell a PowerPoint presentation that covered the following:

OPERATION READY FLG 2024 AFTER ACTION REPORT
PLANNING
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY
EXERCISE SCENARIO
CAPABILITY ANALYSIS
OBJECTIVE 1
OBJECTIVE 2
OBJECTIVE 3
OBJECTIVE 4
OBJECTIVE 5
STRENGTHS
AREAS FOR IMPROVEMENT
IMPROVEMENT PLAN
QUESTIONS?

Councilmember Matthews commented on the recent emergency response exercise last fall, noting that while many corrective actions were listed, most issues were not visibly apparent during the event. She asked about the timeline for implementing those corrective actions.

Mr. Kelly responded that it is a positive that most issues went unnoticed and mentioned there were 17 items under one objective alone so it would take some time to complete all the corrective actions. Mr. Gall added that despite the six-month window, some corrective actions are already complete.

Councilmember House shared her experience participating in the exercise, praising how smoothly it went and how well various organizations coordinated. She appreciated the opportunity and emphasized the value of seeing the full scope of emergency response in action.

Councilmember Garcia thanked the team and highlighted the importance of honest reflection, acknowledging budget and personnel challenges and the need to address them.

Councilmember Matthews also complimented the realism of the exercise, including the use of mock victims, and emphasized the importance of adequate staffing, referencing a recent small aircraft incident as a reminder of preparedness needs.

Mayor Daggett stated the exercise was fascinating and expressed appreciation for efforts to identify and address shortcomings proactively.

9. Discussion of opportunities and considerations of potential City involvement in preserving the Orpheum Theater as a historic community asset for public benefit.

Mr. Clifton introduced the historical background and proactiveness of this discussion. Deputy City Manager Joanne Keene, Community Development Senior Planner Lauren Clementino, and Community Investment Director David McIntire provided a PowerPoint presentation that covered the following:

ORPHEUM THEATER DISCUSSION
BACKGROUND ON THE ORPHEUM
FRAMING THE DISCUSSION
DISCUSS POTENTIAL SCENARIOS -- SCENARIO 1
DISCUSS POTENTIAL SCENARIOS -- SCENARIO 2
DISCUSS POTENTIAL SCENARIOS -- SCENARIO 3
CONSIDERATIONS
OTHER CONSIDERATIONS
QUESTIONS AND DIRECTION

Vice Mayor Sweet shared that the initiative began when the owner Chris Scully approached her about the future of the Orpheum Theater, emphasizing its role as a cultural anchor in downtown Flagstaff. A group was formed to explore options, and she highlighted the importance of keeping the Orpheum locally owned. She also stressed the need to fund the Indigenous Community Cultural Center (ICCC), suggesting that combining both projects could benefit the community and preserve vital cultural assets that have long been in planning.

Indigenous Affairs Administrator Rose Tohe explained that the idea for the ICCC dates back decades, with strong community support pushing it forward. After 15 months of public engagement, a final concept was accepted in 2022, and an RSOQ was issued to find a nonprofit partner. She described the vision for the center as inclusive, not just for Indigenous peoples but for the broader community, grounded in cultural values and a sense of shared space.

Councilmember Matthews supported Scenario Two, which includes both the Orpheum and the ICCC, calling it a long-promised and overdue commitment. She stressed the importance of understanding the full financial picture, including rehab costs, which could reach \$10 million, and the potential need for bonds or taxes. She expressed concerns about voter support and the need for a plan that is financially realistic and respectful to sellers who have been waiting for over a year and could be waiting for another few years.

Councilmember Garcia also leaned toward Scenario Two, recognizing financing challenges but viewing them as manageable. He emphasized the project's importance and suggested it would only require a relatively small financial portion to move forward.

Public commenters in support:

- Ryan Heinsius
- Randy McGrane
- Charles Smith
- Brian Locke
- George Averbeck
- Al White
- Anslem Yazzie
- Dapper Dre
- Chris Scully

Comments included:

- Orpheum being more than just a gathering place for the community but has cultural and historical significance.
- The Orpheum has put Flagstaff on the map.

