

Answers Organized by Candidate Name

Austin Aslan

1. How can the City Council prioritize and advance the goals of the Climate Neutrality Plan in reducing carbon emissions and reaching Flagstaff's commitment to carbon neutrality by 2030?

The climate crisis is a defining challenge of our time. The scientific community has been clear for decades, and recent international assessments warn that the window for avoiding the worst impacts is rapidly closing. For Flagstaff, climate action is not abstract. It's tied directly to wildfire risk, water security, public health, forest resilience, and our unique four-season lifestyle.

I'm proud of my record on these issues. I helped move Flagstaff's original CAAP into implementation, supported updated building codes, advocated for the climate emergency declaration, and helped draft, pass, and defend our Carbon Neutrality Plan. But those milestones alone do not reduce emissions.

The next phase requires implementation. We must continue pursuing building efficiency, transportation alternatives, electrification, renewable energy procurement, and innovative regional partnerships that accelerate clean energy deployment while reducing costs.

I intend to continue building on that tradition because future generations deserve nothing less than our best effort.

2. The City Council currently supports putting a public safety bond and sales tax paid for by current residents, on the ballot in November. One of the items is a new firehouse for the largely unoccupied JW Powell area. Do you support this measure and why, or do you think these costs should be covered by the developers and subsequent land owners?

I support placing the measure before voters. Public safety is one of the core responsibilities of local government, and residents deserve the opportunity to weigh in directly on significant investments in public infrastructure and emergency services.

Reasonable people can disagree about individual components of the proposal, including questions about growth paying for growth and the timing of certain facilities. Those are important discussions. Ultimately, however, I believe the public should have the final say.

I also recognize that every major community investment competes with other priorities. In the future, I would welcome conversations about funding mechanisms for climate resilience, forest health, and other long-term community needs. But public safety deserves its day in court, so to speak. The appropriate next step is to let voters evaluate the proposal on its merits and decide whether it reflects their priorities for Flagstaff's future.

3. Do you think the proposed Red Gap Ranch development as a source of water for the City of Flagstaff is a necessity? What role do you think Advanced Water Treatment (AWT) of reclaimed water can play in our drinking water future?

Water is water. The question isn't where it originated, but whether it can be treated safely, reliably, and affordably.

I support continued investment in AWT and believe it should play an increasingly important role in Flagstaff's long-term water strategy. Communities throughout the Southwest need to become more sophisticated in how they manage and reuse water resources, and Flagstaff should be part of that conversation.

It was strategic for Flagstaff to secure the Red Gap water supply. Whether we develop it is a separate question. The water is brackish, located miles from Flagstaff, and would require significant pumping and treatment. Those realities make it a difficult economic proposition.

Red Gap is best viewed as an insurance policy. I hope we never need it, but I'm glad we protected that option. As the six-year-long chair of the Coconino Plateau Water Advisory Council, I'll continue to prioritize conservation, efficiency, and emerging treatment technologies.

4. Do you believe public safety in Flagstaff is solely the outcome of a well-financed and highly visible police force or do you believe addressing the social issues of poverty, homelessness, and addiction should be an important part of public safety funding? If you support the latest public safety tax and bond proposal how do you justify only increasing funding for the police and fire?

Public safety is about far more than police and fire response. A truly safe community is one where people have stable housing, access to healthcare, treatment for addiction, economic opportunity, and the support systems necessary to thrive. Investments in prevention often improve public safety outcomes just as surely as investments in emergency response.

That said, local government has an obligation to ensure that emergency services are adequately staffed, equipped, and prepared. The public safety proposal before voters addresses infrastructure and personnel needs that have been identified by our public safety professionals.

I do not view these priorities as mutually exclusive. We can support police and fire services while also investing in housing, mental health resources, homelessness response, and other programs like CARE, which I helped initiate, that address the root causes of many community challenges. In fact, I believe that is exactly what a comprehensive approach to public safety requires.

5. What is your understanding of why the City Council goes into executive session? Do you think this practice has been abused or is it always a legal necessity? If you suspect it is not always necessary, would you speak up and question these decisions?

Executive sessions exist because certain discussions cannot legally or responsibly occur in public. Personnel matters, legal strategy, real estate negotiations, and other sensitive topics sometimes require confidentiality to protect the public interest and the City's position.

In my experience, executive sessions are generally used appropriately. That does not mean they should be immune from scrutiny. Transparency should always be the default setting of local government, and executive sessions should be limited to circumstances where they are genuinely necessary under state law.

I have never viewed my role on Council as simply accepting recommendations without question. If I believed an executive session was unnecessary or overly broad, I would absolutely ask questions and seek clarification. The public deserves confidence that confidentiality is being used as a legal tool, not as a substitute for public accountability.

6. For years there's been several things the city would like to change or do but is not able to because of state laws such as restricting regulation of short term rentals. If the state legislature changes party hands in November there may be opportunities to overturn or enact some state laws. What laws would be your priority for our City to overturn or enact?

My answer begins with local control. Communities should have greater authority to address local challenges without constant state preemption.

One of my highest priorities would be restoring tools to address housing affordability. Arizona's restrictions on regulating short-term rentals have significantly limited our ability to respond to local housing conditions. I would also support greater flexibility for communities pursuing energy efficiency, electrification, and climate-related initiatives that reduce costs for residents while advancing sustainability goals. I would welcome the opportunity to revisit efforts to limit plastic bags.

More broadly, I would like to see reforms that strengthen municipal authority and reduce the chilling effect of state preemption. Local governments are closest to the people they serve and are often best positioned to develop solutions tailored to local circumstances. Flagstaff should have the flexibility to pursue innovative approaches when our residents identify a need for action.

7. The new LASS+CAP recommendations have been released calling for greater density throughout the city to increase affordability and sustainability. The Realty community wants to maintain the status quo and build more single family home subdivisions. What role, if any, do you think single family home subdivisions should play in our future?

