

MEETING MINUTES

City of Flagstaff

REGIONAL PLAN CITIZEN ADVISORY COMMITTEE

3:30 p.m. – 6 p.m. October 1, 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

II. Roll Call

A. **Committee Members:**

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Paul Babbitt (Chairman)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Alex Frawley	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Devonna McLaughlin
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Carol Bousquet (Vice Chairman)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Jean Griego	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Jerome Naleski (came late)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Ben Anderson	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Shaula Hedwall	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Eva Putzova
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Susan Bean	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Richard Henn	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> William Ring (left early)
<input type="checkbox"/> Michael Chaveas	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Maury Herman	<input checked="" 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

Paul Babbitt called the meeting to order at 3:33

Kim Sharp reported on the Community Forum held today at NAU. The Federal Office of Urban Affairs Director Carrion, Under-secretary of the Department of Energy and of HUD were visiting Flagstaff and touring the community. A question was posed to the Director by Leah Bornstein, Coconino Community College president – “What is the best way for our community to ‘connect the dots’ in relation to education, jobs, housing, etc., just as the Office of Urban Affairs is working closely with the Department of Transportation, Department of Energy and Housing and Urban Development (HUD)?” – the Director answered “a smart Regional Plan”.

III. APPROVAL of MINUTES for September 3, 2009 and September 17, 2009

RECOMMENDED ACTION: Recommend corrections and approve 9/3/09 [minutes](#) and 9/17/09 [minutes](#).

Motion to accept: 1st David Walker; 2nd Carol Bousquet with note: Carol Bousquet gave a list of comments and corrections to staff, would like edits considered.

Motion to approve 9/3/09 minutes with vice chair comments – approved unanimously

City clerk gave a talk to the community college about the types of minutes. There are ‘Action Minutes’, which only state actions approved by the committee; and ‘Detailed Minutes’ which are verbatim. She recommended a combination of the two types of minutes. Chair Babbitt stated that we are trying to catch the essence of the meeting.

9/19 minutes: 1st Richard Hen; 2nd Richard Walker- Approved 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/>

No public comments

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

A. **Sustainability Memo** – Eva Putzova (est. 30 minutes)

PURPOSE: To review [Memo](#) submitted to CAC by CAC member Eva Putzova

RECOMMENDED ACTION: Discuss

Facilitator: Chair Paul Babbitt

This item of discussion was in response to a memo provided by Eva Putzova, submitted to CAC 7/2/09. The memo discussed the possibility of introducing sustainability as a separate element and as a key guiding principle within the plan. To pursue long term stewardship of our resources, we should be thinking about how all decisions for development and economic development use resources, such as water. Sustainability is a broader term than just environmental sustainability, but is a key part of the overall long term health of the community. Eva would like to see if the committee could come to some type of agreement.

Nicole Woodman, Sustainability Manager for the City of Flagstaff, addressed the committee about where sustainability could fit in the regional plan. The term sustainability should be defined for our community, because this term means different things to different people and won't be effective without an agreed upon definition. A number of communities do have sustainability as a separate element, and this is used as the main guiding principle. Sustainability also addresses climate issues and adaptation. In terms of sustainability within the city organization, her program is trying to weave it through all programs with a clear message of what and why. She encouraged the committee to start with a clear definition.

Alex asked the difference between sustainability as an individual element or being woven into every element. Nicole used an example from Queensland, Australia – which uses sustainability as a specific element – that has the following goal: “This element integrates long term decision making into all long and short term decisions within the comprehensive plan”. Could our Regional Plan use an icon to symbolize which goals and strategies go towards supporting sustainability? Alex stated that sustainability really needs to flow as a guiding principle.

Amanda Acheson, Coconino County Sustainable Building Coordinator, noted that sustainability is a holistic approach, how everything interacts together.

Nicole used Boulder, Colorado as another example – Boulder's General Plan clearly defines 'sustainability' in the beginning. The definition really helps define how sustainability is included in the plan.

Nicole is providing the City Sustainability Commission's comments on the zoning code update, as well as an update on the community sustainability plan.

Chair Babbitt proposed that the issue of 'overarching theme(s)' will also be discussed with the draft outline; the group is heading toward a document that is more integrated and holistic.

Nat White stated that the mission statement can be followed with a values statement. We can have the best of both worlds

Vice-chair Bousquet noted that none of the goals or policies would work to the detriment of any of the other elements, and that makes sustainability a good umbrella for the plan. There is a way to weave sustainability throughout the whole document.