- Orpheum has gathered many different types and groups of people, bringing the community together.
- The Orpheum allows for local artists to have a stage and some where to start
- Commending staff on their knowledge and research on how much the Orpheum is a community asset.
- Encouraging more people to be creative with solutions
- Emphasized stewardship and local job creation through theatre operations.
- Wants to ensure a secure future for the theatre by finding responsible hands to take it forward.
- Described it as a local landmark with deep roots in Flagstaff.
- Believes city ownership could generate revenue and community services.
- Stated Orpheum could be a financial and cultural asset to the city.
- Believes Orpheum rents or a long-term lease could be beneficial.
- Concerned about potential tax increases, but sees the investment as worthwhile.
- Enthusiastic about the idea of a broader arts district.

Steven Puhr addressed Council in opposition and stated that he attends events at the Orpheum a few times a year and there are creative ways to move forward in preserving it. He requests Council be cautious with taxpayer dollars and notes that it has been privately owned for 100 years and has been successful.

Mike Taylor and Mike and Kelly Tulloss submitted written comments in support of preserving the Orpheum.

Councilmember Matthews asked Owner Chris Scully if he can wait a few years to find out the results of an election, knowing that government can take a while and results may not be favorable. Mr. Scully stated they were hoping for the next election cycle as they do have financial obligations, they need to meet but they are willing to bridge some of those gaps if needed. He added that developers are really interested in the property.

Councilmember Aslan asked Al White, as a member of the Board at Theatrikos, if he would recommend a similar arrangement they have with the City. Mr. White explained that while he cannot officially represent the Theatrikos board, he did present the Orpheum preservation idea to them. The board responded with interest, as long as any proposed solution does not require additional funding from the city. The existing partnership is built on trust and long-term commitment, and he suggested that a similar lease or rental model for the Orpheum could provide both financial benefits and long-term sustainability.

Councilmember House emphasized the importance of viewing the Orpheum and ICCC through a historical and community-focused lens, noting that this is not just about one property owner but a broader community investment in arts and culture. She leaned toward Scenario Two, which integrates the Orpheum and the ICCC into a larger arts district, as a way to meet multiple longstanding community needs and strengthen the local economy.

Mr. McIntire explained that Scenario One involves the City of Flagstaff purchasing the Orpheum and contracting a private operator, a traditional model seen elsewhere. Scenario Two is more complex but offers a greater vision, creating an arts district that supports cultural, educational, and community uses, with flexible ownership options and potential for broader community involvement. Mr. Clifton added that such a district could include diverse revenue sources beyond just arts.

Several councilmembers voiced strong support for Scenario Two. They emphasized that the ICCC has been promised for over 40 years and must be prioritized alongside preserving the Orpheum. Councilmember Matthews stressed the importance of financial transparency, including potential bond or tax impacts, and called for a plan that voters can realistically support. She also asked about ballot timelines and Management Services Director Rick Tadder explained informational packets for the public would need to be started this year for a ballot next year.

Councilmember Garcia reflected on the cultural and personal significance of the Orpheum, sharing personal memories and calling it a spiritual and cultural asset.

Councilmember Spence echoed support for including the ICCC and requested full transparency on costs, building condition, and appraisal details before proceeding.

Mayor Daggett expressed general support for whichever scenario ensures the project's success, recognizing the Orpheum as a cornerstone of the community.

Deputy City Manager Keene confirmed the team has clear direction and that an appraisal could be completed within 60--90 days, allowing progress on further planning.

10. Regional Plan Implementation

Comprehensive Planning Manager Sara Dechter provided a PowerPoint presentation that covered the following:

REGIONAL PLAN IMPLEMENTATION
 REGIONAL PLAN 2045 UPDATE PROCESS
 OBJECTIVES
 CRITICAL SUCCESS FACTORS
 PROCESS AND COSTS
 PROCESS AND VALUES
 STATE REQUIREMENTS
 THE PLAN AND CITY CODE
 WHAT DID WE REQUIRE IN THE PAST?
 WHAT DO WE REQUIRE NOW?
 CODE-PLAN RELATIONSHIP

Councilmember Matthews raised concerns about the vague language in policy around substantial performance, noting that it often leaves too much up to staff interpretation, which can lead to inconsistencies, higher costs, and frustration. She emphasized the need to clarify language to avoid ongoing confusion between staff and the development community, which already faces a complex process.