I support Flagstaff for Affordable Housing's recommendation and generally support the direction of the LASS+CAP work. Housing affordability and sustainability are not competing goals; they are actually quite complementary.

Single-family homes will continue to have a place in Flagstaff, but they can't be the only housing product we build. We'll never build ourselves into affordability; demand will always outpace supply in coveted Flagstaff. We need duplexes, townhomes, cottage developments, mixed-use projects, and other forms of "missing middle" housing that better match the budgets of our workforce.

I support removing barriers to housing production, including eliminating residential parking minimums, rethinking commercial parking requirements so underutilized parking lots can become homes, encouraging narrower street designs where appropriate, and modernizing development requirements to better align with our affordability and sustainability goals.

The status quo is not producing enough housing. We need to embrace thoughtful change while preserving the qualities that make Flagstaff unique.

8. The City Council has been presented with two separate zoning code amendments that would address data center development proposals in the city. One recommendation is to only allow data centers in Heavy Industrial zones. The other is for a complete ban. Do you think the City should ban data centers and encourage the County to consider doing the same?

Flagstaff should proactively protect itself from large, water-intensive facilities that provide limited local benefit.

A server room, research facility, or small computational hub should not automatically be treated the same as a massive industrial-scale data center. But when discussing larger facilities, I believe the burden should be on the applicant to demonstrate *substantial* local benefit.

One framework I find compelling comes from recent research on socio-economic water productivity. The question is not simply whether a proposed facility can obtain water, but whether the community receives sufficient value in return for the water, energy, land, and infrastructure it consumes.

Data centers often create few jobs while consuming significant resources. They also have a very short lifespan. Profits are privatized while the long-term costs are on us. I support strong restrictions and would support a ban on large, water-intensive data centers. The County should absolutely do the same.

Nancy Baca

1. How can the city council prioritize and advance the goals of the Climate Neutrality Plan in reducing carbon emissions and reaching Flagstaff's commitment to carbon neutrality by 2030?

I support the goals of the Climate Neutrality Plan and believe the City should pursue emissions reductions in ways that are both environmentally effective and financially sustainable. As an economics professional, I focus on measurable results rather than increasing spending to address issues. We should prioritize investments that deliver the greatest reduction in emissions per taxpayer dollar, including efficiency upgrades to public buildings, modernized transportation infrastructures, and incentives for the private-sector.

Reaching carbon neutrality by 2030 is an ambitious goal that will require cooperation among residents, businesses and regional partners. The City should regularly evaluate progress, analyze data, and remain transparent about costs and outcomes. We must also ensure that climate policies do not disproportionately burden working families already struggling with housing and living costs.

Environmental stewardship and fiscal responsibility are not competing values. Flagstaff can strive to meet its sustainability goals while maintaining a strong economy and protecting affordability.

2. The City Council currently supports putting a public safety bond and sales tax paid for by current residents, on the ballot in November. One of the items is a new firehouse for the largely unoccupied JW Powell area. Do you support this measure and why, or do you think these costs should be covered by the developers and subsequent land owners?

Public safety is one of the City's core responsibilities, and I support ensuring that our fire and emergency response systems keep pace with growth and increased wildfire risk. However, I believe taxpayers deserve confidence that costs are being allocated fairly. New development should pay its proportional share of the infrastructure and the public safety services it requires.

Regarding the proposed bond and sales tax package, I believe that spending on public safety has not kept pace with other City spending. If a new fire station is needed to maintain response times and protect current and future residents, that investment would be justified. My approach is guided by fiscal responsibility and long-term planning. Growth should pay for growth whenever practical, while ensuring that public safety services remain reliable and adequately funded for the entire community.

3. Do you think the proposed Red Gap Ranch development as a source of water for the City of Flagstaff is a necessity? What role do you think Advanced Water Treatment (AWT) of reclaimed water can play in our drinking water future?

Water security is one of the most important long-term challenges facing Flagstaff. Given ongoing drought conditions and uncertainty in future water supplies, I believe the City should pursue a diversified strategy rather than relying on any single source/solution. Red Gap Ranch may ultimately play an important role in that strategy, but we should continue evaluating costs, timelines, environmental impacts, and alternatives to ensure we are making the best investment for Flagstaff residents.

I also believe Advanced Water Treatment deserves serious consideration as part of Flagstaff's water future. Globally, communities are increasingly using advanced treatment technologies to safely expand local water supplies. These methods have proven viable and many have years of data available to study. Proven methods can help us improve resiliency and reduce dependence on a single water source. Our goal should be a reliable, affordable, and sustainable water supply that can serve Flagstaff for generations.

4. Do you believe public safety in Flagstaff is solely the outcome of a well-financed and highly visible police force or do you believe addressing the social issues of poverty, homelessness, and addiction should be an important part of public safety funding? If you support the latest public safety tax and bond proposal how do you justify only increasing funding for the police and fire?

Public safety is about more than police cars, fire engines, and emergency response times. A truly safe community also addresses the underlying issues that contribute to crime; instability, public disorder, poverty, homelessness, mental illness, and addiction. I support a balanced approach that recognizes the important role of law enforcement while also investing in programs that help people regain stability and become productive members of the community.

I believe prevention is often more cost-effective than crisis response. Every dollar spent reducing homelessness, addiction, or repeated emergency calls can save taxpayers money over the long term. At the same time, police and fire departments must have the resources necessary to respond.

5. What is your understanding of why the City Council goes into executive session? Do you think this practice has been abused or in your view is it always a legal necessity? If you suspect it is not always necessary, would you speak up and question these decisions?

While I can't claim to know what happens in executive sessions, I believe they serve a legitimate purpose. They allow the City Council to discuss matters involving personnel issues, lawsuits, and negotiations with prospective industries where open discussions could jeopardize City interests or violate privacy. Used appropriately, executive sessions are a legitimate and necessary part of local government. That said, transparency should always be the default. Public trust depends on residents knowing that decisions are being made openly whenever possible and trusting their lawmakers. Accountability and transparency strengthen government and help maintain public confidence in the decision-making process.

