

# MINUTES - DRAFT

## City of Flagstaff

### REGIONAL PLAN CITIZEN ADVISORY COMMITTEE

3:30 p.m. – 6 p.m. April 1, 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

Chair Paul Babbitt called the meeting to order at 3:33 p.m.

#### 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 type="checkbox"/> Jerome Naleski
<input 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"/> Ken Kaemmerle
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Nat White	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Judy Louks	<input type="checkbox"/> Mike Nesbitt
	<input type="checkbox"/> Larry Stevens	<input type="checkbox"/> JR Murray
		<input type="checkbox"/> Eunice Tso

#### III. APPROVAL of MINUTES for March 4, 2010 CAC Meetings

RECOMMENDED ACTION: Recommend changes and approve 03/04/10 [minutes](#).

A motion was made and seconded to approve the minutes of the Regular Meeting of March 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/>

Mike Chaveas made several announcements to the Committee the Travel Management Rule, draft EIS is out for review and comments and can be found the Coconino National Forest website; Walnut Canyon study is off and running and can be found on the [www.walnutcanyonstudy.org](http://www.walnutcanyonstudy.org) website.

Tamera Ramirez was present to voice support for the water element in the Regional Plan.

Betsy McKellar, on behalf of Friends of Walnut Canyon, commented on the Walnut Canyon Study and gave the reason behind the study. More information can be found on the [www.friendsofwalnutcanyon.org](http://www.friendsofwalnutcanyon.org) website.

Cathy Propter commented on learning more on water issues.

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

**A. DRAFT Energy Element *(est. 20 minutes)***

PURPOSE: Review agreed upon goals, policies and other suggested language changes

RECOMMENDED ACTION: Discussion and approval of DRAFT Energy Element

FACILITATORS: - Kimberly Sharp & Tiffany Antol

HANDOUTS: - [ENERGY\\_ELEMENTDRAFTedited\\_32410.pdf](#)

[ENERGY\\_ELEMENTDRAFTClean\\_032510.pdf](#)

Ms. Sharp pointed out the changes made to the draft energy element, and then asked the CAC if these changes were what the Committee had requested from the last meeting. The questions and suggestions for further editing were:

- The MLS proposal was not an agreed upon policy; rather, this is a possible strategy.
- The written material notes the energy savings on public facility retrofits; yet the retrofit costs need to be noted, also.
- It was noted that there are a number of blanks and inquired when the additional and actual numbers from Unisource and APS will be filled in; once the recent and accurate data is sent from these energy providers, it would be incorporated into the document.
- Strategies: A list of all strategies will be added to as we work on the whole planning document; the goal being that many of the strategies can be combined and one strategy may very well implement a number of elemental goals or policies. The same strategy may influence multiple elements.
- A new policy suggestion was noted under Goal E1:9 'super compact spaces' – when was this added? A number of suggestions for edits to the Energy element were given in writing after the last CAC meeting, such as the suggested strategies of hybrid vehicles and compact parking. These will be noted as 'proposed strategies' since it was not discussed as a group.
- Does 'promote' mean 'mandate'? A fuller discussion of action words for policies will be at the next CAC meeting.

**VI. NEW BUSINESS**

**A. Water Element *(est. 120 minutes)***

PURPOSE: Review materials presented thus far; review suggested goals and policies; edit content

RECOMMENDED ACTION: Presentation, discussion and agreement upon goals and policies

FACILITATORS: Sue Pratt and Brad Hill

HANDOUTS: - [WATER\\_RESOURCES\\_ELEMENT\\_DRAFT\\_032510.pdf](#)

[WATER\\_RESOURCES\\_MAP](#)

Ms. Sue Pratt presented the county's water systems and state regulatory issues.

Mr. Brad Hill presented background of the City's water supply, the physical supply and legal availability of the supply and answered questions from the Committee. He also provided policy questions that the Committee needed to think about when drafting water policy, reclaimed water, and water management.

The City has never evaluated their water supply, and there is a scientific approach to evaluating the water supply. The USGS will be conducting such a study that will encompass the area from Payson, Prescott, and Grand Canyon to the New Mexico Boundary and will have a focus on Flagstaff, which will summarize all the hydrology, geology and square miles. The study will attempt to determine if there is a 100 year water supply, thereby allowing for future planning. Natural capacity, water conservation and unsustainable capacity was discussed, as were infrastructure costs. A detailed explanation was given on how Phoenix and other Arizona cities have developed their infrastructure with this in mind. The average Flagstaff resident uses 114 gpd (gallons per day per person), which is ½ of the average Phoenician. In comparison, San Francisco residents use 77 gpd. Reasons for the lower number difference were discussed, which included a higher housing density and no lawns.

Committee comments were:

- Look at water conservation measures from other communities, such as Colorado, New Mexico and Australia.
- This conversation needs to focus on a) policy, strategy and goals from a conservation perspective, and; b) infrastructure.
- All policies will have two sides – water and financial savings; costs. And we need to ask, “Where does this put affordable housing and how do the costs impact affordable housing”?
- Compact development, again, fits into the discussion of cultivations (infrastructure needs), water conservation, people per acre, and what type of land use fulfills these policies.
- Highest density = lowest gpd
- Maybe its better to not develop Red Gap Ranch but extend reclaim infrastructure & promote conservation
- Why does all new construction have to be sprinkled? Is this a smart use of water?
- Highest build out numbers on water report is 179,900 residents; yet if the city pushes for the highest density in the inner core of the city – would this give us a higher population than this? As we plan, shouldn't we look at maximum and current densities? How does density and location affect water projections?
- The State Land Dept. claimed densities on State Trust lands are unrealistic; they have agreed to lower densities. How does this play out with inner city densities and suburban development as is?
- Red Gap Ranch water production would supply the needs of growth out 100 years, especially if this includes conservation efforts; yet it will be very expensive, and there are water rights issues.
- The build-out scenarios are mostly residential; how about industrial & commercial? *The growth scenarios were based upon Flagstaff Area Regional Land Use & Transportation Plan's maximum build-out.*

Mr. Hill's presentation will be available on the website for the Committee's information.

**B. Announcements**

*(est. 10 minutes)*

1. **Next CAC Meeting:** April 15, 2010 - 3:30 p.m. to 5 p

**Agenda Items:**

1. Complete Water discussion;
2. Zoning Code Update;

3. Natural Resource Inventory
2. **Next regular CAC Meeting:** May 6, 2010 - 3:30 p.m. to 6 p.m. at N.AZ Healthcare facilities  
**Agenda Items:** ELEMENT – Environment

**VII. ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting was adjourned at 5:55 p.m.