Ms. Dechter acknowledged that the current language complicates matters and agreed it would grant more discretion to the Council while requiring careful oversight from staff. She welcomed feedback to help refine the code and committed to bringing proposed changes back promptly for review.

IMPLEMENTABILITY
 UPDATED DENSITY RANGES
 FUTURE GROWTH ILLUSTRATION

Councilmember Aslan questioned whether the contingency category in zoning always leads to increased density or if it could be used to manipulate zoning outcomes by invoking future density.

Ms. Dechter clarified that the intent was not to allow such reverse use, noting that the "choose your own zoning" approach has created uncertainty rather than true flexibility. She added that they aim to prevent developers from investing in projects unlikely to be approved. If the Council desires more flexibility, she said staff could explore that with partners based on further guidance.

PAUSE FOR QUESTIONS BEFORE EXAMPLES
 EXAMPLE 1
 EXAMPLE 2

Councilmember House questioned how a property currently zoned R1 could be considered for apartment development in a suburban corridor if R1 is not listed as a compatible zoning category. Ms. Dechter explained that the zoning was originally assigned in 1985 under a different general plan, and the current plan uses updated categories.

Councilmember House asked whether a zoning map amendment would be needed if the property falls under an existing compatible category. Ms. Dechter clarified that R1 is not compatible with the

current corridor designation, and any changes to allow increased density would require Council action.

EXAMPLE 3

Councilmember Spence inquired about the conforming to suburban guidelines, and Ms. Dechter explained they were included in the packet for the Joint Regional Meeting with the County. These guidelines address a mix of uses, diverse housing types, design elements, connectivity, and parks.

Councilmember Garcia asked about Elks Crossing, and Ms. Dechter explained it is a suburban center with a mixed-use designation, including commercial planning and apartment density situated near a hillside.

EXAMPLE 4

EXAMPLE 5

Councilmember Garcia asked how the .67 an acre figure for the historical district was determined, and Ms. Dechter responded that it was based on historical data.

Councilmember Spence inquired about the legal basis allowing a property owner to sue the city for loss of value due to zoning changes. City Attorney Sterling Solomon explained this is related to Proposition 207, which allows owners to claim damages if they can prove a decrease in property value due to a government action.

Councilmember Spence then asked whether anything in the regional plan could trigger a Prop 207 claim. Ms. Dechter clarified that the Regional Plan itself does not change existing entitlements and typically would not prompt such claims. If a property owner initiates a rezoning request, they are required to sign a waiver for Prop 207 rights. Mr. Solomon added that the Regional Plan provides broad guidance, while zoning code changes are more likely to raise Prop 207 concerns.

EXAMPLE 6

FLAGSTAFF REGIONAL LAND USE PLAN FOR 2045

Councilmember Matthews asked if the intention behind the proposed changes is to offer clearer alternatives to current findings used in zoning amendments, making the process more understandable. Ms. Dechter agreed, affirming that if this is the direction the Council wants to take, staff will carefully draft language to align findings with the city's goals and incorporate corresponding code amendments for clarity.

Councilmember Aslan raised the importance of a hierarchy of priorities. In response, Ms. Dechter explained that the team is already drafting "core" and "complementary" priorities, which could be referenced during zoning updates. She added that while the Regional Plan tends to remain broader in scope, the zoning code is where specificity is typically introduced.

Councilmember House questioned the rationale behind a proposed new "Finding #4," expressing concern over how consistency with the plan would be evaluated, especially if a developer claims a goal conflicts with their proposal. She asked whether exemptions would be based on developer interests or actual alignment with broader state and regional goals. Ms. Dechter clarified that under current practice, applicants provide narratives to justify why they cannot meet certain requirements--often tied to design or affordability--and the decision to grant exceptions lies with staff or Council. She noted that recent efforts, like the HOH process, have adjusted some goals to reflect evolving community priorities, though most developers attempt to work within the framework rather than eliminate policies outright.

