

**Meeting Minutes
City of Flagstaff
REGIONAL PLAN CITIZEN ADVISORY COMMITTEE
3:30 p.m. – 6:00 p.m. October 7, 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

The meeting was called to order by Chairman Babbitt at 3:34 PM.

II. Roll Call

The Committee Members were asked to display their name tags clearly in order for them to be easily read by the new Minutes Recorder.

A. Committee Members (x- present; A-absent; E-excused absence):

<u>X</u> Paul Babbitt (Chairman)	<u>X</u> Michael Chaveas	<u>A</u> Maury Herman	<u>X</u> Mike Nesbitt
<u>X</u> Carol Bousquet (Vice Chairman)	<u>A</u> Alex Frawley	<u>X</u> Judy Louks	<u>E</u> Eva Putzova
<u>X</u> Ben Anderson	<u>E</u> Jean Griego	<u>X</u> William Ring	<u>A</u> Eunice Tso
<u>E</u> Susan Bean	<u>X</u> Shaula Hedwall	<u>E</u> Devonna McLaughlin	<u>X</u> Nat White
<u>X</u> Richard Henn	<u>X</u> Jerome Naleski		
<u>Alternate Members:</u>	<u>X</u> Don Walters	<u>X</u> Julie Leid	<u>X</u> Trish Rensink

III. APPROVAL of MINUTES for September 16, 2010 CAC Meetings



RECOMMENDED ACTION: Recommend changes and approve 09/16/10

Meeting Minutes.

The minutes of the September 16, 2010 were approved with the following changes:

1. New Business B. Walnut Canyon: "The proposal is for a national park and preserve with a center ~~closed~~ OPEN to recreational use"; "For the community to propose this, it ~~must~~ SHOULD be in the general plan"; "Urban ~~Space~~ GROWTH Boundary"; forest restoration – "The national park service would do restoration themselves if it is their property; The Park service would hand the forest restoration the same as Forest Service areas".
2. Committee Member Shaula Hedwall noted that she had attended 9/16/10, as was not noted on the minutes.

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/>

There was no public comment.

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

A. **1. Community Values Survey** *(est. 60 minutes)*

PURPOSE: Present and discuss preliminary survey results of sample survey

FACILITATORS: Dr. Rich Fernandez, Northern Arizona University

HANDOUTS: [Memo: Community Values Survey](#), Bob Caravona (10/01/10)

[Community Values Survey](#) (pdf)

Flagstaff 2012 Regional Pan Community Survey Plan Preliminary Results

[Map](#) of sample survey responses

Dr. Rich Fernandez of Northern Arizona University presented the preliminary results of the Community Values Survey sent to a random sample of community members this summer. A map showing the geographic dispersion of the sample survey was shown. Specific points from the survey were summarized, not all. The survey was conducted by mail and at no cost to the respondents. It was primarily conducted to non-business households, both renters and home-owners. The sample survey was of 380 residents out of 32,564; a total of 136 completed surveys were returned. The survey was random, very detailed and had a 35% response rate. The sample population received 5 contacts; (1) a pre-letter was sent saying that the survey would follow by mail; (2) an introductory letter with the survey and a return envelope; (3) a follow up post card reminding people to complete the survey; (4) a second survey with a letter was sent to those who had not completed it yet; (5) and then a final reminder to those who had not sent it in to please do so.

Respondent Characteristics:

The survey results were compared to the 2000 Census results for community profile correlation; the survey result highlights:

1. 55% were female, 44% were male/18 years old or older who responded;
2. Education level indicated a higher education level than average; 35% with a college degree, 11% with a Masters and 5% with PhDs/17% with some college; 7% with a high school degree and 1% with some high school;
3. Average age was about 10 years older than the Census Bureau. The average age of our respondents was 49 years;
4. Income distribution was very close to the Census Bureau statistics;
5. How many residing in the household: 62.6% have 2 in the household; 32% just one in the household; 76% have no children in the household;
6. Almost 70% owned their homes;
7. 92% live here year round. Most folks have lived here at least 18 years;
8. Type of residence: 58.6% in single family homes, apartments 15%; town homes 10% and mobile homes 7%.

Business & Economic Development

Dr. Fernandez didn't review every item out of the survey but did present some of the questions from the survey and the responses.

1. "New businesses are essential to ensure economic stability for the Flagstaff region":
Most respondents agreed with that statement.
2. "Flagstaff should encourage more national retail stores":
An even distribution with an interesting split – those who strongly agreed is about 10% and neutral is in the middle.
3. "Permit fees should be reduced to support small businesses"
Most agreed.
4. "Local government should be more business friendly."
Agreed and strongly agreed.

During discussion of the various answers and responses and what they could mean, Dr. Fernandez reiterated that it was a fair sampling of the region and the responders were given an opportunity to answer all questions. He also said it was too late to change any of the questions, that the questions were pre-tested; they had even been pre-tested on this group, and also with other county, city and ordinary folks.

Housing

1. "The Flagstaff housing market is adequately priced in relation to wages".
Response was either strongly disagreed, or disagreed. Most respondents, who do not hurt for money, responded that it was not true.
2. "Flagstaff should focus more on affordable housing."
Most agreed.
3. "Multi-family housing is needed ore in Flagstaff than single family houses."
Most did not know.
4. "The region should support a homeless shelter".
Most agreed.

Energy & Conservation

1. "The installation of renewal energy technology such as wind and solar power should be linked to financial incentives".
Most agreed/45%
2. "There should be incentives for increasing residential energy use"
3. "Flagstaff should require use of green materials in new building construction."
Most agreed; Dr. Fernandez suggested that the word "requiring" often changes the responses quite a bit from "incentivizing".
4. "Residential wind turbines should not be used for the production of electricity within the city." 50% agree but most disagreed.
5. "Money spent on urban open space is wasteful." Most disagreed, almost 50%
6. "If existing water resources are inadequate, water should be imported from outside the region." A split, but most agree.

