

MINUTES

1. CALL TO ORDER

Mayor Daggett called the meeting of the Flagstaff City Council held October 7, 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 regular meeting, 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: Mayor Becky Daggett
Vice Mayor Miranda Sweet
Councilmember Austin Aslan
Councilmember Anthony Garcia
Councilmember Khara House
Councilmember Lori Matthews
Councilmember David Spence

Staff 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 Garcia read the Mission Statement of the City of Flagstaff, and Councilmember Spence 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.

Stephen Puhr addressed Council and raised concerns about the city's investment management and questioned the information presented during the recent presentation. He requested the City Council to monitor investments more closely.

Colleen Maring, Chief People Officer at Northern Arizona Healthcare, addressed Council to announce upcoming listening sessions to gather community input on the future of the current Flagstaff Medical Center site if the hospital relocates.

5. PROCLAMATIONS AND RECOGNITIONS

A. Proclamation: Housing America Month

Councilmember House read and presented the proclamation.

B. Proclamation: Domestic Violence Awareness Month

Mayor Daggett read and presented the proclamation.

C. Proclamation: Indigenous Peoples' Day

Councilmember Matthews read and presented the proclamation.

6. COUNCIL LIAISON REPORTS

Councilmember Matthews reported on the Mountain Line meeting. She highlighted ongoing work on tax increases, rehabilitation of benches and shelters, and improvements to paratransit agreements.

Vice Mayor Sweet mentioned an upcoming Metro Plan meeting that she would be attending.

7. APPOINTMENTS

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 the City Council may vote to go into executive session, which will not be open to the public, for the purpose of discussing or considering employment, assignment, appointment, promotion, demotion, dismissal, salaries, disciplining or resignation of a public officer, appointee, or employee of any public body..., pursuant to A.R.S. §38-431.03(A)(1).

A. Consideration of Appointments: Housing Commission

Moved by Councilmember Austin Aslan, **seconded by** Councilmember Khara House to appoint Sarah Meyer to the Housing Commission - Builders and Real Estate Professional - Realtor position.

Vote: 7 - 0 - Unanimously

8. LIQUOR LICENSE PUBLIC HEARINGS

Applications under Liquor License Public Hearings may be considered under one public hearing and may be acted upon by one motion unless otherwise requested by Council.

Mayor Daggett opened the public hearing.

Deputy City Clerk Georganna Staskey introduced the applications and indicated that the Police Department and Community Development had provided their respective findings.

There being no public comment, Mayor Daggett closed the public hearing.

A. Consideration and Action on Liquor License Application: John Stephan Dolan "The Porch Flagstaff", 360 W. Forest Meadows Street, Series 12 (Restaurant), New License

Moved by Councilmember Lori Matthews, **seconded by** Vice Mayor Miranda Sweet to forward the applications to the State with a recommendation of approval.

Vote: 7 - 0 - Unanimously

9. CONSENT AGENDA

All matters under Consent Agenda are considered by the City Council to be routine. Unless a member of City Council expresses a desire at the meeting to remove an item from the Consent Agenda for discussion, the Consent Agenda will be enacted by one motion approving the recommendations listed on the agenda. Unless otherwise indicated, expenditures approved by Council are budgeted items.

Mayor Daggett pulled Item 9F from the Consent Agenda for discussion.

Moved by Councilmember Anthony Garcia, **seconded by** Vice Mayor Miranda Sweet to approve the Consent Agenda as presented with the exception of Item 9F.

Vote: 7 - 0 - Unanimously

A. Consideration and Approval of Contract: Approval of cooperative purchase from RWC International DBA RWC Group for Public Works and Water Services Divisions under State of Arizona - Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) Contract No. CTR069476 in the amount of \$626,043.42

- One (1) 10-wheel plow truck - Public Works - \$430,647.12
- One (1) 6-wheel dump truck - Water Services - \$195,396.30

1. Approve the cooperative purchase of one (1) plow truck for the Streets section and one (1) dump truck for Water Services from RWC International for the amount of \$ 626,043.42; and
2. Authorize the City Manager to execute the necessary documents.

B. Consideration and Approval of Contract: Ratify Grant Agreement between the City of Flagstaff and the U.S. Department of Transportation, Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) for the construction of a Snow Removal Equipment Building (SREB) - Phase 2.

Ratify the Grant Agreement with the Federal Aviation Administration for the Airport Snow Removal Equipment Building - Phase 2 for grant funds in the amount of \$5,772,047.

- C. Consideration and Approval of Contract:** Cooperative purchase through State of Arizona cooperative contract #CTR062609 with MSS Business Transformation Advisory, Inc. for CAD/RMS Migration Consulting.
1. Approve a cooperative purchase through State of Arizona cooperative contract #CTR062609 with MSS Business Transformation Advisory, Inc. in the amount of \$150,000, plus the current local tax rate; and
 2. Authorize the City Manager to execute all necessary documents.
- D. Consideration and Approval of Contract:** Approve the Software Agreement with Emphasys Computer Solutions, Inc. in the amount of \$363,406.00, plus the current local tax rate for Elite Cloud Migration.
1. Approve the five-year Software Agreement with Emphasys Computer Solutions, Inc. (Emphasys) for implementation and software maintenance in the amount of \$363,406.00, plus the current local tax rate; and
 2. Authorize the City Manager to execute all necessary documents.

- E. Consideration and Approval of Meeting Cancellations:** Work Session of November 11, 2025 and Work Session of November 25, 2025

Cancel the Work Session of November 11, 2025 and Work Session of November 25, 2025

- F. Consideration and Approval of Contract:** Five-year contract through Cooperative Contract Sourcewell #101223-AXN for the AXON Officer Safety Plan Bundle.

Councilmember House raised concerns about the reliance on AI and the potential for bias. Chief Connolly assured that safeguards were in place and emphasized the importance of training officers to review AI-generated reports. Chief Information Officer CJ Perry shared that the system was more of a transcription service, and he had a high level of confidence that those types of biases would not occur.

Councilmember Garcia asked about the importance of body cameras. Chief Connolly offered that being able to capture the events that occur during a police interaction provides a system of accountability along with transparency to the public.

Moved by Councilmember Khara House, **seconded by** Councilmember Anthony Garcia to approve the five-year contract for the AXON Officer Safety Plan Bundle in the amount of \$3,579,459.40 through Cooperative Contract Sourcewell #101223-AXN to AXON for the AXON AB4 Flex POV, the AXON Taser 10 equipment and related software licenses. In FY 2025-26 we will be required to pay \$486,338.29 and \$773,280.26 every year after for four (4) years and authorize the City Manager to execute the necessary documents.

Vote: 7 - 0 - Unanimously

- G. Consideration and Approval of Contract:** This contract with SWCA, Incorporated DBA SWCA Environmental Consultants, will initiate an update to the Greater Flagstaff Region Community Wildfire Protection Plan.
1. Staff recommends City Council approve this contract with SWCA with payment not to exceed \$259,390.00.
 2. Authorize the City Manager to execute all necessary documents.

