

MINUTES - DRAFT

City of Flagstaff

REGIONAL PLAN CITIZEN ADVISORY COMMITTEE

3:30 p.m. – 6 p.m. September 3, 2009

Northern Arizona Healthcare Educational Offices: 1000 N. Humphrey's Suite 241, Flagstaff, AZ;
in the Fort Valley shopping center, south of the hospital.



In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, if you need assistance to participate in this meeting, please contact Bonita Sears at 928-779-7632, ext. 7294 (or 774-5281 TDD). Notification at least 48 hours in advance will enable the City to make reasonable arrangements.

I. CALL TO ORDER

Chair Paul Babbitt called the meeting to order at 3:54 p.m.

II. Roll Call

A. Committee Members:

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Paul Babbitt (Chairman)	<input type="checkbox"/> Alex Frawley	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Devonna McLaughlin
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Carol Bousquet (Vice Chairman)	<input type="checkbox"/> Jean Griego	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Jerome Naleski
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Ben Anderson	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Shaula Hedwall	<input type="checkbox"/> Eva Putzova
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Susan Bean	<input type="checkbox"/> Richard Henn	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> William Ring (arrived at 5:00 p.m.)
<input type="checkbox"/> Michael Chaveas	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Maury Herman	<input type="checkbox"/> David Walker
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Ken Kaemmerle	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Nat White	<input type="checkbox"/> Steve Darden

B. Alternate Members:

Judy Louks
 Larry Stevens

C. STAFF:

Kimberly Sharp, Jim Cronk, David Wessel, Bill Towler, Martha Mase

III. APPROVAL of MINUTES for August 6, 2009

RECOMMENDED ACTION: Recommend corrections and approve [minutes](#)

Motion to approve the minutes of the Regular Meeting of August 6, 2009 as amended to include comments by Carly Long, Representative of Friends of Flagstaff future, was made and seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

IV. PUBLIC COMMENT

At this time, any member of the public may address the Committee on any subject within their jurisdiction that is not scheduled before the Commission on that day. Due to Open Meeting Laws, the Committee cannot discuss or act on items presented during this portion of the agenda. To address the Committee on an item that is on the agenda, please wait for the Chair to call for Public Comment at the time the item is heard. If time does not allow all comments to be heard, public comments may be posted to the Regional Plan blog: <http://flagregionalplan2012.wordpress.com/>

None

V. OLD BUSINESS - (Continued, postponed, and tabled agenda items.)

A. Vision Statement *(est. 60 minutes)*

PURPOSE: To establish a DRAFT vision statement of the Regional Plan 2012

RECOMMENDED ACTION: Review CAC proposed Draft Vision statement; CAC comments & edits

PRESENTERS: Bill Towler and Jim Cronk, Facilitators

ATTACHMENTS: [Vision Statement Qualities](#)
[Vision Statement version 'A'](#)
[Vision Statement version 'B'](#)

Mr. Cronk led the discussion on the vision statement qualities. The Committee members were in agreement about the desired qualities for a vision statement that had been identified at the previous meeting. These qualities were identified as: simple, meaningful words, compelling, accessible, visionary, interconnected and values.

The Committee was asked to review the draft vision statements labeled A and B that had been drafted by the task force and Staff. They were asked to identify what they liked in both statements.

Mr. Herman expressed a concern about the Committee process in reviewing the statements. He suggested that the Committee thoroughly discuss the work of the task force instead of what was produced by the staff.

Chair Babbitt stated that he was comfortable in what has been done.

Mr. White stated that this is our working value statement and the Committee should not worry about calling it a vision statement. He suggested they work with content of the statements.

Mr. Kaemmerle asked for clarification as to whether this was for the year 2030. It was determined that this should be corrected to reflect 2030.

Mr. Ring stated that from his perspective, version B was the best. It was concise, straight forward, attached to important elements, and describes our vision. It was not as imbedded with words that have a double meaning and covered all the bases, but he said he would include the introductory paragraph of Version A.