6. For years there's been several things the city would like to change or do but is not able to because of state laws such as restricting regulation of short term rentals. If the state legislature changes party hands in November there may be opportunities to overturn or enact some state laws. What laws would be your priority for our City to overturn or enact?

Local communities are often better at recognizing their issues than state government is, and I generally support giving cities greater autonomy to address local issues. I would also support local government having more control over policies that expand housing supply, streamline responsible development, and provide cities with greater flexibility to address water security and infrastructure needs.

My approach would be practical rather than ideological. I would evaluate proposed changes based on whether they improve affordability, protect property rights, strengthen local decision-making, and help Flagstaff address its specific challenges while maintaining a healthy economy and strong quality of life.

7. The new LASS+CAP recommendations have been released calling for greater density throughout the city to increase affordability and sustainability. The Realty community wants to maintain the status quo and build more single family home subdivisions. What role, if any, do you think single family home subdivisions should play in our future?

Flagstaff's housing affordability challenges require a broader range of housing options than we have today. I support thoughtful increases in housing density in appropriate locations. Greater housing choices can help address affordability while reducing transportation costs and supporting environmental goals.

While I do not agree with the generalization made in the question regarding the realty community, I also do not believe that discouraging single-family homes or neighborhoods is the appropriate solution. Many families aspire to homeownership, and single-family homes will continue to play an important role in our community. As someone who grew up in several different neighborhoods across Flagstaff and lived in a variety of housing densities, I see the value in having options. The question is not whether we build single-family housing or higher-density housing but instead it is how we create a balanced mix that meets the needs of students, professionals, young families, seniors, and longtime residents.

8. The City Council has been presented with two separate zoning code amendments that would address data center development proposals in the city. One recommendation is to only allow data centers in Heavy Industrial zones. The other is for a complete ban. Do you think the City should ban data centers and encourage the County to consider doing the same?

While I do not currently support a blanket ban on data centers, I would have serious concerns about the feasibility of a data center in our area due to our current water issues. Such decisions

should be based on careful analysis of economic benefits, infrastructure demands, water consumption, energy use, jobs created, location and compatibility with existing land uses.

I also have concerns about the rapidly changing technological advances that could quickly replace large scale data centers and leave communities with infrastructure that no longer fits their needs. Overall, Flagstaff should pursue economic development that aligns with community values, but we should also be willing to say no when a project imposes costs that outweigh its benefits.

Patty Hansen

1. How can the city council prioritize and advance the goals of the Climate Neutrality Plan in reducing carbon emissions and reaching Flagstaff's commitment to carbon neutrality by 2030?

Flagstaff's Carbon Neutrality Plan sets important goals for protecting our community and reaching carbon neutrality by 2030. To achieve these goals, the City Council must focus on actions that reduce the most carbon emissions while also improving residents' daily lives, such as lowering energy costs, protecting our water resources, improving forest health, and building a more resilient community.

We can make progress by increasing energy efficiency in city buildings, supporting clean energy, improving public transportation and safe walking and biking options, and making sure future growth reflects our sustainability values. The Council must also track progress, use resources wisely, and work closely with residents, businesses, and regional partners.

As we move forward, the Council must ensure climate solutions are affordable, realistic, and benefit everyone. Protecting our environment and keeping Flagstaff livable for future generations can and should go hand in hand.

2. The City Council currently supports putting a public safety bond and sales tax paid for by current residents, on the ballot in November. One of the items is a new firehouse for the largely unoccupied JW Powell area. Do you support this measure and why, or do you think these costs should be covered by the developers and subsequent land owners?

Currently, I do not support building a new fire station in this undeveloped area. While planning for future growth is important, we must also recognize that many Flagstaff residents are struggling with affordability. We should not ask current taxpayers to take on additional costs for future development.

Even if developers and future landowners pay the initial construction costs, that does not address the ongoing expenses of staffing, operations, and maintenance. Those long-term costs could ultimately fall on existing residents.

In my 20-plus years working in Flagstaff, I have seen planned developments change or never happen. We need to ensure growth pays for itself. I believe the Council should explore available options, such as a community facilities district, special assessment area, or other legally available funding mechanisms, to ensure the growth creating the need for new infrastructure contributes to both the upfront and long-term costs.

3. Do you think the proposed Red Gap Ranch development as a source of water for the City of Flagstaff is a necessity? What role do you think Advanced Water Treatment (AWT) of reclaimed water can play in our drinking water future?

I do not believe developing Red Gap Ranch is a necessity at this time. While long-term water planning is essential, this project raises serious concerns about cost, sustainability, and impacts on current residents. Building pipelines, pumping stations, and treatment facilities would require significant investment, and transporting water long distances to Flagstaff would create ongoing energy and operational costs. Questions also remain about groundwater sustainability and environmental impacts.

Before pursuing such a large project, we should fully explore alternatives, including Advanced Water Treatment of reclaimed water. AWT has its own challenges, including infrastructure costs, energy demands, and the need for strong public confidence, but it provides an opportunity to safely reuse existing water supplies and strengthen local water resilience.

Red Gap Ranch should remain part of Flagstaff's long-term water portfolio, but any development must be environmentally sustainable, financially responsible, and protect current residents from unfair costs.

4. Do you believe public safety in Flagstaff is solely the outcome of a well-financed and highly visible police force or do you believe addressing the social issues of poverty, homelessness, and addiction should be an important part of public safety funding? If you support the latest public safety tax and bond proposal how do you justify only increasing funding for the police and fire?

I do not believe public safety is solely the result of a well-funded and highly visible police force. True public safety also requires addressing issues such as poverty, homelessness, addiction, and affordability. Investing in prevention and support services can improve lives while reducing the demand placed on emergency responders.