H. Consideration and Approval of Contract: This contract with SWCA will implement heritage surveys required for prescribed fire clearance across priority areas of the Flagstaff Ranger District, Coconino National Forest.

1. Staff recommends City Council approve this contract with SWCA with payment not to exceed \$1,210,591.00.
2. Authorize the City Manager to execute all necessary documents.

10. ROUTINE ITEMS

A. Consideration and Adoption of Resolution No. 2025-46 and Ordinance No. 2025-19: A Resolution of the City Council of the City of Flagstaff, Coconino County, Arizona, declaring as a public record that certain document filed with the City Clerk entitled "PZ-25-00028 - High Occupancy Housing Update" and an Ordinance of the City Council of the City of Flagstaff, Coconino County, Arizona, amending the Flagstaff City Code, Title 10, Flagstaff Zoning Code.

Moved by Councilmember Khara House, **seconded by** Councilmember Lori Matthews to read Ordinance No. 2025-19 by title only for the final time.

Vote: 7 - 0 - Unanimously

Moved by Councilmember Lori Matthews, **seconded by** Vice Mayor Miranda Sweet to adopt Resolution No. 2025-46.

Vote: 7 - 0 - Unanimously

AN ORDINANCE OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF FLAGSTAFF, AMENDING THE FLAGSTAFF CITY CODE, TITLE 10, FLAGSTAFF ZONING CODE, BY ADOPTING BY REFERENCE THAT CERTAIN DOCUMENT ENTITLED "PZ-25-00028 -- HIGH OCCUPANCY HOUSING UPDATE"; PROVIDING FOR REPEAL OF CONFLICTING ORDINANCES, SEVERABILITY, AUTHORITY FOR CLERICAL CORRECTIONS, AND ESTABLISHING AN EFFECTIVE DATE

Moved by Councilmember Khara House, **seconded by** Councilmember Lori Matthews to adopt Ordinance No. 2025-19.

Vote: 7 - 0 - Unanimously

B. Consideration and Approval of Planned Residential Development allowances and modifications to Engineering Standards: STL 405, LLC requests Planned Residential Development (PRD) allowances and Engineering modifications for "STL 405 -- Pine Canyon Expansion", a 54-lot subdivision on 77.7 acres in the Rural Residential (RR) Zone within the Resource Protection Overlay (RPO).

Planner Ben Mejia provided a PowerPoint presentation that covered the following:

STL 405 PINE CANYON EXPANSION
REQUEST OVERVIEW
VICINITY MAP
BACKGROUND

PRD -- DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS

PRD -- COMMUNITY SPACE

PRD -- DESIGN ELEMENTS

REQUESTS FOR MODIFICATION TO ENGINEERING STANDARDS

MODIFICATION #1: TYPICAL URBAN CUL-DE-SAC - MODIFIED BACK OF CURB RADII (DETAIL NO. 10-04-010)

MODIFICATION #2: RESIDENTIAL LOCAL "WIDE" STREET SECTION - MODIFY TO ELIMINATE SIDEWALKS (DETAIL NO. 10-09-037).

MODIFICATION #3: RESIDENTIAL LOCAL STREET SECTION - MODIFY TO ELIMINATE SIDEWALKS (DETAIL NO. 13-10-09-038).

MODIFICATION #4: ENTRY ROAD - MODIFICATION TO STREET SECTION (DETAIL NO. 10-09-038).

MODIFICATION #5: ENTRY ROAD - MODIFICATION TO STREET SECTION (DETAIL NO. 10-09-038) FOR VEHICULAR GATES.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Lindsay Schube with Gammage and Burnam requested approval of the preliminary plat, including modification 5, which would allow a gate at the proposed expansion of Pine Canyon. She acknowledged ongoing ideological objections to gated communities in Flagstaff but emphasized that Pine Canyon had historically been a gated development and that this phase continued that pattern. She expressed appreciation for staff collaboration and committed to finalizing a Memorandum of Understanding to resolve traffic concerns well before the final plat returned for consideration.

Councilmember Garcia asked for clarification on the tree resources in the steep slope protection area. Mr. Mejia explained that residential projects must preserve at least 50% of tree and forest resources, typically documented in a Natural Resource Protection Plan. That plan was not included because the application, one of the first under the new subdivision code, focused only on the planned residential development standards and requested engineering modifications. Although the plan was not provided, staff confirmed that the project was compliant with all resource protection requirements, including the 50% preservation standard for both the overall site and the golf course tract. The steep-slope protections were also verified during the review.

Councilmember Garcia asked about sidewalks and if there was a reason they were not included in the project. Mr. Mejia explained that Pine Canyon developed without sidewalks, and they were continuing that through the development pattern.

Councilmember Garcia then asked for more information on the traffic and gate access concerns. City Engineer Paul Mood offered that the concern was that the existing Pine Canyon gate on John Wesley Powell (JWP) often caused morning construction traffic to back up significantly, which was currently manageable only because the road dead-ends. Once the road extension project was completed, such backups would be unacceptable. Staff reviewed the proposed Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) submitted and felt confident that it would address the issue and that projected residential traffic should be adequately accommodated. There was sufficient stacking distance at the gate for regular resident entry and exit; the primary concern was construction-related traffic, which the MOU was intended to mitigate.

Councilmember Spence asked whether traffic-calming features were required for the project and questioned how the applicant could count a proposed traffic circle on JWP toward those requirements rather than placing calming elements inside the subdivision. Mr. Meja explained that while most subdivision roads were typically dedicated to the public, the interior roads in the project would remain private. However, the subdivision would dedicate the full length of the John Wesley Powell extension, and the applicant was responsible for designing that roadway. Because of that, it was determined that the proposed traffic circle on JWP could qualify as the project's traffic-calming element.

Ms. Schube added that the roundabout was intentionally designed as a calming feature along JWP and at the subdivision entry. Other engineering modifications, such as reduced pavement and a meandering roadway, also contributed to calming vehicle speeds and reducing infrastructure footprint.

Vice Mayor Sweet expressed support for accessory dwelling units (ADUs) and was pleased that setback standards would not prevent them. She asked whether ADUs were anticipated within the development and how the applicant planned to encourage them. Ms. Schube stated that they did expect and intended to encourage ADUs. Because many homes would be custom-built, lot sizes and setbacks would allow owners to incorporate ADUs into their designs. They planned to educate prospective homeowners and promote ADU options as part of the development process.

Vice Mayor Sweet then asked about planned infrastructure to support multimodal transportation. Ms.

Schube explained that Pine Canyon was intended to function as a multimodal community, even without traditional interior sidewalks. She highlighted expected connections to the FUTS trail system, opportunities for bike and pedestrian access, and integration with nearby mixed-use areas on adjacent state trust land. The surrounding commercial and recreational amenities like cafes, dining, parks, and trails were intended to make it easier for residents to walk or bike rather than rely on cars.

Councilmember Matthews asked whether the project was being reviewed under the resource protection pilot program or the existing standards, and staff confirmed it was under the existing standards. She contrasted the project's tree-preservation requirements with recent Forest Service work near JWP, where more than half the trees were removed, and how dramatically it changed the character of the area.