Mr. Kaemmerle agreed with version B and with version A introductory.

Mr. Anderson stated that they already have a clear statement from Vision 20/20

Ms. McLaughlin said she preferred version B, that is was not quite as simple as version A. Some parts were too long.

Ms Bean preferred version A with the introductory of version B.

Mr. Naleski said that he liked the labels and the organization in version A.

Ms Hedwall liked version B and liked the headings for version A.

Mr. Herman said that he liked version A more than version B and that some parts in version B were over blown.

Ms. Putzova's comments were read by Ms. Sharp. Ms. Putzova preferred version A

Ms. Hedwall read her comments to the Committee. She said they should come up with terms that are widely understood and include them in a broader statement.

Mr. White said that he supported Ms. Hedwalls' concept.

Mr. Ring also agreed with Ms. Hedwall.

Mr. Cronk then reminded the Committee of the previous discussion about the introduction and all the elements.

Ms. Bousquet said that she liked the words in version A and like the way version B defines categories. She said that it makes sense to clump the elements in categories, that it helps to link the vision and preamble to what will come later.

Mr. Babbitt stated that he liked the connectivity and is looking for this in the vision statement. He asked: how they would decide what is coming before the community, which of these versions? He stated that he would like the vision statement to be a result of some consideration of the conflict between one proposal and another. He liked keeping it somewhat simple and for the planned elements to set the priority.

Mr. Cronk stated that it seems like the Committee is in favor to take the opening paragraph of version B.

Ms. Bousquet suggested using the fist of five to move this discussion along.

Ms. Sharp stated that it seemed like everyone like the introductory of Version A because of the history, and suggested using this as background to state where they are coming from and where they are going.

Mr. Naleski asked if once they decide on this vision statement if it would be posted before the Committee at every meeting to help keep them focused on what they are doing. Staff agreed to do this.

Mr. Anderson asked Ms. Bousquet how you would differentiate between Built Environment and Planned Environment and her response was to refer to the proposed plan format which includes circulation, economic development, bicycling and energy as part of built environment. Planned environment includes elements such as community character; land use, historic preservation among others.

“The Greater Flagstaff Community recognizes the importance of the region’s unique cultural and ecological setting on the Colorado Plateau, by creating a lifelong stewardship for the natural and built environment to sustainably co-exist. This is upheld and valued by residents and visitors alike to encourage and advance intellectual, environmental, social economic prosperity for today’s citizens and future generations.”

The Committee further reviewed the draft introductory statement and recommended some changes to the words and the final draft was put to a vote. The final draft is as follows:

“The Greater Flagstaff Community embraces the region’s extraordinary cultural and ecological setting on the Colorado Plateau through active stewardship of the natural and built environments. Residents and visitors encourage and advance intellectual, environmental, social and economic vitality for today’s citizens and future generations.”

Motion by William Ring to approve the revised draft vision statement and seconded by Nat White.
Motion carried unanimously.

The Committee discussed what the next steps would be and using the two drafts that were prepared would be used to discuss the elements and how they would categorize the elements. The Committee asked staff to prepare an outline for consideration at the October meeting, based on the idea of grouping the elements into the proposed categories as a starting point.

B. Sustainability Memo – Eva Putzova

PURPOSE: To review Memo submitted to CAC by CAC member Eva Putzova

RECOMMENDED ACTION: Discuss

Facilitator: Chair Paul Babbitt

It was the consensus of Committee Ms. Putzova's comments when she is present; this item was tabled to the October agenda .

VI. NEW BUSINESS

A. Activity Centers (est. 60 minutes)

PURPOSE: To discuss the purpose of 'Activity Centers' in Flagstaff, direction for future focus for policies and development, and correlation with circulation, conservation, neighborhoods, etc.