I do not support the current proposed bond and sales tax increase for police and fire. A recent resident survey conducted for the Council showed the cost of living is the top concern for residents. At a time when many families are struggling with rising costs, I do not believe we should ask taxpayers for additional revenue without ensuring proposals reflect community priorities.

As a former local government department head, I understand the need for resources. However, responsible leadership requires making difficult choices. Council should prioritize the public safety needs residents identified, including wildfire equipment, wildfire facilities, and emergency medical equipment.

5. What is your understanding of why the City Council goes into executive session? Do you think this practice has been abused or in your view is it always a legal necessity? If you suspect it is not always necessary, would you speak up and question these decisions?

I believe in open and transparent government, and executive sessions should only be used when truly necessary. I understand there are legitimate reasons for Council to meet privately, including personnel issues, confidential records, legal advice, litigation, negotiations, real estate matters, and security concerns.

While I do not know the specific reasons this Council has gone into executive session because those discussions are confidential, as an outside observer, it appears they are used more frequently than I have seen with other local governments. Just because Council can legally meet behind closed doors does not always mean it should.

If elected, I would ask questions before entering executive session and speak up if I believed a discussion could appropriately take place in public. Transparency, accountability, and allowing residents to hear important conversations should always be the priority whenever possible.

6. For years there's been several things the city would like to change or do but is not able to because of state laws such as restricting regulation of short term rentals. If the state legislature changes party hands in November there may be opportunities to overturn or enact some state laws. What laws would be your priority for our City to overturn or enact?

I believe local communities should have more authority to address the unique challenges they face. One of my top priorities would be restoring local control over short-term rentals (STRs). Cities like Flagstaff need the ability to regulate the number and location of STRs, protect neighborhood character, and address their impact on housing affordability.

I would also support changes that give cities more tools to create affordable housing, including the ability to identify dedicated funding sources and protect renters from discrimination based on legal sources of income.

Finally, I believe the Legislature should respect local decision-making. Flagstaff residents know our community's needs better than lawmakers at the State Capitol. If we are given reasonable flexibility, we can develop solutions that reflect our values and improve quality of life for our residents.

7. The new LASS+CAP recommendations have been released calling for greater density throughout the city to increase affordability and sustainability. The Realty community wants to maintain the status quo and build more single family home subdivisions. What role, if any, do you think single family home subdivisions should play in our future?

Flagstaff needs more housing, but we must grow in a way that is affordable, sustainable, and financially responsible. I support the goals of LASS+CAP to increase housing choices and create a more sustainable community. Single-family homes will continue to be part of Flagstaff, but relying primarily on new subdivisions at the edges of the city will not solve our housing crisis.

For many residents, the dream of owning a home is becoming out of reach. We need to bring back true "starter homes" and create more pathways to homeownership. Building more expensive single-family homes is not the answer.

We should prioritize adding homes where roads and services already exist, including smaller homes, accessory dwelling units, duplexes, and town homes. This makes better use of existing infrastructure.

A strong community includes different housing options so people at all stages of life and income levels can call Flagstaff home.

8. The City Council has been presented with two separate zoning code amendments that would address data center development proposals in the city. One recommendation is to only allow data centers in Heavy Industrial zones. The other is for a complete ban. Do you think the City should ban data centers and encourage the County to consider doing the same?

At this time, I support Flagstaff having a ban on data centers. I would also encourage the County to consider the same. Communities with data centers have raised serious concerns about their long-term impacts. Data centers require significant amounts of water, which is already a critical issue for Flagstaff and Northern Arizona. They also consume enormous amounts of energy to power servers and cooling systems, and nearby residents have reported noise concerns. They create relatively few permanent jobs after construction is complete and

use large areas of land that could serve other community needs. Finally, large data centers do not align with Flagstaff's carbon neutrality goals.

AI can be a valuable tool, but I would only reconsider my position if data centers can demonstrate minimal water use, renewable energy commitments, full infrastructure cost recovery, and clear community benefits.

Khara House

1. How can the city council prioritize and advance the goals of the Climate Neutrality Plan in reducing carbon emissions and reaching Flagstaff's commitment to carbon neutrality by 2030?

The City works actively to treat the CNP as a guiding framework for actions, including using it to support and guide budgeting, zoning, transportation, facilities, purchasing, and capital planning. I support our continued investment in energy efficiency, building electrification, renewable energy, multimodal transit, infrastructure, and land use decisions that reduce our impact in equitable ways. I also think we've long established a shared belief that our 2030 goal can be more than aspirational, despite its ambitious and approaching date. We must ask with each decision how we're working towards the goals of the CNP, building community resilience, protecting our water and other resources, and improving affordability. I rely on experts to share the how, but believe the work must be practical, measurable, and connected to our residents' daily lives, especially when facing parallel and concurrent challenges in housing, transportation, wildfire preparedness, and household energy costs.

2. The City Council currently supports putting a public safety bond and sales tax paid for by current residents, on the ballot in November. One of the items is a new firehouse for the largely unoccupied JW Powell area. Do you support this measure and why, or do you think these costs should be covered by the developers and subsequent land owners?

I support giving voters the opportunity to decide on the public safety bond and tax, but I don't think it's a simple question. We certainly have very real public safety infrastructure, staffing, wildland fire, and emergency response needs. As a growing community, we must plan for response times before new neighborhoods are fully built out, rather than reactively building to meet critical needs down the line. That said, I also share community concerns about asking the community to carry too much of the cost of growth. My support for the public safety measures being proposed is dependent upon transparency, accountability, and a serious parallel commitment to ensuring growth pays its fair share. While I believe developers and future landowners should contribute (through impact fees, DAs, infrastructure requirements, etc.), we also have to ensure that those contributions aren't also passed along to the community members we're trying to serve.

3. Do you think the proposed Red Gap Ranch development as a source of water for the City of Flagstaff is a necessity? What role do you think Advanced Water Treatment (AWT) of reclaimed water can play in our drinking water future?