Councilmember Garcia emphasized that development should not drive the Regional Plan and requested clearer identification of community values in future presentations. He asked staff to highlight where values are protected and where streamlining is being applied. Ms. Dechter acknowledged that the sheer volume of goals and policies sometimes creates uncertainty, which becomes costly and inefficient when conflicts are discovered late in the process. She stressed that

identifying and incorporating core community values early is crucial to avoiding delays and cost increases.

Councilmember Matthews added that while it is good the plan can adapt, frequent changes can undermine public trust, especially when adjustments occur after a plan is approved by voters. She questioned the purpose of a Regional Plan if it is constantly revised. Ms. Dechter responded that previous planning processes were hindered by difficulties in maintaining quorums and compressed implementation timelines. She assured the Council that anticipated changes would be minimal and addressed proactively.

Councilmember Matthews asked whether amendments would now need to comply with all goals and policies, expressing concern about the overwhelming number of standards. Ms. Dechter clarified that the updated approach would focus only on goals relevant to the type of amendment being proposed, rather than requiring compliance with all 500. This would streamline the process while still upholding the plan's intent.

Ms. McNulty commented that the overarching goal is to allow rezonings to proceed without unnecessarily triggering full-scale plan amendments. By aligning zoning districts with the Regional Plan, decisions can be made more easily. She emphasized that if zoning is not simplified, property owners may choose to build within their existing rights, potentially bypassing public input.

Councilmember Aslan stated that the goal is to create clear boundaries for developers to work within. He emphasized that the intention is not to make it easier for developers to do whatever they want, but rather to make it easier for them to build in ways that align with the City's vision and values.

FLAGSTAFF REGIONAL PLAN 2045
EXAMPLES OF TREATMENTS
BENEFITS
DIFFERENCES
QUESTIONS AND FEEDBACK
HOSPITALITY OVERLAY
RESORT USE
HOSPITALITY OVERLAY
QUESTIONS AND FEEDBACK

Councilmember Aslan expressed initial appreciation for the efforts to consider requests regarding land use but voiced discomfort with the new overlay plan, particularly the potential to limit Little America's density to just one unit per acre. He emphasized the community's desire for more housing opportunities rather than resorts and worried that redesignating the limited land available might threaten housing development. Ms. Dechter clarified that the flexibility in the new plan would allow hotel properties to convert more easily into housing or mixed uses, such as part-time residences or short-term rentals, which current land use designations do not permit. While the plan itself cannot detail all these future possibilities, it serves as a framework for designating parcels and guiding further discussions on appropriate uses.

Councilmember Matthews noted that the feedback from Little America indicated a preference for zoning flexibility allowing a mix of housing, workforce housing, and resort-style living on their property. She asked if guardrails could be established, such as limits on the number of housing units, to ensure a balanced approach. Ms. Dechter responded that there currently is not a zoning category that allows such a mixed-use modern resort, and achieving that would require updating zoning codes. The plan itself would only guide these discussions, not implement them.

Councilmember House shared some hesitation, recalling past proposals for a "Little America neighborhood" and expressing concern about shifting from a neighborhood-focused plan to a resort plan without clear benefits or sufficient community involvement. Councilmember House stressed the importance of deeper community engagement from Little America before moving forward.

Councilmember Garcia also expressed hesitation, particularly about the language used in the plan and its implications for the community. He asked if a new zoning code could be created to address

these concerns without becoming overly complicated or restrictive. Ms. Dechter mentioned that jurisdictions like Phoenix and the county have custom zoning tools negotiated and legislated through council processes, which could serve as models. The intent is that parts of Little America could remain as resort uses while other parts evolve, but this would depend on future zoning decisions. Currently, this remains a conceptual discussion.

Mayor Daggett asked whether the Regional Plan Committee had been consulted about changing direction based on community feedback. Ms. Dechter explained that the committee completed its work in March and will not be reconvened, but acknowledged this is a late-arising issue that warrants further examination in upcoming hearings and work sessions.

