

MINUTES - DRAFT

City of Flagstaff

REGIONAL PLAN CITIZEN ADVISORY COMMITTEE

3:30 p.m. – 5 p.m. February 18, 2010

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.

Draft Regional Plan Vision Statement:

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.

I. CALL TO ORDER

Vice Chair Carol Bousquet called the meeting to order at 3:35 p.m.

II. Roll Call

A. Committee Members:

<input type="checkbox"/> Paul Babbitt (Chairman)	<input type="checkbox"/> Alex Frawley	<input type="checkbox"/> Devonna McLaughlin
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Carol Bousquet (Vice Chairman)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Jean Griego	<input type="checkbox"/> Jerome Naleski
<input type="checkbox"/> Ben Anderson	<input type="checkbox"/> Shaula Hedwall	<input 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"/> Ken Kaemmerle
<input type="checkbox"/> Nat White	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Judy Louks	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Mike Nesbitt
		<input type="checkbox"/> Eunice Tso

B. Alternate Members: Larry Stevens JR Murray

III. APPROVAL of MINUTES for February 4, 2010 CAC Meetings

RECOMMENDED ACTION: Recommend changes and approve 02/04/10 [minutes](#)

A Motion was made and seconded to approve the minutes of February 4, 2010 as submitted. 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/>

No public comments

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

A. Community Values Survey

(est. 30 minutes)

PURPOSE: Presentation and discussion of 'Community Values Survey'

RECOMMENDED ACTION: Presentation and discussion

FACILITATORS: Bob Caravona and Dr. Richard Fernandez

HANDOUTS: Updated 'Survey' based upon responses from CAC & peer review

Dr. Richard Hernandez presented to the Committee the updated Survey that he has been working on. He provided a brief background on the purpose of the survey and how it was developed. His report covered the following items:

- Development of the questionnaire
- Pretesting
- Population & sampling
- Data entry
- Analysis & report writing

The development of the survey questions was based on the seventeen required elements and five optional elements. The design of the survey is an attempt to maximize the response rate. The CAC was presented a pretest that will be sent out to a sample of Flagstaff region residents in the spring of 2010. The sample size is expected to be around 1,000; based upon the most recent census figure for the region of 80,000 people. The pretest sample was based on the response received from the Committee members on the questionnaire that was sent to them.

The mailing of the survey must be staged in order to maximize the response rate; this requires contacting the participants a number of times. A telephone survey was not a good idea because of the number of questions. The survey takes about 20-30 minutes to complete. An initial letter will be mailed informing the residents of the survey and second letter with the survey. A third follow up would be a postcard to thank them for completing the survey or to remind them to complete the survey if they have not responded. A fourth follow-up would be to re-mail the survey to those who have not responded. The fifth contact is to remind them of how important it is to complete the survey. Right now the process is at a standstill, waiting on funding for mailing and follow-up.

Data entry is done after the completed survey is mailed back, followed by analysis and report writing. Mr. Caravona informed the committee that they had applied for a grant but have not received a response. Mr. Hernandez added that the survey can be sent out at any time once funding is received.

Questions and comments from the Committee:

- What is the period of time from first mail out and receipt of survey back? About two months.
- How many of the surveys have you received back from the Committee? About 50% of survey.
- Has the survey been revised based on comments received from the Committee? Yes.
- Questions need to be simple and direct to make it easy to respond.
- Do you need 1000 responses to get an estimate of how many to produce? After the initial mailing the first response would be about 20%. A token payment to each respondent would help to get responses back.
- How do we place this in the values policy?
- How are recipients selected? Is it random? Yes.
- How do you define homeowner? Renter, homeowner. Have not worked out the details. Will probably include renters, apartment complexes. Will include questions on years of occupancy to determine residency.
- Does this include business addresses?

- Should we exclude student populations? Need to be inclusive as possible.
- What happens if you don't get a grant? Will ask Dave Wessel if he can provide some assistance. If not may have to go with a survey monkey.
- Would we lose some of the graduate students if we have to start over? Have already lost some.
- Can you estimate a cost? A cost estimate was done for the grant.
- Will this survey will be added to the website for review and comments.

B. Context

(est. 15 minutes)

PURPOSE: As requested, updated information regarding population; potential growth; etc.

RECOMMENDED ACTION: Presentation and discussion

FACILITATORS: Dave Wessel

Mr. Wessel was not available and this item was tabled.

**C. Resolve Outstanding Issues of Retreat “Process Desired Outcomes & Expectations”
pp. 2-4**

(est. 30 minutes)

PURPOSE: Follow-up on Retreat Recommendations

RECOMMENDED ACTION: Review list; a number of items are to be agreed upon.

FACILITATORS: Bob Caravona

HANDOUTS: Retreat Items to Resolve

- [Retreat Items to Resolve](#)

Mr. Caravona summarized to the Committee the issues that needed resolution. He stated that this is based on the Retreat held on December 10, 2009 where the Committee expressed their desire to address the unresolved issues. Based on the Retreat Report, there are four issues that need to be resolved:

- Process/Logistics
- Context
- Vision and Values
- Relationship to Other Planning Processes.

For Process and logistics, the issue being how to reach agreement on the decision making process. Previously the Committee had agreed on using a fist of five method of voting. The Committee needs to resolve how to handle the ones and twos. This was discussed briefly however no decision was made whether to go with majority and acknowledge the ones and twos. He asked the Committee whether they should continue to discuss the ones and twos after the vote.

Comments by the Committee:

- Opposed to the five finger voting
- Five finger votes works if we use the fingers as numbers and add them up and divide by the number of people to come up with an average or use percentages.
- Acknowledge that one is a catastrophic response; you have to really mean a one if you vote a one, two has reservations but close.
- A lot of things brought to committee have not been thoroughly discussed; five finger votes are good for an informal vote and present an approach for discussion. Gives an idea where the committee is coming from. If everybody votes a three more discussion is needed.
- If we're satisfied with five finger vote, does that mean we are willing to commit to more time, because it means more discussion?