Alex asked: are we going to use values or guiding principles? Guiding principles flow through the plan, just like the conservation framework of the County's Comprehensive Plan. She would prefer defining sustainability within every element – how that particular element could be 'sustainable' for our community.

Eva asked if we were constructing this plan thinking that the policies are guided by something. Can sustainability be that number one priority, as well as identifying how sustainability works within all elements? Identify the issues very explicitly.

Bill Ring: this is a much larger question; we could be re-engineering the whole plan. He thought we were working on filling in the holes of a document that is pretty much whole. If we take the approach of guiding principles, such as sustainability, and understanding how each guiding principal works with each element, we could be scrapping everything we have. Are we discussing this route which is a change of course?

Maury Herman: will sustainability be viewed as a quaint term of the early 2000's? Not that the concepts won't continue, he said he would rather we define what we mean without using the term 'sustainability'. If we just specify what we mean, we could save some work. Eva's memo does suggest our worldwide situation in the future and that we will have to go through a transition, but when you get too far away from the area we live in, we lose sight of what is occurring. Expressing some understanding of moving away from the use of fossil fuels is a good point, but when you get too far in one direction, frustration builds and the pendulum swings the opposite way. The community could end up with employers that don't fit our goals, because desperation could lead to bad decisions. We need to recognize the market during these policy discussions. There are behavior modifications, such as gasoline taxes, that would alter behaviors more than rules. He would like to see us aligned with this kind of thinking.

Susan Bean noted that tonight's agenda includes a discussion of the outline, and this discussion leads into that one. She said she likes having the topic integrated with each element and the language can reflect that element.

Bill Ring asked Susan if she was suggesting that sustainability not be a stand alone element? Susan said she thought the 'guiding principals' could be interwoven with a series of icons, for example. Sustainability is relative to everything.

Bill Ring said he has been working with Alex Frawley on coming up with a definition of sustainability for another project, and it is planning for seven generations. It could really go either way, yet we all agree sustainability belongs in the plan. He was concerned about making sustainability into its own chapter; it would seem to marginalize the issue. He could be supportive of weaving the idea of sustainability through the chapters that it applies. He said he hesitates to think that it is THE overarching principle. There are some issues with how sustainability is defined, yet he thinks it belongs in the fabric of the plan.

Alex said she appreciated Maury's comments, that considering true costs is important. Don't forget that the plan will be redone every 10 years, and it can be adjusted according to the market. We need to define sustainability for our community and then it is accessible.

Nicole Woodman noted that the concept of sustainability is so dynamic. There is an opportunity to create an education tool by weaving sustainability throughout the plan. Sustainability is not just environmental issues but includes economic and social issues.

Rich Henn agrees with Paul Babbitt in having a preamble leading into the document. How would we really develop a plan that wouldn't be sustainable? That is what Flagstaff is, we are working towards a sustainable community.

Eva would envision that there are many policies falling under sustainability and clearly identified throughout the plan. It could be used to check if these policies are truly sustainable, to put an icon next to them. Our society will come up with other ways to produce energy beyond the use of fossil fuels. The cars aren't the problem, it is the fuel used to power them.

Bill Ring suggested that a committee of the CAC get together to see how this text might look.

Carol Bousquet noted that although this plan will be redone or revised in 10 years, it is important to look longer term. It is important to talk about big dreams as well.

Eva asked how the city defines sustainability. Nicole addressed the definition. Eva suggested that the CAC come up with a definition and come up with the guiding principles.

Chair Babbitt – a summary of this discussion will be noted, and this topic will continue on the November agenda.

VI. NEW BUSINESS

A. September 24 Focus Group results *(est. 30 minutes)*

PURPOSE: To review the Open House comments and discuss the results of Focus Group 2 (Water, Energy, Environment & Conservation) to provide direction for future policy discussions. Meeting comments and SWOT results will be handed out at the CAC meeting; posted to website afterward.

RECOMMENDED ACTION: Discuss and provide direction

FACILITATORS: Bill Towler (Environment); Sue Pratt (Water); facilitator (Energy)

Kim reported on the focus group of 9/24/09 with a Powerpoint presentation. Sue Pratt, Bill Towler and Amanda Acheson each facilitated the three 'break-out' groups and gave a summary. 28 from the public attended out of an invitation list of about 100 people.