Red Gap Ranch is part of Flagstaff's long-term water portfolio, but it shouldn't be treated as the only answer to our water future. Necessity depends on demand, conservation, cost, energy use, climate conditions, legal constraints, and other available alternatives. I'm cautious about moving forward with a critical project like this without continuing public scrutiny that offers clear evidence that it's the most responsible path. AWT has a major role to play in our future planning; reclaimed water is already one of Flagstaff's most important resources, and treating water to drinking-water standards can help stretch local supplies and reduce pressure for more expensive or environmentally disruptive projects. I know the Water Division is constantly looking at options in this area to support decision making with strong science, public education, technically sound pathways, and trust-building with the community to ensure options like advanced water treatment are publicly understood.

4. Do you believe public safety in Flagstaff is solely the outcome of a well-financed and highly visible police force or do you believe addressing the social issues of poverty, homelessness, and addiction should be an important part of public safety funding? If you support the latest public safety tax and bond proposal how do you justify only increasing funding for the police and fire?

My work in public and behavioral health tells me that public safety is not solely the outcome of a visible police force, but also dependent on housing stability, behavioral health care, substance use recovery supports, emergency medical response, wildfire preparedness, youth opportunities, and streets designed to keep people alive. The public safety tax and bond proposal is focused on emergency response infrastructure, which I don't believe is only focused on police and fire; rather, it focuses on police, fire, dispatch, emergency management, EMT, our partnership with alternative response, and related equipment and resources. It is a piece of, but not all of, a holistic public safety strategy. I support asking voters to consider emergency response needs while also calling on the City to invest in upstream safety, including housing, homelessness response, crisis alternatives, recovery-ready community work, and partnerships that reduce harm before a 911 call is necessary.

5. What is your understanding of why the City Council goes into executive session? Do you think this practice has been abused or in your view is it always a legal necessity? If you suspect it is not always necessary, would you speak up and question these decisions?

Executive session is meant to be a limited legal tool allowed for Council to receive legal advice, discuss certain personnel matters, consider negotiations, or protect confidential information. It is not meant to be a way to avoid public accountability or avoid having hard conversations in public view. I don't believe the practice has been abused, but I do think that public trust requires Council to keep as much discussion as possible within the open session. If I had concerns

about whether an executive session was necessary, I have no issue raising that concern. While I can't think of instances where executive sessions have been held inappropriately, I also don't think "legal" should be the default answer to why we have them; in other words, we do because we need to, not just because we can. Our default should be openness, unless there is a clear reason necessitating otherwise.

6. For years there's been several things the city would like to change or do but is not able to because of state laws such as restricting regulation of short term rentals. If the state legislature changes party hands in November there may be opportunities to overturn or enact some state laws. What laws would be your priority for our City to overturn or enact?

I would prioritize tools that help cities advance housing affordability, water protection, climate action, and community well-being. That includes revisiting limits on inclusionary housing, strengthening local authority for tenant protections and housing programs, allowing more flexibility on local revenue options, and protecting Flagstaff's ability to regulate high-impact land uses. Specifically, I would look at laws like A.R.S. 9-461.16 (inclusionary/affordable housing preemptions), Arizona Proposition 312 (homelessness/encampments), and expanding fair housing protections. I also continue to work with local and state advocates to restore more local authority over short-term rentals and support affordability. I would also support state action to help communities better address wildfire mitigation, forest health, flood insurance challenges, and behavioral health crisis response. We can't afford to be blocked from solving the challenges our community asks us to solve if there are legal remedies available that simply have not been enabled at the legislature.

7. The new LASS+CAP recommendations have been released calling for greater density throughout the city to increase affordability and sustainability. The Realty community wants to maintain the status quo and build more single family home subdivisions. What role, if any, do you think single family home subdivisions should play in our future?

Single-family homes cannot remain our default answer to growth. Our best path forward is a broader range of housing types in all neighborhoods, including duplexes, triplexes, fourplexes, townhomes, ADUs, mixed-use development, affordable and workforce housing, and apartments. Development should be focused near jobs, schools, transit, and services. I support greater density when it is paired with good design, infrastructure planning, open space protections, and attention to neighborhood impacts and risks of displacement or gentrification. Our goal is not to eliminate single-family neighborhoods, but to recognize that our housing, climate, and affordability goals require more choices than the status quo has allowed. A future built around single-family subdivisions would push housing farther out, while the "missing middle" options listed above help us develop within and in sustainable ways to support Flagstaff's well-being into the future.

8. The City Council has been presented with two separate zoning code amendments that would address data center development proposals in the city. One recommendation is to

only allow data centers in Heavy Industrial zones. The other is for a complete ban. Do you think the City should ban data centers and encourage the County to consider doing the same?

I don't believe data centers are a good fit for Flagstaff, given their potential water, energy, land use, noise, and infrastructure impacts. I'm open to a ban if that is the clearest, most legally robust way to protect community resources. At minimum, we have to ensure that data centers are not broadly allowed by right; Heavy Industrial zoning alone may not be enough without strong performance standards and public review. I also support encouraging the County to examine this issue carefully, because we know that data centers don't respect jurisdictional boundaries when it comes to regional environmental impacts. Starting with the belief that Flagstaff can't afford to sacrifice scarce water, clean energy capacity, or community well-being for a use that may offer limited local benefit, I believe the City and County must be aligned when it comes to examining the significant strain on resources our residents depend on.

CJ Lucke

1. How can the city council prioritize and advance the goals of the Climate Neutrality Plan in reducing carbon emissions and reaching Flagstaff's commitment to carbon neutrality by 2030?

As a Planning and Zoning Commissioner, I believe we are on the right track in our building codes to integrate energy-efficiency technologies and infrastructure into new construction. While we don't require buildings to install solar panels, we do require the wiring so that the house is ready to accept the panels at a future date.