Moved by Councilmember Khara House, **seconded by** Councilmember Lori Matthews to approve the use of PRD standards subject to the following conditions:

1. If a conditional use permit for the golf course facility is not granted, all reference to the golf course use must be removed on all future submittals and an alternative PRD design element shall be elected by the applicant. The Planning Director shall determine compliance with the design element elected.

Vote: 7 - 0 - Unanimously

Moved by Councilmember Khara House, **seconded by** Vice Mayor Miranda Sweet to approve the requests for modifications to Engineering Standards #1-4 subject to the following conditions:

1. Civil engineering plans and final plat for STL 405 Pine Canyon Expansion must meet the recommended conditions of approval as written in the City Engineer Response to Engineering Modification Requests dated May 22, 2025.

Vote: 7 - 0 - Unanimously

Moved by Councilmember Khara House, **seconded by** Councilmember Lori Matthews to approve the request for modification to Engineering Standards #5 with the following conditions of approval:

1. A Memorandum of Understanding shall be executed prior to approval of the final plat that includes:
2. A resolution to traffic impacts on John Wesley Powell Boulevard, to the satisfaction of the City Engineer.
3. Use of the gate will abide by the regulations for public access as allowed by the existing Pine Canyon DA.

Vote: 7 - 0 - Unanimously

11. PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS

- A. Consideration and Adoption of Resolution No. 2025-54, Resolution No. 2025-55, and Ordinance No. 2025-21:** A resolution of the Flagstaff City Council, repealing Resolution No. 2017-03 related to ParkFlag District fees; repeal of conflicting resolutions; and establishing an effective date; a resolution of the Flagstaff City Council declaring as a public record that certain documents filed with the City Clerk and entitled "2025 ParkFlag Code Amendments"; and an ordinance of the City Council of the City of Flagstaff, amending the Flagstaff City Code, Title 3 Business Regulations, to establish parking and permit fees for the ParkFlag District, and Title 9 Traffic, to update provisions related to the Comprehensive Parking Management Program and duties of the Office of the Parking Manager; providing for penalties, repeal of conflicting ordinances, severability, authority for clerical corrections, and establishing an effective date

Mayor Daggett opened the public hearing.

ParkFlag Manager Gail Brockman and Management Services Director Rick Tadder provided a PowerPoint presentation that covered the following:

PARKFLAG DOWNTOWN PARKING RATE INCREASE
ORDINANCE FIRST READ
BACKGROUND
PROGRAM IMPLEMENTATION
PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT
CHANGING EXPENSES
PROGRAM HISTORY
IMPROVEMENTS
REVENUE, LOCKBOX AND OTHER CONSIDERATIONS
PROPOSAL
PERMIT EXPANSIONS
ENHANCED SERVICES
PARKFLAG RATES AND FEES ANALYSIS
FINANCIAL OVERVIEW
FINANCIAL OVERVIEW -- REVENUES
FINANCIAL OVERVIEW -- USES OF FUNDS
FINANCIAL OVERVIEW -- FUND BALANCE
FINANCIAL OVERVIEW -- LOCKBOX
FINANCIAL SUMMARY
PUBLIC COMMENTS
LOOKING AHEAD
TIMELINE FOR ADOPTION

Mr. Clifton offered that the discussion was the culmination of several years of work between city staff and the downtown business community. Throughout those discussions, two issues had consistently dominated conversations, parking and enhanced services downtown. The proposed parking rate increase was rooted in the business community's desire to fund and improve services in the downtown area. While additional revenue would help sustain internal operations, most of the new funds generated, particularly through the lockbox mechanism, would be reinvested directly back into downtown enhancements. He highlighted the fortunate timing of multiple efforts coming together including rising lockbox revenues, two pending parking-related projects, and growing momentum around enhanced downtown services. It created an opportunity to advance improved parking infrastructure and enhanced services in a way that aligned with long-standing priorities of the downtown business community.

Councilmember House asked for confirmation about the research conducted on comparable paid-parking rates in similar cities. Staff explained that the rate study included a review of municipalities, university towns, and private lots. Overall, most comparable cities fell within the \$1.50-\$3.00 per hour range.

Councilmember House also asked whether the city's discussions about EV charging rates or program expansion related to the parking rate proposal. Staff indicated that they did consider EV charging in the rate study but currently treated it as a separate operational discussion. Existing chargers in downtown were limited and concentrated at the Visitor Center, City Hall, county buildings, and at the airport. The placement and pricing strategy was tied to visitor convenience, sustainability collaboration, and anticipated future expansion, especially at the airport.

Councilmember House then asked about the implementation of the proposed "\$1 for the first half hour, \$2 for the full hour" structure. Staff clarified that the system could recognize session extensions and automatically charge the higher rate if the user extended within the active session or shortly after it expired. However, if someone returned late and started a new session manually, the system may treat it as another half-hour purchase. This could be addressed through software updates, which would take roughly a month plus kiosk updates, and staff believed the structure was operationally feasible.

Councilmember Matthews asked how the vendor permit worked. Ms. Brockman explained that vendors who were visiting multiple downtown businesses to take orders or handle invoices in a regular vehicle could purchase a \$10 a month employee parking permit which would allow them to part in designated employee zones.

Councilmember Matthews mentioned the commitment made when the old courthouse was torn down to provide 200 downtown parking spaces. While there had been past discussions about that commitment, it remained a priority due to community trust concerns. Community Investment Director Dave McIntire stated that the city was actively working to create the 200 spaces, with a long-term goal of 450 spaces under the lockbox ordinance. Approximately 150 surface lot spots existed, but they were not counted as permanent since some were on parcels like the Foundation for Senior Living (FSL) site, which could change hands or uses. He highlighted potential parking solutions including spaces north of the courthouse, a partnership with a downtown hotel under design review, or a surface lot that could be integrated into a parking garage as part of the downtown connection center. He explained that purchasing lots downtown was challenging and not considered the best use of prime real estate. Instead, the city sought partnerships with developers to integrate parking with other uses, such as affordable housing.

Vice Mayor Sweet asked how the city would ensure that the enhanced downtown services funded by the recent increase were actually delivered and made visible to local businesses, residents, and tourists. Staff explained that if a third party was responsible for providing the services, they would be placed under a formal agreement approved by City Council. The agreement would include a clearly defined scope of services, which would serve as the basis for holding the vendor accountable. The city would oversee implementation to ensure the services were delivered as intended.

There were questions about the development or availability of a regular parking report. Staff shared that while a detailed parking report existed, it had not been issued annually in the past. Moving forward, they planned to produce an annual or semi-annual report on parking and related programs, including financials and progress updates, to clearly communicate how funds were being used

Councilmember Garcia asked how the lockbox worked. Staff explained that the "lockbox" was a restricted fund established by ordinance, which required setting aside 20% of every dollar collected from parking, whether at kiosks or through permits, exclusively for adding to the downtown parking inventory. Currently, the lockbox held approximately \$2 million, which had not yet been spent. She explained that building structured parking was very costly, with garages averaging \$50,000 to \$65,000 per space, meaning the current funds covered only a small portion of the needed investment. Revenue growth was also slowed during COVID when the program was temporarily suspended. To address the funding gap, the city was exploring partnerships and other mechanisms, including debt financing, to expand parking without waiting for the lockbox to fully grow, while acknowledging that progress may appear slow due to the high costs of downtown parking development.