Bill Towler presented the results of the Environment group, which was facilitated by himself, Sarah Rief (AZ Game and Fish), Bob Hoffa (Conservation Manager, City of Flagstaff) and April LaLiberte (Brownfields Manager, City of Flagstaff). Mr. Towler listed the subjects that are to be covered under 'Environmental Planning', then some of the questions posed to the group; Bill went through the highlights on the SWOT analysis. The Pima County Model for the Conservation Lands System was briefly discussed. Bill reviewed the flip chart notes which will be posted to the Regional Plan website next week; there were about 10 people in the group, the usual suspects but a great discussion.

Nat White noted that a more balanced discussion is necessary in the Focus Groups. Many are invited to participate, but the 'usual suspects' turn up, and the conversation seems a little one-sided. Mr. White highly encourages the entire group to help get buy-in from different groups.

Recent efforts have been made in inviting all aspects of the community to participate, such as the recent presentation to the Chamber of Commerce, Northern Arizona Board of Realtors and Northern Arizona Building Association.

Kim Sharp noted that the CAC isn't expected to use the Focus Group information and write policies. The goal is that at each monthly CAC meeting, a formal presentation and discussion will be made; the CAC will use the presentation materials, public comments from Open Houses, Focus Group discussion and background information to begin thinking of policy development.

David Wessel noted that a 'values' survey will also contribute to policy development. The NAU community values survey is underway, but a Gallup poll is getting ready to administer a statewide survey on values. We would have to use some extrapolation, but we could ascertain statistically significant information from this.

Chair Babbitt noted that so few people are participating, it is disconcerting. He noted that at an open house for the bond advisory, the water table was the busiest at that time. We need to generate that that type interest.

Eva said we are working hard but the public is not involved. We cannot get the public involved without a properly funded project. Eva would like to go to the City Council to express concern for under funding of this effort. She would like to speak with other committee members.

Alex Frawley said we are all critical thinkers and we need to think empathetically. If you look at the economy, it is no wonder people aren't coming out to attend. They are too busy making ends meet.

Chair Babbitt said the city has another proposal about parking downtown; he stumbled onto a blog that had a great community discussion. It would be nice if the Regional Plan blog was getting that type of attention. Paul had coffee the other day with a copy of the plan on the table, and it was interesting to start conversations about the plan.

Judy Louks said people that utilize this tool are here, but until people realize that this impacts the whole, interest remains limited. She would be curious to know how many people in Flagstaff even know we have a regional plan.

Susan Bean said when someone comes in with a development project, the first person they meet should be able to explain the document. If this was part of the process all along maybe there would be more interest.

Sue Pratt reviewed the water resources break-out group, which she facilitated with Brad Hill from the City. One of the key issues that came out early in the discussion was sustainability and having a sustainable water supply. The need to include environmental needs when considering water resource issues. The current RP has a water element but does not have any 'Water Resources' policies. There was much discussion on background information; the fact that the city is a water provider and the county is not; legal issues; identifying needs and supplies. The water element requirements of ARS are looking for known legal and available ground water supplies. The city is working on answering these questions with a hydrology report. Sue presented the SWOT analysis results, which are on the PowerPoint.

Eva questioned the opportunities outside of the city and under the county's control. Sue responded that most of the issues around water are regulation driven. Opportunities come down to laws and ordinances.

Alex asked if the group can require things like low-flow toilets. Sue responded that it can be part of the discussion but the CAC needs to get more information about the regulatory framework that surrounds water.

Nat asked about the strategy on the focus groups. Are we preparing groups with a lot of information or less information? Kim responded that it is brief background information. Nat noted that regarding recent proposals for mandatory water conservation efforts, there has been

strong opposition from the development community because it means adding regulation, and from the city council because it was a broad based approach and would cost money to develop. As we think about policies there has to be a real practical side and not just the visionary side.

Maury Herman would like clarification on the grey water vs. reclaimed water supply discussion. Mr. Herman also had concern over the dichotomy of property rights and human rights; because property rights are a human right, and both have suffered from perception. Sue would not recommend that policies be developed until the CAC has had an opportunity to study the issue in depth.

Amanda Acheson presented the findings for the Energy break-out group, which she facilitated with Rebecca Sayers. Beginning with the ARS requirements, and acknowledging that there are no existing policies for energy in the current RP, they directed questions to the group which helped answer the SWOT analysis. Amanda reviewed some policy statement ideas that the focus group came up with, such as an energy commission similar to Pima County, balance between renewable production and overall consumption, four policy suggestions from F3 - implementing building codes with highest efficiency; retrofitting existing buildings; long term goal of 100% of energy from renewable sources; green house gas reduction goals be included.

Eva stated that there is a strong feeling that the political environment is a big influence on this issue.

