

MEETING MINUTES

City of Flagstaff

REGIONAL PLAN CITIZEN ADVISORY COMMITTEE

3:30 p.m. – 6:00 p.m. January 6, 2011

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

II. Roll Call

A. Committee Members:

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Paul Babbitt (Chairman)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Michael Chaveas	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Maury Herman	<input type="checkbox"/> Mike Nesbitt
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Carol Bousquet (Vice Chairman)	<input type="checkbox"/> Alex Wright	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Judy Louks	<input type="checkbox"/> Eva Putzova
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Ben Anderson	<input type="checkbox"/> Jean Griego	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> William Ring	<input type="checkbox"/> Eunice Tso
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Susan Bean	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Shaula Hedwall	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Devonna McLaughlin	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Nat White
	<input type="checkbox"/> Richard Henn	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Jerome Naleski	
	<input type="checkbox"/> Don Walters	<input type="checkbox"/> Julie Leid	<input type="checkbox"/> Trish Rensink

Alternate Members:

III. APPROVAL of MINUTES for December 2, 2010 CAC Meetings

RECOMMENDED ACTION: Recommend changes and approve 12/2/10 Meeting Minutes.

Ben Anderson made a motion to accept the December 2, 2010 meeting minutes without change, it was seconded by Mike Chaveas, and the motion was passed.

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 comment.

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

A. Environnemental Planning & Conservation Element (est. 140 minutes)

PURPOSE: Discuss and recommend goals and policies for 'Environmental Planning & Conservation Element'

FACILITATORS: Jim Cronk, Bob Caravona, John Aber, Mark Ogonowski, Sue Pratt

HANDOUTS: Proposed Water Quality draft text, goals and policy
Goals and Policies (Continued 3)

1. Completion of 'ENVIRONMENT AND CONSERVATION ELEMENT'.
 - a. Parking Lot

- b. Wildlife
 - c. Water Quality
 - d. Dark Skies
 - e. Natural Quiet
2. OPEN SPACE & RECREATION ELEMENTS – Draft text, (time permitting)

Climate

Susan Bean made a motion to keep the idea, but keep it as a strategy, it was seconded by Jerome Naleski, but after further discussion a vote was not taken and the item was put back into the parking lot.

It is already required by the State Statute to be done, so Staff does not feel it needs to be a Policy nor a strategy as it is already required of the City Staff. Discussion was had about how to elevate that implementation of an annual review so that it becomes incorporated into the routine of the government. This issue could be addressed in a cover letter explaining the committee's recommendations and state that the committee feels that the practice of an annual report is critically important and should be prepared and sent to both of the governing bodies. This issue could also be left as a strategy for now so the issue can be addressed later.

The chairman feels that the CAC could be viewed as more expert than others due to the experience with the current Regional Plan and it may be appropriate to write to the governing bodies on the implementation and issues that come up in the CAC review process.

Concern was raised about whether or not this should be limited to the Climate piece of the Regional Plan. Should over arching issues such as this be included in a preamble?

The CAC decided to keep this issue alive and when the committee begins to draft either the Preamble or an Appendix it will be brought back up for the committee to decide where to put it so that it has the most global application.

Ecosystem Health

Shaula Hedwall made a motion to adopt the Staff recommendation to change the language from referring to just the Forest Service, but to land management agencies in general, it was seconded by Jerome Naleski, and the motion was passed.

Discussion was had to add an additional Policy to address Mike Chaveas' comment. It will be addressed further in the February meeting. During that time Staff will work with Mr. Chaveas to develop the proposed Policy.

Ecosystem Health – Rio Project

Staff is preparing a presentation on the Rio Project for the February meeting, so it will be kept in the parking lot until then.

Ecosystem Health – Policy #9

Bill Ring made a motion to modify the language of Policy #9; it was seconded by Maury Herman. However, after further discussion Mr. Herman withdrew his second so the motion was withdrawn. The decision was made to put this issue back into the parking lot so that Eva Putzova can be part of the discussion.

This committee felt that this issue clearly belongs in the future trade off discussion. Concern was also raised regarding the word “ensure” and whether or not that word allows for trade-offs in the planning process.

Committee members felt that it would be useful to know rules, laws and ordinances that are already in place. Thus, the CAC won't make suggestions that are already covered somewhere else.

A definition of the word “biodiversity” has been provided relying upon information from the Ecological Society of America. Concern was raised about whether the definition provided was too broad. Possible solution is to not use the word “biodiversity” in the Policy, if this is kept as a policy. Biodiversity may be too broad a term to use. Suggestion was made to eliminate the last sentence of the proposed definition.

The County planners looked at particular pieces of property and determined what land is more sensitive than others. Staff is currently trying to map areas that are particularly sensitive.

Concern was raised about the interpretation of this Policy and in the use of this Policy.

Noxious and Invasive Weeds

Jerome Naleski made a motion to accept the Staff recommendation to re-word the Policy and add a strategy, it was seconded by Ben Anderson, and the motion was passed.