- Using the five finger vote is a way of determining what the issues are. If people are voting ones do we even want to approve it.

Mr. Caravona asked if they wanted to continue with five finger vote. It sounds like you want to hear the dissenters and then the discussions go on and on. Discussion should be limited and then do a revote to see if it passes

- Based on number of ones, it would determine further discussion.
- Ask those people who vote a one or a five, ask them why. They should be able to state concisely what their position is if you're a one or five.
- Don't bring us something that has controversy imbedded in it unless it's clear.

Mr. Jim Cronk suggested using the parking lot idea, which would not entirely disregard the ones or twos, but go with the majority and save this for later discussion.

- In the guiding principles, we were given only two choices with no room for discussion.

Mr. Caravona asked if they wanted something clear and concise or broad ideas.

- Stick with five finger vote because of concern with one and two finger votes. Need to be concise, considerate and compromising in everything we do.
- Get over perfect wording. Need to move quickly because there is a lot of work to do.
- Set time limit to discuss one votes, five minutes at the most.
- What do we do if we continue to have one votes? Park in the parking lot and set a limit of how many we can put in there.

Mr. Caravona summarized the discussion stating that they will continue with fist of five voting and a brief discussion for those one votes. Be concise and considerate. Will vote again after discussion and if there are any ones left they will be put in the parking lot. After the elements get drafted, it will come back for review again. Change second vote to yea or nay.

- Staff or chair will need to move discussion along.

A Motion was made and seconded to use the outline that was written on the board on the fist of five. Motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Caravona presented the next item for discussion and resolution. To decide if a fundamental review and update is needed or is the CAC just tweaking he current plan. It is important for the process not to "reinvent the wheel"

Comments by the Committee:

- Having identified the gaps, it makes sense to address the gaps, bearing in mind the whole plan. It was suggested to fill in gaps first.
- Update data being used.
- Identified new elements that did not exist and some elements were collapsed. Need to resolve the new elements. This was addressed in the schedule.
- Do we want to do the five optional elements? Do we want to do 22 elements?
- See if we can address the five optional elements another way.
- Under three categories we have a handful of elements it would be appropriate to put in background information of the existing elements, a collection of elements to see how it meshes and come up with one background statement. So new information is not needed.

Mr. Caravona summarized what was discussed. Tweak what existing information we have and be concerned about the additional optional elements; put those optional elements that we don't have information on the back burner. The five new optional elements are: community character and design, economic development and tourism, cultural and natural resources planning, social capital and historic preservation.

Mr. Towler suggested leaving out community character and incorporating the others into the seventeen elements.

Mr. Cronk asked if the seventeen elements and the five optional elements were approved by the City Council and County Board of Supervisors. The answer was yes.

A motion was made and seconded to resolve to review and modify the current plan. The motion carried unanimously.

The next topic of discussion was the Analysis of emerging themes from the input being received so that the CAC can ensure the public's comments are not lost and are incorporated into the plan. Mr. Caravona reminded the Committee of the public participation plan outline that they had adopted for public comments that they receive and which were posted on the website.

Comments by the Committee:

- Where are public comments filed when they come in. They are put on the website.
- Concern that there is not enough public interest in this issue. How can information be disseminated to the public.
- Is there a place on the website that people can input their comments?
- Suggestion that information be sent out.
- If you want input, make a decision and wait for comments.

Mr. Caravona suggested adding public comments to CAC meeting agenda.

Next topic of discussion was to Determine relationship between elements. A diagram had been discussed by staff showing the relationships between elements but has not been completed. **No resolution was discussed.**

Context

Mr. Caravona stated that this has been discussed before however no formal decision was made whether the planning horizon is 2030. The Regional Transportation plan is also based upon that. Discussed also was capacity planning and will be looking at the water availability study and how much we will have for development. This will be coming up in April. We will also be looking at David Wessel's projections on growth rates and infrastructure limitations and his recommendations and build out scenarios and test assumptions at decision theaters. He asked if this was acceptable to the Committee in the form of Context.

Comments from the Committee:

- This is a significant amount of work and is critical to the Committee as a form of planning agency to have a grasp of the concepts and limitations. Also to think of growth in two or three dimensions. But we don't have to grow out; we can grow in and up. That is why a test theater could be critical for us.
- What is Decision Theater? A way of testing your regional plan with a variety of matrix.
- Where is the operationalization of the policy belong? The measures, the indicators, where does the operationalization of the policy occur? I would like to see what type of matrix we will be developing per element in order to have that applied by the planner.
- We talked about building in community indicators. What can we measure to ascertain whether we are succeeding in our efforts? This is build into the outline and is on the work plan to complete.
- How do we make this legal so when it gets to DRB and City Council you have a reference? This is a policy, general plan and below that is the Zoning Ordinance and other tools to implement the policy. The CAC will set the policy framework and the

public and political bodies will vote on. The plan is not an ordinance. It's a policy for planning.

At this point, there was no quorum and no vote was taken. The Committee determined that they did reach an understanding.

VI. NEW BUSINESS

None

A. Announcements *(est. 10 minutes)*

1. **Next regular CAC Meeting:** March 4, 2009 - 3:30 p.m. to 6 p.m. at N.AZ Healthcare facilities

Agenda Items:

1. Hierarchy of Planning Framework – various planning documents; existing RP influence.
2. ELEMENT – Energy *(information package & draft available on-line)*

VII. ADJOURNMENT

Vice Chair Carol Bousquet adjourned the Meeting at 5:14 p.m.