Councilmember Garcia asked about the availability and cost of workforce or employee parking downtown. He expressed concern that high parking costs could be burdensome for employees earning minimum wage. Staff explained that employee parking operated on a first-come, first-serve basis, with permits sold according to available spaces. Recently, 91 spaces were added at the FSL lot to accommodate both pay-to-park and employee permit holders. Currently, roughly 400 employee permits had been sold, with many allocated to shift workers or students, and there were still plenty of available spaces, particularly on the north side of downtown. On the south side, fewer spaces existed, but plans were underway to expand employee parking zones in anticipation of future downtown projects that could reduce available spots. Pay-to-park hours were clarified as 9:00 AM to 5:00 PM Sunday through Thursday, extending to 8:00 PM on Friday and Saturday.

Councilmember Aslan expressed support for the proposed \$1 per half-hour parking rate, seeing it as a balanced approach. He emphasized that discussions about downtown services should not be limited to traditional items like trash pickup or litter control, but should also include infrastructure, aesthetics, and overall beautification, creating a unified theme for downtown Flagstaff over time. He also highlighted the importance of flexibility in parking garage design, suggesting that future shifts in transportation or parking needs could allow the structures to be repurposed for other uses. He noted

that while pursuing the 200 additional parking spaces was important, a dispersed approach to parking, rather than concentrating all spaces in a single large structure, would better serve the downtown area and reduce walking burdens for visitors.

John VanLandingham and Jean Christie addressed Council regarding downtown parking.

The following comments were received:

- Park Flag was created in 2016 to manage parking demand downtown and establish the lock box for future parking.
- There is a need for rate increase, inflation and growing downtown activity mean the original rates no longer go as far; the proposed increase supports both additional services and inflation adjustments.
- Strong support for annual reports from the ParkFlag program to show revenue, expenses, and build community trust.
- Suggest keeping or lowering fees at the surface lot north of the new courthouse if rates are raised elsewhere.
- The 200 structured parking spots promised in the 2016 courthouse bond are a separate commitment and should not be funded by the lock box.
- Questioned the necessity of spending money to update meters to industry standards immediately, suggesting waiting to save funds.
- Encouraged city employees and councilmembers to take buses or bike to work to set an example for sustainability, even if dress codes or convenience may be a factor.

There being no further public comment, Mayor Daggett closed the public hearing.

Councilmember Matthews reinforced the importance of producing an annual report for the enterprise fund, it was essential for transparency and addressing community questions. The upcoming parking fee increase would support enhanced services, including beautification efforts to improve benches, trash cans, and overall aesthetics, as well as better trash pickup and snow removal in the downtown area. The goal was to make downtown cleaner, more uniform, and more appealing for tourism. She acknowledged staff's hard work on the issues and looked forward to seeing improved results in the future.

Councilmember Garcia suggested exploring the feasibility of collecting data to understand how many locals versus tourists were using parking because it could inform future programming. There had been positive impacts from the paid parking program and how the program had made parking more efficient and convenient for customers. He expressed appreciation for the outreach from small businesses sharing their experiences.

Vice Mayor Sweet thanked everyone involved for their hard work and expressed support for the rate increase; it made sense and was timely given downtown's growth as a destination. She highlighted the anticipated benefits, including cleaner streets, safer walkways and alleyways, restroom maintenance, graffiti removal, and general upkeep. Enhanced services were long overdue, and she expressed enthusiasm for seeing their positive impact on downtown.

Moved by Councilmember Lori Matthews, **seconded by** Vice Mayor Miranda Sweet to read Resolution No. 2025-54 by title only.

Vote: 7 - 0 - Unanimously

A RESOLUTION OF THE FLAGSTAFF CITY COUNCIL, REPEALING RESOLUTION NO. 2017-03 RELATED TO PARKFLAG DISTRICT FEES; REPEAL OF CONFLICTING RESOLUTIONS; AND ESTABLISHING AN EFFECTIVE DATE

Moved by Vice Mayor Miranda Sweet, **seconded by** Councilmember Lori Matthews to read Resolution No. 2025-55 by title only.

Vote: 7 - 0 - Unanimously

A RESOLUTION OF THE FLAGSTAFF CITY COUNCIL DECLARING AS A PUBLIC RECORD THAT

CERTAIN DOCUMENT FILED WITH THE CITY CLERK AND ENTITLED "2025 PARKFLAG CODE AMENDMENTS"

Moved by Councilmember Lori Matthews, **seconded by** Councilmember Khara House to read Ordinance No. 2025-21 by title only for the first time.

Vote: 7 - 0 - Unanimously

AN ORDINANCE OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF FLAGSTAFF, AMENDING THE FLAGSTAFF CITY CODE, TITLE 3 BUSINESS REGULATIONS, TO ESTABLISH PARKING AND PERMIT FEES FOR THE PARKFLAG DISTRICT, AND TITLE 9 TRAFFIC, TO UPDATE PROVISIONS RELATED TO THE COMPREHENSIVE PARKING MANAGEMENT PROGRAM AND DUTIES OF THE OFFICE OF THE PARKING MANAGER BY ADOPTING BY REFERENCE THAT CERTAIN DOCUMENT ENTITLED "2025 PARKFLAG CODE AMENDMENTS"; PROVIDING FOR PENALTIES, REPEAL OF CONFLICTING ORDINANCES, SEVERABILITY, AUTHORITY FOR CLERICAL CORRECTIONS, AND ESTABLISHING AN EFFECTIVE DATE

A break was held from 5:36 p.m. through 5:55 p.m.

12. REGULAR AGENDA

- A. Consideration and Adoption of Resolution No. 2025-48:** A resolution of the Flagstaff City Council, approving an amendment to the Intergovernmental Agreement between the Summit Fire and Medical District; the Highlands Fire District; and the City of Flagstaff for joint hiring and promotional processes.

Fire Administration Manager Jessica Vigorito provided a PowerPoint presentation that covered the following:

FIRE JOINT HIRING AGREEMENT
HISTORY
JOINT HIRING & PROMOTIONAL PROCESS IGA

Mayor Daggett expressed her appreciation for the partnership and ensuring that all firefighters in the region are trained in the same manner.

Moved by Councilmember Khara House, **seconded by** Vice Mayor Miranda Sweet to read Resolution No. 2025-48 by title only.

Vote: 7 - 0 - Unanimously

A RESOLUTION OF THE FLAGSTAFF CITY COUNCIL, APPROVING AN INTERGOVERNMENTAL AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE SUMMIT FIRE AND MEDICAL DISTRICT, THE PINWOOD FIRE DISTRICT, THE HIGHLANDS FIRE DISTRICT THE CITY OF FLAGSTAFF FOR JOINT HIRING AND PROMOTIONAL PROCESSES

Moved by Councilmember Khara House, **seconded by** Councilmember Lori Matthews to adopt Resolution No. 2025-48.