We have moved forward with flood mitigation projects and in particular I am grateful to see Sunnyside finally get resources to manage neighborhood flooding. Reducing carbon emissions is tied to increasing housing density and getting people to use more public transportation. I would like to see 4th Street developed into mixed use commercial and housing so that people can both live and work in Flagstaff.

I also would like to see free on demand self-driving cars used along Route 66 in a trial period to see if it changes commuter behaviors.

2. The City Council currently supports putting a public safety bond and sales tax paid for by current residents, on the ballot in November. One of the items is a new firehouse for the largely unoccupied JW Powell area. Do you support this measure and why, or do you think these costs should be covered by the developers and subsequent land owners?

I think developers should cover the cost of infrastructure for new developments. The Council has put the bond measure on the ballot and if it passes, it will include funds to build the fire

station. I do support the bond measure and can make a case that all firefighter personnel can respond to wildfires which impact the whole city. Having an additional fire station helps protect everyone from wildfires.

There is more to this story. The JW Powell Corridor should already have a completed Specific Plan that guides development. The plan would have shown where roads should go, laid out public facilities, and parks/open space. A Specific Plan would have required developers to contribute for infrastructure as part of subdivision requirements. Instead, the City just paid Canyon del Rio \$6.1 million for 14.7 acres for a Right of Way purchase. We must make sure developers are paying their fair share.

3. Do you think the proposed Red Gap Ranch development as a source of water for the City of Flagstaff is a necessity? What role do you think Advanced Water Treatment (AWT) of reclaimed water can play in our drinking water future?

I think both development options are necessary for redundancy and to ensure an adequate water supply past the current forty-year window.

I am a proponent of putting reclaimed water back into the water cycle through Lake Mary. This water would then be processed through the existing filtration system and could be used as potable water.

There are many other entities interested in the groundwater in the area around Red Gap, so we need to be involved in these discussions even though we are all drawing from the same Coconino Aquifer underneath Flagstaff. Having a second pipeline into the City helps if we have a catastrophic wildfire and can't use our local water supplies. Plus, we may be able to leverage state and federal agency funding to help treat and move that water to Flagstaff while also helping our Navajo Nation neighbors to have a reliable water supply.

4. Do you believe public safety in Flagstaff is solely the outcome of a well-financed and highly visible police force or do you believe addressing the social issues of poverty, homelessness, and addiction should be an important part of public safety funding? If you support the latest public safety tax and bond proposal how do you justify only increasing funding for the police and fire?

In order to answer the last part of that question first, the current City Council over the last ten years has not adequately funded safety services.

According to the city staff, over a 10-year period, the anticipated revenue from the sales tax, bond sale, and development impact fees will be \$237 million -- enough to cover the "most critical needs" identified by the public safety departments.

This leads into the first part of the question. I do believe in a continuity of care in order to address underlying social issues that impact safety. I would like to see a Detox Center built with

a mandatory 48 hour stay for anyone admitted to the facility. I would like to see increased resources for mental health treatment. Finally, additional drug and alcohol treatment centers will help law enforcement to get people off the streets and into a continuity of care.

5. What is your understanding of why the City Council goes into executive session? Do you think this practice has been abused or in your view is it always a legal necessity? If you suspect it is not always necessary, would you speak up and question these decisions?

As a former District Clerk who worked with the Port of San Diego attorneys to determine what could be discussed in closed session, I would absolutely speak up and question decisions.

One of the major mistakes the current Council made in their ongoing dispute with Desert Mountain Energy over fracking (less than two miles away from our Red Gap water source) was that they inappropriately went into closed session. The lawsuits are ongoing, but this was a mistake that should have never occurred. Had I been on the City Council, I would have challenged the provision under which the closed session was deemed necessary.

6. For years there's been several things the city would like to change or do but is not able to because of state laws such as restricting regulation of short-term rentals. If the state legislature changes party hands in November there may be opportunities to overturn or enact some state laws. What laws would be your priority for our City to overturn or enact?

One of the major tenants of my campaign is that we must get back local control over short term rentals, election procedures, zoning codes and taxing second and high value homes. The State has tied our hands on all these issues. I would ask for local control of short-term rentals first – deciding how many we want in the City and how close together they can be clustered.

When I was meeting voters, many asked why we couldn't charge a higher tax rate for second homes or high value homes over \$4 million. The State currently sets regulations that all residential properties be assessed at a uniform ratio, regardless of whether they are primary residences or vacation homes. I would change this law.

Finally, there have been zoning laws that require "any city with a population more than 75,000" to do certain things regarding zoning. I would change that qualifier.

7. The new LASS+CAP recommendations have been released calling for greater density throughout the city to increase affordability and sustainability. The Realty community wants to maintain the status quo and build more single-family home subdivisions. What role, if any, do you think single family home subdivisions should play in our future?

We have limited land to develop within city limits so that requires us to increase housing density and the different types of home available for purchase. I do believe that home ownership can

help to build wealth and stability but that home can be a townhome, part of a fourplex or part of a Community Land Trust. What I do not want to see are more vacation homes, gated golf course communities or expensive homes on an acre of land.

8. The City Council has been presented with two separate zoning code amendments that would address data center development proposals in the city. One recommendation is to only allow data centers in Heavy Industrial zones. The other is for a complete ban. Do you think the City should ban data centers and encourage the County to consider doing the same?

As a Planning and Zoning Commissioner, I asked staff to return with the second amendment banning data centers. The reason I asked for this is because sometimes I think we need to be bold and say exactly what we want to happen. In this case, staff felt that by limiting data centers to Heavy Industrial and requiring a Conditional Use Permit approved by Planning and Zoning, they would be in effect banning the centers without saying so. Usually I would agree with staff but this type of development has so many negative impacts that we can't provide them any path to build in Flagstaff – no matter how restrictive we believe that path to be.

Lori Mathews

1. How can the city council prioritize and advance the goals of the Climate Neutrality Plan in reducing carbon emissions and reaching Flagstaff's commitment to carbon neutrality by 2030?