Ben Anderson stated that this is one of the elements that is going to be radically changed, and a lot of this is out of our control, so do we prioritize residential or commercial use? Do we encourage commercial development or do we support residential wind turbines?

Shaula Hedwall noted that the biggest existing effort across the region for renewables is biomass. The city and county are both involved, and this needs to be noted on the energy SWOT.

Maury Herman was concerned about the note "Rental properties are NOT interested in energy efficiency." As a landlord, he is regularly asked about utility bills on residential and commercial properties. There are economic incentives to improve rental properties. The owners of buildings are better capitalized than single family homeowner when the economics are right. There are trade offs with tax incentives. Where they are used should be reviewed.

Nat White has observed energy trade-offs over the years. Living on Mars Hill in the 60's, the city every morning looked like we had a tremendous control burn, because a lot of folks were heating their homes with wood burning stoves and the lumber mill ran by steam and cleaned out their stacks every morning. Regulations for more efficient wood burning stoves and the introduction of natural gas have greatly improved our air quality today.

B. Regional Transportation Plan results

(est. 45 minutes)

PURPOSE: To review the final RTP document and discuss Regional Plan implications. Full document is available via website: http://www.flagstaffpathways.org/updates/RTP_Draft_v2.0.pdf

RECOMMENDED ACTION: Discuss and provide direction

FACILITATORS: David Wessel, FMPO Director

David Wessel: the FMPO is doing an update to the regional transportation plan (RTP), using the policies from the existing regional plan. The plan will be on the website and will be around town with comment cards. The public comment period will run until mid-November and the FMPO is looking for approval in December. Wessel has reviewed activity centers with the CAC, which really drives the RTP plan. Other issues are connectivity, which prohibits or provides for good mobility; and noting that congestion comes with trade-offs, such as a potential Highway 89 by-pass. What are the alternatives? You sit in traffic or you widen a road. Do need to look at transit

as a possible option. A recommended study is a Highway 180 bypass. Addressing daily congestion issues versus snow play traffic. Other potentially controversial issues: extending Clay Ave; study Milton Road; future development interchange needs. Until these are studied in detail, the ends are unknown. Smart growth principles are based on a network of streets with a ¼ mile grid. Flagstaff has many areas where a ¼ mile grid is not possible. What types of network will really be required? Comment period is 45 days – please let your opinion be heard.

Eva asked about the funding of this plan and the timeline for this process. When this is done what will happen to the RTP. Dave responded that it will have to be amended with the Regional Plan update – any new policies and/or different land use direction.

Paul asked for the more thorough presentation on the RTP and discussion at the November meeting.

C. Regional Plan Document Working Outline *(est. 30 minutes)*

PURPOSE: To begin drafting Regional Plan 2012 document outline

RECOMMENDED ACTION: Discuss and provide direction

FACILITATORS: Bob Caravona

HANDOUTS: Draft outline prepared by staff for comparison and discussion

Two alternative outlines were presented by Tiffany Antol, County Planner:

Draft 1 – based upon first ‘vision’ statement;

1. Both begin the same – introduction, purpose of the plan, acknowledgement
2. Executive summary w/ overarching themes; sustainable Flagstaff – based upon County’s comprehensive plan with overarching theme of conservation – similar idea with introduction, sustainability for Flagstaff, how this relates to all goals and policies throughout
3. Vision and guiding principals – the ‘vision statement’ drafts produced by the committees had many guiding principals incorporated.
4. Planning elements – ARS requirements
5. Community Profile

Headings:

- Environmental Quality;
- Community Character;
- Development, Transportation, Growth & Sustainability
- Monitoring & Implementation: community indicators, implementation
-

Draft 2 – based upon second’ vision’ statement - Very similar – different order

Headings:

- Natural Environment;
- Built Environment;
- Human Environment;
- Planned Environment

All 17 required and 5 optional elements are included; what makes sense to make the document usable?

Tiffany noted that 'land use' was last, because all other elements feed into the land use element.

CAC comments:

This goes back to who is using the document as to verbiage being used, simple is better. Identify the user groups we want to look at and use this plan; this helps us check with the community that this is a useful tool.

The planning framework talks about how this plan works with other groups and documents

The headings should be what elements naturally go together. Possibly put all the elements on a grid and understand the connectivity – good visual tool. Tiffany noted that she did this in the office to work on the outline, she will bring this to the next 'Outline' discussion.