Vote: 7 - 0 - Unanimously

- B. Consideration and Adoption of Resolution No. 2025-52 and Ordinance No. 2025-20:** A Resolution of the City Council of the City of Flagstaff, Coconino County, Arizona declaring as a public record that certain document filed with the City Clerk and entitled "2025 Amendments To Flagstaff City Code, Title 13, Engineering Design Standards And Specifications For New Infrastructure" and an Ordinance of the City of Flagstaff, Coconino County, Arizona, amending the Flagstaff City Code, Title 13, Engineering Design Standards And Specifications For New Infrastructure.

Development Engineer David Millis and Engineering Project Manager Robert Thompson provided a PowerPoint presentation that covered the following:

TITLE 13 AMENDMENTS AMENDING ENGINEERING STANDARDS TO ALLOW MICRO-TRENCHING
MICRO-TRENCHING
WHAT IS MICRO-TRENCHING
PILOT PROJECT
PILOT PROJECT CONSTRUCTION
PILOT PROJECT FINISHED CONDITIONS
PUBLIC OUTREACH AND FEEDBACK
MICRO-TRENCHING BENEFITS
MICRO-TRENCHING RISKS
COMMUNITY AND STAFFING IMPACTS

Council discussed public feedback concerning micro-trenching, particularly regarding frost depth and road integrity. Staff explained that the frost line was a primary concern for water utilities and was less critical for dry utilities like fiber. Existing city engineering standards required 24 inches of cover, which was sufficient given the local frost depth of 30 inches. Comparisons with other mountainous communities and feedback from municipalities using similar installations showed no evidence that deeper trenching was necessary, and going deeper would require larger equipment that may not be feasible.

The conversation also addressed staffing and costs. While micro-trenching offered cost savings primarily for providers, additional city staff may be needed to manage permits and community impacts. Although a new staff position was not requested, potential funding could come from IT project funds or ongoing revenue. Permit management practices, such as limiting the number of simultaneous permits per provider, helped ensure staff resources were not overwhelmed.

Regarding road longevity, there was no indication from colder climates or other municipalities that micro-trenching negatively impacted road integrity. In older areas, it could fill existing gaps and be beneficial, whereas in newer roads, the impact was neutral. The technology had been in use for at least five years in the U.S., with the City of Mesa leading local adoption. California and regional bodies like the Maricopa Association of Governments had begun establishing standards and best practices, which were referenced in developing local standards.

Staff considered multiple providers and conduit usage. Standards allowed for up to two providers with specific cut locations, and additional providers were handled on a case-by-case basis. Typically, multiple providers did not overlap in the same neighborhoods, reducing the likelihood of repeated cuts in the same areas. Overall, the approach balanced efficiency for providers with careful oversight of community and infrastructure impacts.

Moved by Councilmember Anthony Garcia, **seconded by** Vice Mayor Miranda Sweet to read Resolution No. 2025-52 by title only.

Vote: 7 - 0 - Unanimously

A RESOLUTION OF THE FLAGSTAFF CITY COUNCIL DECLARING AS A PUBLIC RECORD THAT CERTAIN DOCUMENT FILED WITH THE CITY CLERK AND ENTITLED "2025 AMENDMENTS TO FLAGSTAFF CITY CODE, TITLE 13, ENGINEERING DESIGN STANDARDS AND SPECIFICATIONS FOR NEW INFRASTRUCTURE"

Moved by Councilmember Lori Matthews, **seconded by** Councilmember Anthony Garcia to read Ordinance No. 2025-20 by title only for the first time.

Vote: 7 - 0 - Unanimously

AN ORDINANCE OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF FLAGSTAFF, AMENDING THE FLAGSTAFF CITY CODE, TITLE 13 ENGINEERING DESIGN STANDARDS AND

SPECIFICATIONS FOR NEW INFRASTRUCTURE, BY ADOPTING BY REFERENCE THAT CERTAIN DOCUMENT ENTITLED "2025 AMENDMENTS TO FLAGSTAFF CITY CODE, TITLE 13, ENGINEERING DESIGN STANDARDS AND SPECIFICATIONS FOR NEW INFRASTRUCTURE"; PROVIDING FOR PENALTIES, REPEAL OF CONFLICTING ORDINANCES, SEVERABILITY, AND ESTABLISHING AN EFFECTIVE DATE

- C. Consideration and Adoption of Resolution No. 2025-51:** A resolution of the Flagstaff City Council establishing an amount of effluent/reclaimed water to be released into the Rio de Flag subject to advanced water purification technological options, regulations and availability.

City Attorney Sterling Solomon addressed Council and stated that in 2010, the city entered an agreement with Arizona Game and Fish to release 200 gallons per minute of reclaimed water weekly for 20 years. Recognizing the benefits of supporting riparian habitat, the city would like to extend the program on a long-term basis, while accommodating evolving water purification technology, regulations, and availability.

Moved by Councilmember Lori Matthews, **seconded by** Vice Mayor Miranda Sweet to read Resolution No. 2025-51 by title only.

Vote: 7 - 0 - Unanimously

A RESOLUTION OF THE FLAGSTAFF CITY COUNCIL ESTABLISHING AN AMOUNT OF EFFLUENT/RECLAIMED WATER TO BE RELEASED INTO THE RIO DE FLAG SUBJECT TO ADVANCED WATER PURIFICATION TECHNOLOGICAL OPTIONS, REGULATIONS, AND AVAILABILITY

Moved by Councilmember Lori Matthews, **seconded by** Councilmember Anthony Garcia to adopt Resolution No. 2025-51.

Vote: 7 - 0 - Unanimously

- D. Consideration and Adoption of Resolution No. 2025-50:** A resolution of the Flagstaff City Council, approving an Intergovernmental Agreement (IGA) between the State of Arizona through the Arizona Department of Transportation and City of Flagstaff for the Arizona State Match Advantage for Rural Transportation (AZ SMART) Match Reimbursement for the Downtown Mile Safety and Connectivity Improvement Project.

Grants, Contracts, and Emergency Management Director Stacey Brechler-Knaggs addressed Council and stated that the agreement with ADOT was for the AZ SMART grant match reimbursement for the downtown mile safety and connectivity improvement project. The city sought approval for a \$32.4 million grant, bringing the total construction award to \$56.3 million. By applying for a federal grant, the city was also eligible for a \$3 million matching grant through Arizona Smart, reducing the local match from \$12.8 million to \$9.8 million. Additionally, BNSF was contributing an \$11 million match, creating strong leverage between federal, state, local, and private funding.

Moved by Vice Mayor Miranda Sweet, **seconded by** Councilmember Khara House to read Resolution No. 2025-50 by title only.

Vote: 7 - 0 - Unanimously

A RESOLUTION OF THE FLAGSTAFF CITY COUNCIL, APPROVING AN INTERGOVERNMENTAL AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE STATE OF ARIZONA AND THE CITY OF FLAGSTAFF FOR THE ARIZONA STATE MATCH ADVANTAGE FOR RURAL TRANSPORTATION (AZ SMART) FUND AWARD FOR THE DOWNTOWN MILE SAFETY AND CONNECTIVITY IMPROVEMENT PROJECT

Moved by Councilmember Khara House, **seconded by** Vice Mayor Miranda Sweet to adopt Resolution No. 2025-50.