Concern was raised over timing of the release of the zoning code update vs. the Regional Code. The time table of amending the zoning code after the Regional Plan is drafted depends upon the size of the task. Concern was raised by the committee regarding which set of rules a developer is to follow as the zoning code and Regional Plan are developed and amended. It was explained that legally, applications that are made and complete prior to the effective date of the ordinance proceed under the previous code.

The committee will receive back ground information on the timing, schedule and ramifications of the Regional Plan and the Land Development Code, and the February agenda will include a follow up regarding committee member questions. A City council member wrote up a report to explain how the Regional Plan relates to and implements the Land Development Code that will also be provided to the committee members for their review.

As a result of this Policy, Staff will amend the plant list in the landscaping standards to include drought tolerant and edible species and striking those species that are not tolerant.

Environmentally Sensitive Lands

Bill Ring made a motion to accept the Staff recommendation to accept Policies #7, #8, and #9 as strategies and to carry forward Policy #10 to a different time and circumstances and address extended notification then, it was seconded by Jerome Naleski, and the motion was passed.

The committee felt that the concept of the enhancement of the public review and community involvement process was an important concept to keep alive.

Air Quality #8

Susan Bean made a motion to accept the Staff recommendation (b), it was seconded by DeVonna McLaughlin, and the motion was passed.

Watchable Wildlife

The Regional Plan currently references the Watchable Wildlife Recreation Vision Document, which is a proposal put together by Parks & Recreation and Coconino County. The committee was concerned that if you refer to another document in this Plan you need to be aware that the referenced document can change with time. The committee decided to take time to review this Policy and the Vision Document and put it in the parking lot until next month.

Water Quality Goal

No consensus was made about whether or not to leave as written or write without the word "restore". No one commented or disputed to leave the Goal as written without the word "restore".

Water Quality Policy #1

Julie Leid made a motion to revise the wording to remove "cost benefit" and add "additional or alternative treatment technologies", it was seconded by Shaula Hedwall, and the motion was passed.

Concern was raised concerning how you would complete a cost benefit analysis when considering human health.

Water Quality Policy #2

Carol Bousquet made a motion to revise the wording to be "Recognizing the increasing concern about water quality, seek methods to divert contaminants from the waste stream" it was seconded by Nat White, and the motion was passed.

The original policy was intended to address diverting materials before they get into the waste stream. Concern was raised over how to define "actively diverting". Staff recommended that different language be used in the Policy. The committee recognizes that contaminants are a problem, they want to have an educational effort, and they want to cooperate with other agencies.

Water Quality Policy #3

Julie Leid made a motion to accept the proposed language, it was seconded by Nat White, and the motion was passed.

It was requested that "best management practices" be defined in the strategies section of this Policy.

Water Quality Policy #4

Nat White made a motion to accept the policy as amended, it was seconded by Jerome Naleski, and the motion was passed. Maury Herman abstained from voting.

Suggestion was made to delete the word "illicit" as that means illegal and the committee discussed all other "legal" things put on the ground that could potentially contaminate our water supply. One example is putting salt on the roads during winter.

Water Quality Policy #5

Nat White made a motion to change Policy #5 to a strategy with adopted language under the "divert" Policy, it was seconded by Jerome Naleski, and the motion was passed.

Water Quality Policy #6

Jerome Naleski made a motion to change "require" to "encourage" and to adopt the other amended language, it was seconded by Julie Leid, and the motion was passed.

Water Quality Policy #7

Jerome Naleski made a motion to delete Policy #7, it was seconded by Julie Leid, and the motion was passed.

Feeling that all preceding water quality statements address and cover water quality concerns; this Policy could be improperly implemented and could be a blanket statement that could become very restrictive and carried too far.

Overall the committee felt that all Water Quality Policies did not specifically address construction phase water quality. The committee made the decision to parking lot this issue and to work on writing a new Policy to address this specific concern.

Water Quality Policy #8

Julie Leid made a motion to adopt the language "eliminate or reduce the potential for contaminant migration", it was seconded by Nat White, and the motion was passed.

Water Quality Policy #9

Carol Bousquet made a motion to keep the idea of transparency, but as part of a larger conversation about communication in our community, it was seconded by Jerome Naleski, and the motion was passed.

This Policy is a suggestion by Larry Stevens of the Expert Forum. The intent of this Policy is to hold the City more accountable to report on the quality of surface and groundwater used by and discharged by all users. The committee felt that this was a City Council issue and that the Council should decide how the City should communicate with the citizens.

There already exist State and Federal filing requirements as a public utility. Concern was raised about the accessibility and understandability of the information currently available to the public. The suggestion was made to have a later discussion with policy makers.

B. Announcements

1. Next regular CAC Meeting:

February 3, 2011, 3:30 p.m. to 6 p.m. at N.AZ Healthcare facilities

The Chairman asked for a one page write up of the Expert Forum.

Agenda Items:

- a) Rio De Flag Presentation
- b) Open Space - 5 goals and policies total: 1 goal, 4 policies
- c) Recreation - 5 goals and policies total: 1 goal, 4 policies

VI. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned by Chairman Babbitt at 6:05 PM.