Eva said if one section has too many elements in it, it becomes too large, blurry eyed. Possibly we could have some type of designer thinking about this graphically with color coding, icons, etc. and how we organize this. In the end, we will need an abbreviated version produced in a very simple way to display the essence and flavor of the plan, especially as we want buy-in from the community to vote for approval.

Susan Bean said in her experience an inexperienced editor will say "I need an outline"; but it must evolve more organically than that. We can waste a lot of time in developing a rigid outline. The groupings seem fine in either case – it shows what we are aiming for. But she didn't think deciding on these is helpful right now; we are not in a position to fiddle with this. Yet, it is extremely helpful to see this mapped out this far.

Carol Bousquet– I would like to see some draft outline put up on the website as a navigation tool for the public to find the information, and as a training tool for the public to see this project grow and evolve – echoing the work we're doing so that the information is accessible in the same format.

Nat White – Draft 1 – goes with staff suggestion at this time as a working document. Alex Frawley also votes for using Draft 1, although economic development should not be under 'community character' but under 'development'. Eva prefers Draft 2, yet struggles with 'planned environment' in relation to natural / built and human as three categories – economic development would be under 'human'. Mr. White agrees that it would be good to have something on the web page, as a link to this outline, so the public can see the progress.

Ben Anderson– what will the end product look like? It will change, but he said he is desperate for something like this to work from. He is struggling to understand how all this information we are being given comes together – this outline is great progress. This tool to track our work is essential for him.

Paul – anyone very unhappy if we use one for now, knowing that this is evolutionary....

Devonna McLaughlin – in reviewing the existing Regional Plan, do these structures address existing gaps? Any there any other sections we should look at?

Bill Towler –said we have 22 elements now, they capture most everything. We can add and adjust along the way

Do these elements fit together – and what do we want to call them? How the groupings are different – what fits together in a group? Ask our current planners – how would they use these groupings? What makes the most sense to them? Can we call it 'section 1' 'section 2' and 'section 3' for now and name the sections later? We just need something to get us going, not written in stone.

Alex Frawley made a motion that the CAC use Outline Draft 1 to move forward; Jerome Naleski seconds the motion, noting that it is not set in stone. Unanimous vote to use 1 for now.

VII. CONCLUDING GENERAL BUSINESS

A. Homework

To be e-mailed to each CAC member, Focus Group attendee and the Regional Plan contact list:

1. Survey monkey – Poll existing policies for ‘Water, conservation, energy & environment’:
www.surveymonkey.com

This survey will be e-mailed out soon

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

1. **Special CAC Meeting:** October 15, 2009 – 3:30 p.m. to 6 p.m. at N. AZ Healthcare facilities. This meeting will be to continue existing land-use policy review and discussion.

Took a vote to see who will be here – 11 people (quorum); Rich Henn would like us to decide on second meetings sooner than later so he can book the space.

Announcement – Zoning Code charrette NEXT WEEK – be there

Announcement – Juniper Point open house tonight at CCC until 7 p.m.

Question – rezoning information? Will there be information out there that a new major road will be needed for the Juniper Point proposal? Is the connection between Regional Plan and RTP and development being made? Ex: JWP extension – Lone Tree – Juniper Point? Ask Dave Wessel.

Paul – public notices for major rezoning are MAJORLY inadequate – so many more people need to know about this.

Ben – speaks to the importance of the Regional Plan and the fact that the Zoning Code and RTP are proceeding. Public doesn’t participate because it is impossible to understand, and impossible to keep up with it.

2. **Upcoming Open Houses and next Focus Group (Open Space, Parks & Recreation, Public Facilities):**

10/22 – TOWN HALL MEETING - 5:30 p.m. City Hall: review of public discussions for topics thus far

10/30 – 7-9 a.m. OPEN HOUSE (Pulliam Airport); noon – 2 p.m. (City Hall Lobby)

11/04 – 4-7 p.m. OPEN HOUSE (Highland Fire Dept., Kachina Village)

11/19 – 4-7 p.m. FOCUS GROUP (Aquaplex)

3. **Next CAC Meeting:** November 5, 2009 - 3:30 p.m. to 6 p.m. at N.AZ Healthcare facilities

Future Agenda Items:

1. Regional Plan document outline (Nov. 5)
2. Existing RLUTP policies for Water, Conservation, Energy & Environment (Nov. 5)
3. ‘Water Resources’ presentation and discussion (Nov. 5)
4. Zoning Code update (Nov. 5)
5. Energy & Environment presentation and discussion (Dec. 3)
6. Open Space & Conservation presentation and discussion (Jan. 7)

VIII. ADJOURNMENT