Vote: 7 - 0 - Unanimously

- E. Consideration and Adoption of Resolution No. 2025-49:** A resolution of the Flagstaff City Council, approving an Intergovernmental Agreement for a Cooperative Purchasing Agreement between the Arizona Board of Regents for and on behalf of Northern Arizona University to pursue a range of clean energy projects to meet carbon neutrality goals.

Sustainability Director Nicole Antonopoulos provided a PowerPoint presentation that covered the following:

VIRTUAL POWER PURCHASE AGREEMENT
AGENDA
1. RECAP OF VIRTUAL POWER PURCHASE AGREEMENT
ROLE OF A VIRTUAL POWER PURCHASE AGREEMENT
THE CITY'S CURRENT CLEAN ENERGY PORTFOLIO
2. THE INTERGOVERNMENTAL AGREEMENT
INTERGOVERNMENTAL AGREEMENT
SOLICITATION DRAFT SCORING
3. NEXT STEPS
VPPA DRAFT TIMELINE

Council and staff discussed how the city participated in the Green Power Partner program. The program allowed the city to buy renewable energy credits based on its monthly consumption of electricity. The city generated some of its own electricity, they purchased electricity from Hoover Dam, and everything else that did not qualify as clean or renewable energy, the city purchased credits.

The city purchased roughly 36,000 MWh of renewable energy credits annually to offset its entire municipal electricity use, including its own generation and Hoover Dam purchases. Those credits ensured the city met its carbon neutrality goals. Some concerns were raised about the portion of offsets coming from external sources rather than local emission reductions.

Staff further explained that energy consumption fluctuated annually, particularly in Water Services, and the city was pursuing energy efficiency measures to stabilize costs. Participation in a consortium allowed the city to leverage its buying power to negotiate better prices. While Phoenix was initially part of the intergovernmental agreement, recent staff turnover had delayed their formal participation. Even without Phoenix, the consortium could still achieve significant economies of scale and access large-scale renewable projects, though Phoenix's eventual involvement would enhance opportunities.

Councilmember Aslan stated that he anticipated partners coming into the program on an ongoing basis as time moved forward, he asked what other entities might be able to join in. Dr. Erik Neilsen shared that several other public entities and non-profits had shown interest in the consortium and were monitoring the model Flagstaff and NAU were putting together. Many organizations shared similar clean-energy and carbon-reduction goals but achieving them was difficult in a state without competitive wholesale or retail electricity markets. The structure of the IGA allowed additional partners to join later, provided current members approved their inclusion, creating the potential for a growing coalition over time.

Flagstaff's role as the first partner to formally step into the agreement highlighted a strong city--university partnership, with NAU having designed its climate action plan to complement and support the city's own goals. Together, they were positioning themselves as early leaders in the state and creating momentum that could draw in additional participants as the effort expands.

Councilmember Garcia asked whether the city was leading the way in the state by pursuing the initiative. If that was the case, he felt comfortable embracing the associated risk, noting that it did not appear to be a high-stakes gamble but rather a carefully measured one, supported by built-in safeguards that allowed the city to monitor progress and step back if needed. Staff reiterated that the agreement was non-binding. They reviewed the upcoming process: if the city and all other participating agencies approved their agreements, NAU would issue a solicitation on behalf of the consortium. The city would then evaluate the proposals using a process similar to its own

procurement system. Staff assured the Council that they would only return with a recommendation that was financially sound and avoided excessive expenditures.

Councilmember Matthews asked about the \$10,000 contribution toward legal or consulting services. Staff clarified that the city was not being asked to commit any immediate funding. Costs would only arise if the city ultimately entered into an agreement with a virtual power purchase agreement developer, and even then, the expenses would be shared and capped. Up to that point, NAU had shouldered the financial responsibility for engaging consultants and moving the work forward. Council would still have ample time to review and discuss the broader risks, the fluctuation concerns, the guardrails that would be put in place, and the full list of participating partners before making any formal decision.

Moved by Vice Mayor Miranda Sweet, **seconded by** Councilmember Khara House to read Resolution No. 2025-49 by title only.

Vote: 7 - 0 - Unanimously

A RESOLUTION OF THE FLAGSTAFF CITY COUNCIL, APPROVING AN INTERGOVERNMENTAL AGREEMENT BETWEEN ARIZONA BOARD OF REGENTS FOR AND ON BEHALF OF NORTHERN ARIZONA UNIVERSITY AND THE CITY OF FLAGSTAFF FOR COOPERATIVE PURCHASING INTERGOVERNMENTAL AGREEMENT

Moved by Councilmember Austin Aslan, **seconded by** Councilmember Anthony Garcia to adopt Resolution No. 2025-49.

Vote: 7 - 0 - Unanimously

- F. Consideration and Adoption of Resolution No. 2025-47:** A resolution of the Flagstaff City Council, approving an Intergovernmental Agreement (IGA) between the City of Flagstaff and the State of Arizona, acting by and through the Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) for the design and construction of a traffic signal at the intersection of W. Route 66 and Woody Mountain Road.

Deputy City Manager Joanne Keene and City Engineer Paul Mood provided a PowerPoint presentation that covered the following:

ADOT IGA W. ROUTE 66 AND WOODY MOUNTAIN RD. TRAFFIC SIGNAL
ADOT TRAFFIC SIGNAL IGA
EXISTING CONDITIONS

Councilmember Aslan indicated that improvements in the area were clearly necessary, especially with significant new development expected to increase traffic. Staff mentioned the prospect of a future roundabout, which was the preferred permanent solution. He asked for clarification on how installing a temporary traffic signal might jeopardize the long-term plan. He was also interested in more details about how long the temporary signal would be in place and what form it would take, along with the expected duration and appearance of the temporary setup.

Mr. Mood explained that the temporary traffic signal would be constructed with wood poles, overhead span wire, and standard signal heads, similar to the setup at Butler and 4th Street. If the long-term plan ultimately included a roundabout, the temporary signal was considered the most practical interim solution because it could operate for a year or two while preserving flexibility for the future redesign. He also explained that although the city had about \$11 million in Proposition 419 funding designated for West Route 66, the money was allocated over multiple years rather than available in a single lump sum which limited the ability to launch a full-scale permanent project immediately. A temporary signal could potentially be installed by the end of the year, whereas a permanent signal would take much longer due to equipment availability, and it would come at a much higher cost. He added that discussions with Senator Rogers suggested that any unspent money from the signal project could be redirected toward broader corridor improvements. There may also be opportunities next year for legislative or MetroPlan funding requests, though those typically result in partial awards rather than full project coverage. Overall, staff anticipated that meaningful improvements at the intersection could realistically occur within the next two to three years.