As a City Council member, I am committed to responsible environmental stewardship that advances Flagstaff's Carbon Neutrality Plan goals while protecting our community's economic vitality and affordability.

I support data-driven decisions that balance environmental progress with real-world impacts on local businesses and families. Given current advancements, aligning with national goals of carbon neutrality by 2050 offers a more realistic and achievable path.

By pursuing practical, cost-effective strategies such as targeted energy efficiency and conservation programs, along with local carbon removal projects like biomass utilization and biochar production we can reduce emissions while delivering co-benefits including waste reduction and economic opportunities. This flexible, balanced approach safeguards our environment without overburdening taxpayers or diverting resources from critical services like housing, public safety, and infrastructure, preserving Flagstaff's unique character for generations to come.

2. The City Council currently supports putting a public safety bond and sales tax paid for by current residents on the ballot in November. One of the items is a new firehouse for

the largely unoccupied JW Powell area. Do you support this measure and why, or do you think these costs should be covered by the developers and subsequent land owners?

Yes, I support placing the \$40 million public safety bond and half cent sales tax increase on the November ballot. Strategically locating a new Firehouse in the JW Powell area is prudent long-term planning. Faster response times save lives, contain fires to the room of origin, reduce toxic emissions, and protect the environment. Improved fire protection also lowers homeowners' insurance premiums potentially by up to 47% through better ISO ratings. Developers contribute via impact fees, but new growth occurs gradually. The bond thoughtfully bridges this timing gap to serve existing neighborhoods while ensuring future accountability. This balanced approach demonstrates responsible leadership.

3. Do you think the proposed Red Gap Ranch development as a source of water for the City of Flagstaff is a necessity? What role do you think Advanced Water Treatment (AWT) of reclaimed water can play in our drinking water future?

I believe the proposed Red Gap Ranch development could serve as a strategic water source for Flagstaff's future, provided the city conducts ongoing cost benefit analyses. Currently, about 50% of our water comes from wells located in the surrounding forest. Red Gap Ranch provides an assurance of 100-year water supply for a population of 100,000 while providing redundancy against risk like catastrophic wildfires. Red Gap Ranch is also designated to be beneficial to tribal communities and other stakeholders with city pursuing federal partnerships for funding.

Advanced treatment of reclaimed water offers a promising compliment. As technology advances, it can reduce reliance on new sources while supporting conservation. I support a pragmatic diversified strategy that prioritizes water availability, reliability and public health.

4. Do you believe public safety in Flagstaff is solely the outcome of a well-financed and highly visible police force or do you believe addressing the social issues of poverty, homelessness, and addiction should be an important part of public safety funding? If you support the latest public safety tax and bond proposal how do you justify only increasing funding for the police and fire?

Public safety in Flagstaff requires both strong first responders and proactive solutions to underlying social challenges. I support the latest public safety tax and bond proposal because it strengthens our overall response capacity.

Increased funding equips police and fire personnel to address immediate crises, including those involving homelessness, poverty, and addiction. Our CARES unit, for example, reaches vulnerable individuals more effectively and compassionately, while allowing sworn officers to focus on other community needs. This year alone, first responders have assisted with over 27 overdoses and numerous medical emergencies.

At the same time, addressing social issues requires dedicated strategies. This is why I serve on a steering committee advancing a medically assisted detox center and a full continuum of care

as a standalone initiative. This balanced approach ensures resources are used effectively across prevention, emergency response, and long-term support.

5. What is your understanding of why the City Council goes into executive session? Do you think this practice has been abused or in your view is it always a legal necessity? If you suspect it is not always necessary, would you speak up and question these decisions?

Executive sessions are legally permitted for sensitive matters such as personnel issues, litigation, and real estate negotiations to protect the city's interests and ensure candid discussion. I support their appropriate use when required by law. However, I would not hesitate to question any session that appears unnecessary or overly broad, and I would advocate for the greatest transparency and open discussion possible within legal boundaries. As an incumbent with direct experience on the Council, I base my view on firsthand knowledge rather than speculation.

6. For years there's been several things the city would like to change or do but is not able to because of state laws such as restricting regulation of short term rentals. If the state legislature changes party hands in November there may be opportunities to overturn or enact some state laws. What laws would be your priority for our City to overturn or enact?

If the state legislature changes party control after November, I would actively lobby to restore greater local control in key areas where state laws currently limit flagstaff's ability to meet community needs.

A top priority would be increased flexibility to regulate short term rentals helping preserve housing affordability and neighborhood character.

Regardless of which party holds the majority I plan to reintroduce legislation originally developed last year with my Flynn brown fellowship cohorts that would authorize Tax Incremental Financing (TIF) in Arizona. This tool would generate critical resources to address our housing shortages.

Additionally, I would advocate for procurement reforms that give qualified local businesses priority, rather than defaulting to the lowest bidder under current state requirements. Any such changes must be balanced against cost differences to ensure responsible stewardship of public funds.

7. The new LASS+CAP recommendations have been released calling for greater density throughout the city to increase affordability and sustainability. The Realty community wants to maintain the status quo and build more single family home subdivisions. What role, if any, do you think single family home subdivisions should play in our future?

Single-family home subdivisions should continue to play a major role in Flagstaff's future, offering housing choices that many families desire and supporting stable neighborhoods. While increased density can aid affordability and sustainability, we must avoid one-size-fits-all mandates that ignore community character or strain infrastructure. I favor balanced, market-responsive policies: incentives for diverse housing types, including single-family where appropriate, paired with smart planning to ensure fiscal sustainability and quality of life.

8. The City Council has been presented with two separate zoning code amendments that would address data center development proposals in the city. One recommendation is to only allow data centers in Heavy Industrial zones. The other is for a complete ban. Do you think the City should ban data centers and encourage the County to consider doing the same?

