

MINUTES - DRAFT

City of Flagstaff

REGIONAL PLAN CITIZEN ADVISORY COMMITTEE

3:30 p.m. – 6 p.m. November 05, 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

The meeting was called to order at 3:38 p.m. by Vice Chair Carol Bousquet.

II. Roll Call

A. **Committee Members:**

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| <input 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 |
| <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 |
| <input checked="" 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

C. **Staff:** Sue Pratt, Kim Sharp, Tiffany Antol, Bob Caravona, John Aber

III. 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

Approval of Minutes – October 1, 2009 Meeting Minutes

A motion to table the approval of the October 15th Meeting Minutes was made by David Walker and second by Ben Anderson and voted unanimously, until further corrections and clarifications could be made, as submitted by Vice-Chair Bousquet.

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

A. Regional Transportation Plan *(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

The following discussions occurred:

- Differences between the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) and the Regional Plan
- Major policies in the RTP:
 - Balance travel choices
 - Optimize existing infrastructure
 - Enhance the local economy
- Strategies:
 - Complete Streets
 - Connectivity
 - Activity Centers
- Challenges:
 - Limited investment resources;
 - Appropriate mix of transit choices;
 - Funding issues
 - Character – how to integrate necessary mobility and not degrade or only enhance character
- Area types and Activity Centers:
 - CAC will help identify Activity Centers – identify, desired overall mix, growth and shape
 - Levels of service for various modes identified
 - CAC comment – the RTP seems to show too many Activity Centers for our population. What is the appropriate level?
- CAC comments & answers to their questions:
 - Show FUTS connections to AZ Loop Trail
 - Need to understand road project scoring – how do modes score against each other?
 - JW Powell dips south for reasons of topography. The alignment is only conceptual at this time.
 - If a jurisdiction request federal funded dollars for a project shown in the Regional Land Use and Transportation Plan but is not shown in the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP), then it would not get funded. The RTP will need to be amended first.
 - Belmont Traffic Interchange (TI) was scored higher for potential jobs which was concern in comparison to other projects listed.
 - The RTP is based upon and in alignment with existing Regional Plan (2001)
 - Discrepancies between slides and hand-out need to be addressed. Does the CAC have the latest RTP draft?
 - A number of projects – how doe we get a “NO” next to these potential projects?
 - 89N Interchange

- 180N by-pass
- Answer: CAC can communicate as a body or as individuals – submit written comments to the FMPO by November 19th; certain proposed projects can ‘go away’ with the existing CAC process
 - a. recommendation from the CAC;
 - b. bring the RTP into compliance through the adoptions of the RLUTP (e.g. not showing the road); or
 - c. an evaluation of the road
- Funding regulated by MPO: federal transit planning money; federal transit capital monies; public transit monies to NAIPTA through FMPO; ADOT money – primarily for roads, some enhancements; Highway safety improvement funds
- Public comments will be presented to the public in both raw and summarized form
- CAC has the ability to AMEND the RTP as the Regional Land Use and Transportation Plan is finalized – the RTP will be brought into coordination with the updated Regional Land Use and Transportation Plan.
- Biggest community concerns – relieve congestion; keep our small town character; environmental protections & wildlife corridors

What is the process from re-allocating funds from ROADS to TRANSIT? Through local sales tax initiatives; very little state funds – Highway ADOT funds are primarily roads and right-of-way improvements.

- **Based upon RTP analysis: by 2030, Flagstaff will not get that much benefit from encouraging multi-modal transportation (buses, pedestrians and bicycles) because we currently do not have the densities and diversity to support higher BPT (bike/ped/transit) use. Unless.....**
 - 25% future growth by 2030 is well below thresholds to drive great investments in public transit, unless growth is concentrated specifically to take advantage of these mode shifts and transit options
 - Should we build today for an expected mode shift? Or for \$350 per barrel oil prices?
- Submit comment to Dave Wessel, FMPO Director by November 19th 2009: dwessel@flagstaffaz.gov

V. **NEW BUSINESS**

A. **Energy Element**

(est. 100 minutes)

PURPOSE: Presentations and discussions with various energy providers; review of public comments regarding ‘Energy’ element from Open Houses and Focus Group

RECOMMENDED ACTION: Discuss and provide direction as to potential energy policies

FACILITATORS: Tom Acker or associate (NAU); Michael McElmury (APS); Nicole Woodman (City of Flagstaff); Amanda Acheson (Coconino County);

HANDOUTS (attached as links and hard copies available upon request):

- [Flagstaff RP Open House & Focus Group - ‘Energy’ public comments summary](#)
- [F3 Suggested Policies](#)
- Flagstaff Zoning Code transects views of alternative energy. Sherwood Design Engineers
 - [\(1\) Solar/Wind; \(2\) Solar; \(3\) Alternative Energy; \(4\) Alternative Energy 2](#)
- [Arizona Energy Atlas](#)
- Energy Policy examples from

- Coconino County Comprehensive Plan
- Buckeye, AZ General Plan Energy goals, within Environmental Element
- Pinal County Comprehensive Plan – Energy Chapter
- Lake Oswego, OR General Plan Energy Element (population 35,278)
- Tigard, OR General Plan Energy Element (population 47,150)
- See Coconino County's Sustainable Building Program's website for an overview:
<http://www.coconino.az.gov/comdev.aspx?id=148>

Presentations by:

- Dr. Tom Acker, NAU
- Michael McElmury, APS, Director, Northern Arizona Energy Delivery
- Nicole Woodman, City of Flagstaff Sustainability Manager
- Amanda Acheson, Coconino County, Sustainable Building Program Manager

Summarized presenter and CAC discussion:

- The biggest bang for the buck – wind or efficiency? "Efficiency."
- There is a problem with transmission at the macro scale – how to get the energy produced to areas of service. The short term possibility is not strong, but long-term potential is decent.
- Mr. McElmury showed that by the year 2025, our energy needs will increase by 20%. In comparison, what could be our increase in energy efficiency by 5% by 2025?
- consider policies across the board, commercial (include university), residential, industrial – both micro and macro

VI. CONCLUDING GENERAL BUSINESS

A. **CAC Retreat – CAC would like to schedule a retreat to focus on process**

1. Staff will work with the Chair and Vice-chair to send out potential dates and see if an outside facilitator can be obtained.

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

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

VII. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 6:04 p.m.