Councilmember Aslan asked about the overall plan for the area, the timeline, and how it worked with other projects around the city. Mr. Mood explained that the \$11 million from Proposition 419 was already programmed in the city's CIP, specifically for improvements along the West Route 66 corridor. That funding was intended to support future partnerships with ADOT and to help leverage grants, but it was not enough to immediately launch major construction. The next step was to begin actively pursuing grant opportunities once the West Route 66 Operational Assessment received formal approval from the MetroPlan board. At that point, the city and its regional partners would start exploring every possible funding avenue, but the exact timing remained uncertain.

MetroPlan Executive Director Kate Morely added that the operational assessment would be presented to the board the following day. Over the past year and a half, a project advisory group made up of staff from the city, ADOT, MetroPlan, and Mountain Line had developed a comprehensive long-term vision for the corridor. The full build-out plan, including roundabouts at key intersections, carried a price tag of roughly \$32 million. With the city's \$11 million in Prop 419 funds and the additional \$2 million appropriation from Senator Rogers, the region was still far short of the full amount needed. Because of the funding gap, the advisory group had acknowledged that the roundabouts may need to be removed from the initial implementation if full project funding was not secured, replacing them with traffic signals instead. While roundabouts remained the preferred long-term solution, the temporary signal project and incremental improvements helped move the corridor closer to that vision, even if the full buildout would require continued funding efforts and phased progress over time.

There were questions about how the \$1.9 million allocated through the IGA could be used, given the long-term vision for the intersection. Staff clarified that the IGA was explicit that a traffic signal must be installed, and the city would comply by moving forward with a temporary signal to address immediate safety needs driven by new housing in the area. The cost of that temporary signal was expected to be only a few hundred thousand dollars, leaving roughly \$1.5 million available for additional improvements, such as a future roundabout, once more funding was secured. Accepting the funds did not limit the city's ability to pursue its broader vision for the corridor. The remaining money could support long-term solutions, and nothing in the agreement prevented the city from choosing a different form of permanent traffic control. The funding was very beneficial, provided immediate safety relief, and still allowed the city to shape the long-term design of the area.

Moved by Councilmember Lori Matthews, **seconded by** Vice Mayor Miranda Sweet to read Resolution No. 2025-47 by title only.

Vote: 7 - 0 - Unanimously

A RESOLUTION OF THE FLAGSTAFF CITY COUNCIL, APPROVING AN INTERGOVERNMENTAL AGREEMENT BETWEEN ARIZONA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION AND THE CITY OF FLAGSTAFF FOR THE DESIGN AND CONSTRUCTION OF A TRAFFIC SIGNAL AT THE INTERSECTION OF WOODY MOUNTAIN ROAD AND U.S. ROUTE 66

Moved by Councilmember Lori Matthews, **seconded by** Vice Mayor Miranda Sweet to adopt Resolution No. 2025-47.

Vote: 7 - 0 - Unanimously

- G. Consideration and Adoption of Resolution No. 2025-53:** A resolution of the Flagstaff City Council, authorizing the acquisition of real property interests necessary for the Rio De Flag Flood Control Project, a public use; providing for delegation of authority, condemnation authority, repeal of conflicting resolutions, and establishing an effective date

Real Estate Manager Bryce Doty displayed a map and aerial photos of the properties to be acquired for the Rio de Flag Flood Control Project. Mr. Clifton offered that the project had reached a critical point for timing and all efforts had been exhausted to acquire the needed properties.

A RESOLUTION OF THE FLAGSTAFF CITY COUNCIL, AUTHORIZING THE ACQUISITION OF

REAL PROPERTY INTERESTS NECESSARY FOR THE RIO DE FLAG FLOOD CONTROL PROJECT, A PUBLIC USE; PROVIDING FOR DELEGATION OF AUTHORITY, CONDEMNATION AUTHORITY, REPEAL OF CONFLICTING RESOLUTIONS, AND ESTABLISHING AN EFFECTIVE DATE

Moved by Councilmember Anthony Garcia, **seconded by** Councilmember Austin Aslan to adopt Resolution No. 2025-53.

Vote: 7 - 0 - Unanimously

13. DISCUSSION ITEMS

A. Micromobility Share: Update and Scope Discussion

Climate Section Director Jenny Niemann, Engineering Transportation Planner Chris Phair, MetroPlan Transportation Demand Management Planner Kim Austin, and AmeriCorp Vista Jamie Larson provided a PowerPoint presentation that covered the following:

MICROMOBILITY SHARE IN FLAGSTAFF
 AGENDA
 WHAT IS SHARED MICROMOBILITY?
 BACKGROUND
 SEEKING COUNCIL DIRECTION
 IMPLEMENTATION STEPS
 RECAP OF FEBRUARY COUNCIL PRESENTATION
 WHY MICROMOBILITY SHARE?
 MICROMOBILITY IS SUPPORTED BY NUMEROUS CITY AND METROPLAN GUIDING PLANS
 SHARED MICROMOBILITY IS WIDESPREAD
 2018 BIKESHARE PILOT
 FEASIBILITY REPORT
 HIGH IMPACT RISKS
 MEDIUM IMPACT RISKS
 NAU PARTNERSHIP
 A COLLABORATIVE EFFORT
 ENGAGEMENT REVIEW
 ENGAGEMENT
 COMMON THEMES
 COMMUNITY SURVEY RESULTS
 PEER CITY INTERVIEWS
 COLLABORATION
 PURSUIT OF A MICROMOBILITY SHARE PROGRAM
 STAFF RECOMMENDATION
 SCOPE
 TO ENSURE A COMPREHENSIVE PROGRAM
 TO ADDRESS APPROPRIATE AND ADEQUATE PARKING
 TO ENSURE ADEQUATE STAFFING, MAINTENANCE AND REBALANCING
 TO ENSURE SAFETY AND COMPLIANCE
 TO ADDRESS EQUITY CONCERNS
 TO ADDRESS CUSTOMER SERVICE AND PUBLIC PERCEPTION CONCERNS
 TO ADDRESS COMPANY VIABILITY AND REVENUE MODEL CONCERNS
 STAFF RECOMMENDATION
 IMPLEMENTATION STEPS
 SEEKING COUNCIL DIRECTION

Councilmember Garcia expressed enthusiasm for moving the initiative. He emphasized that the actual rollout should be gradual and incremental, to allow the city to learn about its strengths and weaknesses without overextending or placing too much burden on service providers. Starting small would still yield meaningful data while creating a manageable and sustainable early partnership that can grow as the city, the provider, and the community adapt to micro-shared mobility.

Councilmember Aslan shared that he believed that shared mobility was inevitable, and that the city should guide it rather than resist it. He supported rolling it out slowly in small, manageable phases to help the community adjust. Winter conditions remained a major concern, as devices would be unusable for long stretches. He emphasized that the bigger challenge would be earning community buy-in, which would require listening, demonstrating success, and addressing skepticism through real-world outcomes. He was also interested in understanding late-night use, especially as an alternative to driving.

Councilmember House expressed her support for moving the program forward. She noted that improper bike drop-offs were a challenge during the pilot and appreciated that the new operator requirements included designated parking areas. She also appreciated the program's attention to equity.