I am committed to evidence-based decision making. Based on current information I support Flagstaff adopting strong protective zoning standards that effectively limit or prohibit large scale data centers within city limits. I would also encourage Coconino County to adopt a similar approach for large facilities while explicitly allowing micro data centers in small server rooms.

Large scale data centers are extremely resource intensive, consuming vast amounts of electricity and water. This could drive up utility rates for residents and jeopardize our future water supply. But we must be careful when setting any new zoning codes related to data centers. If the zoning amendment is too broad it could unintentionally affect normal small scale server rooms that are common with local businesses, hospitals or schools.

Drew Stanley

1. How can the City Council prioritize and advance the goals of the Climate Neutrality Plan in reducing carbon emissions and reaching Flagstaff's commitment to carbon neutrality by 2030?

I think that one way we could make a tangible step forward in reducing the city's emissions would be to increase the availability and affordability of the Mountain Line Bus System. We should transition to a fare free system for the Mountain Line, and ensure that the money gathered from the sales tax increase in 2024 is being utilized to increase the frequency of the Mountain Line, particularly in underserved areas of Flagstaff. Doing this would allow more people (particularly students and seniors) to consider the bus line as a viable alternative to their cars, thus reducing the city's carbon footprint. I also believe that the city should do more to

encourage new developers to build their buildings with sustainability measures in mind, such as solar energy, heat pumps, and more efficient insulation.

- 2. The City Council currently supports putting a public safety bond and sales tax paid for by current residents, on the ballot in November. One of the items is a new firehouse for the largely unoccupied JW Powell area. Do you support this measure and why, or do you think these costs should be covered by the developers and subsequent land owners?**

I do not support the current bond and sales tax ballot measures being proposed. I feel that in a time when the cost of living has skyrocketed in Flagstaff, and the City Government's own ability to raise revenue has been stretched thin over the past several years, we cannot pass a costly sales tax and bond measure that would further strain the pockets of Flagstaff residents. With Flagstaff's crime rate being below the national average, I also question the need for more revenue at this time for the police department, as well as the necessity of some of the projects that are proposed to be funded. The new firehouse slated for the JW Powell area seems an unnecessary addition at this time, and if development does eventually occur for that area, I do believe that the bill should be footed by developers and landowners in the area.

- 3. Do you think the proposed Red Gap Ranch development as a source of water for the City of Flagstaff is a necessity? What role do you think Advanced Water Treatment (AWT) of reclaimed water can play in our drinking water future?**

I would like to learn more about the proposed Red Gap Ranch project as it is not a subject I am familiar enough with at this time to speak on. I will say that the various lawsuits surrounding it over the past several years and the constant delays makes me question its efficacy as a long-term solution to Flagstaff's water needs. I am interested in the role that advanced water treatment could serve for the City, and I am learning more about what the feasibility and cost of using such methods could be.

- 4. Do you believe public safety in Flagstaff is solely the outcome of a well-financed and highly visible police force or do you believe addressing the social issues of poverty, homelessness, and addiction should be an important part of public safety funding? If you support the latest public safety tax and bond proposal how do you justify only increasing funding for the police and fire?**

I believe that in order to have a safe community in the long term, core issues of poverty and generational disparities must be treated directly. I fear that having a highly funded and manned law enforcement can only at best suppress and conceal problems, and that to truly address the root causes of crime, massive action must be taken to improve the actual lives of people in the city, from lowering the cost of housing and transportation, to providing more educational and

economic opportunities. The bond measures I fear could have the opposite effect of what I am sure they are intended for, making us less safe rather than more.

5. What is your understanding of why the City Council goes into executive session? Do you think this practice has been abused or in your view is it always a legal necessity? If you suspect it is not always necessary, would you speak up and question these decisions?

It is my understanding that the executive session is intended for the City Council to review legal questions pertaining to legislation that it might propose, such as in areas of real estate or personnel issues. In practice I fear it is used for City Council to hold private discussions on any range of issues and legislation, and presents an opportunity for Councilors to express opinions (and possibly pressure other councilors into agreeing with those opinions) without public scrutiny. While I don't believe that a counselor should not be allowed to discuss items of public interest without being fully under the public eye, it is concerning that this is done with a quorum of councilors present. Important discussions of legislation should always occur with the opportunity of the public to observe.

6. For years there's been several things the city would like to change or do but is not able to because of state laws such as restricting regulation of short term rentals. If the state legislature changes party hands in November there may be opportunities to overturn or enact some state laws. What laws would be your priority for our City to overturn or enact?

If the state legislature were to become more amenable to changing laws regarding short term rentals, I would want to prioritize two main items. First, I would like the City to be given the ability to tax short term rentals as commercial properties, with the funds being earmarked specifically for low income public housing. Second, I would want the City to have the ability to more aggressively cap the number of short term rentals allowed in Flagstaff, and implement stricter and more severe fines for rental property owners who cause disruption to the neighborhoods that they are located in.

7. The new LASS+CAP recommendations have been released calling for greater density throughout the city to increase affordability and sustainability. The Realty community wants to maintain the status quo and build more single family home subdivisions. What role, if any, do you think single family home subdivisions should play in our future?

I strongly doubt that with the current availability of land for housing development in Flagstaff that single family homes are at all appropriate for future housing development, especially if the goal is to make housing more affordable rather than less. My preference would be for a greater number of triplexes and quadruplexes being built, as well as ensuring that ADUs (Accessory Dwelling Units) are easy to be permitted and built. I also would like to see a greater effort from

the City to increase its own stock of publicly owned housing, particularly if it can be partnered as workforce housing for nurses and teachers.

- 8. The City Council has been presented with two separate zoning code amendments that would address data center development proposals in the city. One recommendation is to only allow data centers in Heavy Industrial zones. The other is for a complete ban. Do you think the City should ban data centers and encourage the County to consider doing the same?**

I am completely opposed to the construction of any kind of data center in Flagstaff, and would advocate for their complete ban in the City and County.