Mayor Daggett also noted that there are alternative approaches, such as using regional center zoning or specific plans for the area. Ms. Dechter confirmed that specific plans and tools like Planned Unit Developments (PUDs) could be used to address these issues in a more tailored way going forward.

UPDATED TRAILS MAP

Councilmember Garcia asked if someone could create a socially generated trail and save it on the site. Ms. Dechter explained that while the app can automatically save routes when users go for a run, users cannot edit official municipal trails. Mr. Solomon added that they would not encourage altering trails or take liability for changes, as they are not asking people to modify existing trails.

QUESTIONS AND FEEDBACK

Public commenters in support of the Regional Plan:

- Nick Wood
- Jim Hill
- Hillary Turby

Comments included:

- Thanked city staff and clarified confusion between the regional plan and zoning process.
- Noted that PUDs still require Council approval.
- Emphasized any major change would still go through a formal amendment process.
- Suggested the overlay is a way to avoid a major amendment, but acknowledged it still needs Council approval.
- Said the plan discourages developers by not providing a clear path forward.
- Believes the system works better with maximums, not minimums, to allow for flexibility.
- Warned developers may be reluctant to join when criteria is uncertain.

Public commenters in opposition to elements of the Regional Plan:

- Mary Norton
- Michele James
- Charity Lee
- Marilyn Weissman

Comments included:

- Criticized the low urban growth category, suggesting it should be higher.
- Opposes the hospitality/resort overlay for Little America; believes it will likely fail.
- Urged Little America to go through the proper zoning amendment process.
- Encouraged collaboration with landowners in the JWP area for alternatives to resort development.
- Opposes the proposed minimum density of 5 units/acre, saying it's too restrictive.
- Warned this could lead to fewer housing units, despite the area currently allowing development.
- Stated that rural residential owners could choose to rezone, but setting a 5-unit minimum

discourages participation.

- Raised concerns about resource protection constraints under the new plan.
- Warned the overlay bypasses community input and sets a bad precedent.
- Criticized limited trail inclusion, asking for clearer demonstration of trails and intent.
- Raised concerns about neighboring land looking like golf course developments.

Noel Griemsmann submitted written comments for modifications and clarifications on behalf of Little America.

Mayor Daggett asked for a reminder of the timeline and whether Council needed to provide direction that evening. Ms. Dechter confirmed that direction was needed to meet the hearing schedule, including a potential special meeting in October. She clarified misunderstandings around zoning compatibility--stating that properties opting into a category do not necessarily have to meet a 5-unit-per-acre minimum, contrary to some public comments.

Councilmember Garcia shared feedback from a meeting with Little America, expressing that trails should remain open until development occurs, but also noted the property's late involvement in the process.

Councilmember Matthews stated concerns about allowing public access to private trails, citing risks such as a past fire from illegal camping. She also requested more discussion on PUD options.

Councilmember House supported the general direction of the presentation, she stated she preferred exceptions over new resort designations, and endorsed the trail map.

Mayor Daggett also supported the trail map and favored handling resort proposals through PUD/PAD rather than a resort-specific designation, citing compatibility and long-term flexibility. Vice Mayor Sweet echoed support for text additions and using the PUD/PAD approach.

Councilmember Matthews inquired about unit density in suburban neighborhoods zoned R1, and Ms. Dechter clarified that it is two units per acre, without a requirement for five units per acre.

Ms. Dechter proposed keeping the drafted density categories (low, medium, high) as written and suggested addressing resort development through future action items rather than showing Resort/Commercial (RC) designations on the growth map.

Councilmember Spence recommended including PUD language in Chapter 5 to give developers flexibility while ensuring Council oversight. Ms. McNulty confirmed that this would function similarly to a rezoning process, allowing for master-planned developments aligned with the city's goals.

Councilmember House reiterated support for using only PUD/PAD language rather than specific resort language, to avoid setting broad development standards that may not fit future needs. Ms. Dechter concluded by confirming that the current trail map display with polygons is acceptable.

11. Open Call to the Public

None

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

None

13. Adjournment

The meeting of the Flagstaff City Council held June 24, 2025, adjourned at 8:47 p.m.

MAYOR

ATTEST:

CITY CLERK