Vice Mayor Sweet asked how the program would work with Mountain Line to help create seamless trips for its users. Ms. Neimann explained that they planned to ask potential vendors how they could integrate their system with Mountain Line's transit app. That would not be required upfront so as not to limit proposals, but staff wanted to understand what was technologically feasible. They also planned to explore coordinated parking near bus stops, recognizing that parking needs would vary across downtown, NAU, and residential areas.

Ms. Neimann also noted during the pilot, micro-mobility was heavily used during hours when transit was not running, which Mountain Line viewed as complementary. They hoped to build on that partnership, including the possibility of seamless or discounted joint payments between scooters and transit. The goal was to strengthen first-mile/last-mile connections, especially in areas where bus service was limited, so residents who could not easily walk long distances to stops could instead use scooters as a bridge to transit.

Vice Mayor Sweet asked what the plan was to keep up with new technology that comes out. Ms. Neimann offered that having several years since the last pilot had been beneficial, because both cities and micro-mobility operators had evolved significantly. Cities now better understand what requirements to set, and operators have become more effective at managing and incentivizing rider behavior. Drawing from peer communities, staff felt better prepared to shape a responsible program. The intent was to start with a short two-year contract to give the city time to evaluate how well the system worked, adjust fees or requirements based on actual staff workload, and decide whether to extend the contract by mutual agreement. The goal was to maintain an ongoing, collaborative relationship with the selected operator, one flexible enough to adapt to new technologies or service offerings as they emerge while ensuring the city continued to have strong oversight and clear expectations.

Councilmember Spence expressed his support for allowing one operator who would provide full support all day, every day.

Councilmember Matthews stated that it was important to make sure that the program was accessible to all regardless of ways to pay and access to technology. She supported moving forward.

Mayor Daggett was also supportive and preferred one operator. She felt that it was a great opportunity for transportation in Flagstaff. Her biggest concern was who made sure that sidewalks were not blocked by parked bikes and scooters. Mr. Phair offered that ensuring proper enforcement to keep scooters off sidewalks and other inappropriate areas would be the responsibility of the vendor rather than the city. Complaints about improperly parked scooters would go directly to the vendor, while the city would maintain oversight through a staff member dedicated to contract management, enforcement, data analysis, and reporting. The vendor would be expected to maintain a local presence in Flagstaff with on-call staff to quickly address hazards such as blocked sidewalks. Redistribution of scooters across the city would also be the vendor's responsibility. Through the RFP process, the city planned to require detailed staffing plans and references from prior contracts to verify their performance.

Council provided direction to staff to move forward with a micromobility program.

14. FUTURE AGENDA ITEM REQUESTS

After discussion and upon agreement by three members of the Council, an item will be moved to a regularly-scheduled Council meeting.

- A. Future Agenda Item Request (F.A.I.R.):** A request by Councilmember Matthews to place on a future agenda a discussion about not tying the rezoning process with site or concept plans.

Councilmember Matthews stated that she would like to have a discussion about decoupling the requirement for a site or concept plan from the rezoning process. Requiring a plan before rezoning forced developers to invest significant time and money prematurely and removing it would not increase risk because site planning would still occur after rezoning approval. The goal was to streamline the process, reduce costs, and ultimately lower housing prices. She asked Planning and Development Services Director Michelle McNulty to share her support of the concept. Ms. McNulty confirmed her supported and noted that current efforts under the regional plan were already moving in that direction and that further steps could make the rezone process easier. She suggested preparing a City Council Report to provide clarity on the efforts and progress. She explained that fully decoupling site plans from rezones depended on adopting the regional plan, which guided land use and zoning, and that staff needed to understand the council's willingness to support the policy shift.

There was requisite support to advance the matter to a future agenda for discussion.

- B. Future Agenda Item Request (F.A.I.R.):** A Citizen Petition: Requesting Council pass a Resolution to support the Back from the Brink Campaign on Nuclear Weapons.

Dr. David Spence addressed Council and asked them to place the Back from the Brink campaign on a future agenda for discussion, He explained that the Back from the Brink campaign was a grassroots effort urging the U.S. to join the 2021 Treaty on the prohibition of nuclear weapons. Sponsored by the Union of Concerned Scientists and Physicians for Social Responsibility, the campaign sought multilateral, verifiable, and irreversible nuclear disarmament, with 78 cities nationwide already endorsing it. Flagstaff would be the second Arizona city to support the initiative, after Tucson.

David Fronske addressed Council in support of advancing the petition to a future agenda. He explained that the Back from the Brink campaign promoted five practical policy measures to reduce the risks of nuclear weapons: pursue verifiable nuclear disarmament, renounce first use, end sole presidential authority to launch nuclear weapons, remove weapons from launch-ready status, and cancel plans to modernize the arsenal. The campaign emphasized the urgent and unprecedented threat of nuclear war, criticized ongoing U.S. nuclear policies and planned \$2 trillion modernization, and highlighted that abolition was feasible through diplomacy, verification, and international cooperation.

Councilmember Aslan acknowledged the existential importance of the issue and shared that he had previously supported similar petitions, but he expressed caution about moving the petition forward. He believed that petitions should have a clear local focus and align with the city's role and responsibilities. While personally supportive and willing to sign the resolution, he did not believe it was appropriate at that time for the city to formally engage in the broader discourse.

Councilmember House agreed and noted that similar petitions had come to the council before. She personally supported the Back from the Brink campaign and was willing to sign on, but did not believe it warranted a formal future Council discussion. She appreciated the effort in bringing the petition forward but did not support advancing it as a Council agenda item.

Councilmember Garcia thanked the petitioners for their advocacy for peace and acknowledged their contributions to the community. He supported having a public discussion on the topic but shared the concern about formal resolutions that had little practical impact.

Councilmember Matthews reiterated her long-standing approach of focusing Council efforts on issues where the city could have a direct impact, resolutions and proclamations should be limited to matters

the city can meaningfully influence. While personally supportive of the cause, she did not support advancing the petition.

Vice Mayor Sweet also did not support advancing the matter forward but indicated that she would personally sign on for the campaign.

There was not requisite support to advance the matter to a future agenda for discussion.

15. OPEN CALL TO THE PUBLIC

None

16. INFORMATIONAL ITEMS TO/FROM MAYOR, COUNCIL, AND STAFF, AND FUTURE AGENDA ITEM REQUESTS

Councilmember House requested a FAIR item to discuss the possibility of Flagstaff becoming a "recovery ready" community. The initiative aimed to unify efforts across behavioral health, substance use, housing, and criminal justice to promote a healthier, thriving community.

17. ADJOURNMENT

The Regular Meeting of the Flagstaff City Council held October 20, 2025, adjourned at 8:31 p.m.

MAYOR

ATTEST:

CITY CLERK

CERTIFICATION

I, STACY SALTZBURG, do hereby certify that I am the City Clerk of the City of Flagstaff, County of Coconino, State of Arizona, and that the above Minutes are a true and correct summary of the Meeting of the Council of the City of Flagstaff held on October 7, 2025. I further certify that the Meeting was duly called and held and that a quorum was present.

DATED this 16th day of December, 2025

CITY CLERK