RECOMMENDED ACTION: Discuss and provide direction

FACILITATORS: Kimberly Sharp, David Wessel and Roger Eastman

HANDOUTS: Handed out at August CAC Meeting:

- Existing RLUTP Policies to support Activity Centers
- RTP Survey results
- Flagstaff 'Districts' Map
- Excerpt from "Suburban Nation: The Rise of Sprawl and the Decline of the American Dream" by Duany, Plater-Zyberk & Speck. Chapters 1 & 2
- Report "How Can I Find and Help Build a Walkable Community"? by DBurden

Mr. David Wessel provided a PowerPoint presentation on the definition and purpose of activity centers. He presented what is in the current Regional Land Use and Transportation Plan on activity centers and another definition from Austin.

The purpose of his presentation was to assist the Committee in sector planning and where they would like to see growth in Flagstaff and where these centers for growth would be. The current Plan speaks to more pedestrian friendly development and less auto use. If activity centers are not included in the planning, what other alternatives are there. He asked the Committee to comment on how activity centers might contribute to the values in the vision statement that was just discussed.

Comments from the Committee included:

- Economic vitality, gives small businesses an opportunity
- Change traffic patterns
- Environmental implications
- Depending on size of town, activity centers lose value as the city grows
- Does every activity center have to duplicate other activity centers?
- There are different kinds of activity centers.
- Promote transportation, use of public transportation.
- Promotes more compact growth.
- Themes for activity centers
- How do you design activity centers, does it include all these different themes?
- What is the philosophy of having businesses near schools?

Mr. Wessel provided a slide of the Walmart shopping center and asked the Committee to comment on what kind of activities takes place at this shopping center.

Comments were:

- Parking
- Restaurants
- Entertainment

He asked what made it successful or unsuccessful.

Comments were:

- All the businesses are clustered together which makes it successful.
- Having difficulty differentiating a shopping center from an activity center.
- Occurs at two interstate intersections and is a good location for big box retail.
- Kind of a community center, but no one lives here. Can't get to this place unless you drive.
- Not pedestrian friendly.
- How to deal with sprawl

There was discussion on downtown development and the need for parking. Mr. Wessel commented that there is evidence that the highest pedestrian activity makes for highest retail return. He asked what might be common to activity centers. Comments were:

- Access
- Public gathering areas
- Central draw

He asked how they might differ:

- Cross purposes work against each other.
- Unique needs and purposes.
- By theme

Mr. Wessel stated that the Regional Land Use and Transportation Plan talks about the number of activity centers and that they are scaleable, small and large. He talked about the downtown area and who it serves. He said the plan also talks about districts and helps to envision where activity centers may be planned in the community. He pointed out some areas on the map that may or may not be good for activity centers. He said that activity centers help to organize, help transportation, guide investment and help focus. He asked whether they should tweak the existing plan and bring sector planning into sharper focus.

VII. CONCLUDING GENERAL BUSINESS

A. Homework

To be distributed during the CAC Meeting. This Homework is to review to prepare for Open Houses, Focus Group and next month's CAC meeting:

1. Cliff Notes: Conservation
2. Focus Group – Water, Conservation, Energy & Environment: Thursday, Sep. 24, 2009
4-7 p.m. – CCC Lone Tree Campus
3. Survey monkey – Poll existing policy review for 'Water, conservation, energy & environment'

B. Announcements (*Informal Announcements, Future Agenda Items, and Next Meeting Date*)

1. **Next CAC Meeting:** September 17, 2009 - 3:30 p.m. to 6 p.m. at N.AZ Healthcare facilities

Future Agenda Items:

1. Land Use, Growth Areas, Bicycle & Circulation policy review (Sep. 17)
 2. RTP update & coordination (Oct. 1)
 3. Regional Plan document format & organization (Oct. 1)
 4. Review existing RLUTP policies for Water, Conservation, Energy & Environment
3. **Zoning Code Design Charrette with Opticos** – October 5-9, 2009

VIII. ADJOURNMENT

Chair Paul Babbitt adjourned the meeting at 6:00 p.m.