Some other items of interest

1. "Planned growth is essential for the Flagstaff area." Strongly agreed - 40% and 50% agreed.
2. "Neighborhoods mixed with shopping area are preferred to shopping centers that require a commute." Most agreed.
3. "Traffic control is adequately balanced among pedestrians, cyclists, public transits and drivers."
Strong curve between agreed/disagreed.
4. "The Flagstaff region uses tax revenue dollars responsibly." Most were neutral, with a split between agreed and disagreed.
5. In response to the question, Committee Member J. Louks found the response surprising, given the educational level of the majority of Flagstaff.
6. "The Flagstaff region should decrease public services rather than increase taxes". Most disagreed.
7. "Law enforcement personnel need to be increased in the Flagstaff region". The response was split down the middle. Dr. Fernandez pointed out that the survey was sent out just prior to the big fire and the big flood of July 21st. Since the survey was sent in the middle of that crisis, the answer is particularly interesting when viewed from that vantage point.

CONSIDERATIONS

One problem to consider is the average age of the respondents; 49. The younger Flagstaff community is not included. Further, there is still more work to be done regarding the open ended

questions and how to figure them out. All responses will be analyzed and put into the final report. Dr. Fernandez posed further questions: Which items show consensus among the respondents? How do incentives trump regulation and the question of neutral answers and responses, which could be an area for further public discussions? Further, how does the information gained from the survey fit into the CAC deliberations?

In closing, Dr. Fernandez asked if the group had suggestions for the form of the final report, e.g., would they prefer it organized as in the required statutory elements or follow the thematic organization of the questionnaire.

Committee Member B. Ring asked for Dr. Fernandez to instruct the group on how to interpret the data. Should the report have instructions on how to draw conclusions on specific questions?

Committee Member Judy Louks queried whether the respondents who answered “neutral”; were they neutral or did they just not care? Some reasons given by the members for the answers of “neutral” were a lack of trust in the government or the atmosphere in the country is more to non-respondents rather than the respondents.

After much discussion, Dr. Fernandez reminded the members that the construction of the questionnaire was guided by the elements. Cross tabulation will be interesting. The final report will be finished at the end of October.

B. Zoning Code Update

(est. 60 minutes)

PURPOSE: Report on Zoning Code release and how it implements the Regional Plan

FACILITATORS: Roger Eastman

HANDOUTS: Memo: Zoning Code Update, Bob Caravona (10/01/10)

Roger Eastman, Zoning Code Administrator for the City of Flagstaff, gave a presentation on the progress to date of the Zoning Code re-write. Initial mapping; community design charrette; administrative drafts and a public draft have all been completed. Lots of public input.

Changes between the LDC and the new Zoning Code noted:

- New organization
- More user friendly
- General code applies standards to all
- Existing zones 35 - Proposed zones 18
- Form Based-Code is integrated into Zoning Code

It is estimated that 60-70% of the new code is based on the LDC. For example, the lighting code did not change much. However, significant changes were made to natural resources.

- Regarding quantitative and qualitative analysis – it is more closely related to the site itself.
- Incorporated the FFD Forest Stewardship Process.
- Landscaping section has been changed a lot.
- Useable process flow charts
- New additions:
 - Affordable housing
 - Construction Assurances
 - Public Improvements
 - Site Planning
 - Sustainability

Division 10-30.70 – a series of “should” statements will be written as more mandatory. The Council will give direction on this. There will be clearer distinctions between guidelines and standards; guidelines will be guidelines and standards will be informing of what must be done. The maps are legible and the appendices are also expandable. Appendix 6 came as a recommendation and it has been developed as an appendix and explains how it is implemented by the zoning code.

The Next Steps:

- o Zoning classes (Thursdays, 3:30 – 5 p.m. at City Hall until November)
- o City Council Work sessions are ongoing;
- o Public Hearings – the next one is Oct 13;
- o City Council Hearings – the next one is Dec 7;

Adoption will be in early spring 2011. All were encouraged to contact Mr. Eastman with questions, etc.: reastman@flagstaffaz.gov and to see www.flagstaffaz.gov/zoningupdate

Committee Members White and Ring congratulated Roger Eastman on the work he has done and for its organization and clarity. Committee Member Ring, however, expressed his concerns about sustainability– should sustainability be a chapter or woven thru the DNA of the document? The CAC has spent considerable time defining ‘sustainability’ and would appreciate Council requesting CAC’s recommendation on the Zoning Code document. City Planning Director Jim Cronk suggested that the CAC as a committee not comment on the Zoning Code, as it may be amended when the Regional Plan is finished to reflect Regional Plan policies, but to be active individually in making recommendations.

B. Announcements

Next regular CAC Meeting: October 21, 2010 - 3:30 p.m. to 6 p.m. at N.AZ Healthcare facilities

Agenda Items:

1. ENVIRONMENT & CONSERVATION ELEMENT – Goals & Policies
 - a. Text and policies will be sent to CAC one week in advance; please send comments and suggested edits to Bob Caravona (bcaravona@flagstaffaz.gov) by Oct. 18.

Announcements:

1. Regional Plan ‘Community Character’ Focus Group: Oct 28th Thursday noon to 3 at the Aquaplex.
2. Regional Plan ‘Housing’ - Two opening houses (Nov. 1 & 19) and one Focus Group (Dec 3)

V. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 5:53 PM by Chairman Paul Babbitt.