

# MINUTES

## City of Flagstaff

### REGIONAL PLAN CITIZEN ADVISORY COMMITTEE

**3:30 p.m. – 7:00 p.m. February 3, 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:** [*x=in attendance; e=excused absence*]

|  |  |  |   |
|--|--|--|---|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Paul Babbitt (Chairman)        | <input type="checkbox"/> Michael Chaveas         | <input type="checkbox"/> Maury Herman            | <input type="checkbox"/> Mike Nesbitt             |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Carol Bousquet (Vice Chairman) | <input type="checkbox"/> Alex Frawley            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Judy Louks   | <input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/> Shaula Hedwall          | <input type="checkbox"/> Devonna McLaughlin      | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Nat White     |
|  | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Richard Henn | <input type="checkbox"/> Jerome Naleski          |   |
| <b><u>Alternate Members:</u></b>                                   | <input type="checkbox"/> Don Walters             | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Julie Leid   | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Trish Rensink |

**III. APPROVAL of MINUTES for January 6, 2011 CAC Meetings**

RECOMMENDED ACTION: Recommend changes and approve 1/6/11 [Meeting Minutes](#).

Motion to approve previous minutes by Chairman Paul Babbitt. Motion was carried. Quorum present. Suggestion to go back to format with excused absence for minutes. Chairman Babbitt requests comments or corrections. None offered. Motion to approve. Motion carried.

**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. Environmental Planning & Conservation Element *(est. 90 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: [Goals and Policies \(Continued 4\)](#). [Issue Paper on Rio – COF \(Nov. 2010\)](#).

**1. Completion of 'ENVIRONMENT AND CONSERVATION ELEMENT'.**

**a. Parking Lot:**

Rio de Flag Presentations:

Presentations:

- Army Corp of Engineers c/o City of Flagstaff
- Friends of the Rio
- Flagstaff Area Stream Team

Opened for questions:

Discussed use of “Restore” .

Bill Ring asked regarding the number of properties; acreage within the encumbered area of the Rio de Flag flood plain, both in the city and county. Mr. Duvall thought it best to reflect on dollar amounts associated with potential damages to properties within the flood plain. \$450,000,000 possible damages to property and \$91,000,000 in other damages. Project acreage within the city is approximately 350 acres and approximately that same amount in the county.

Chairman Babbitt: Does the Committee have info on what role the regional plan played? Doesn't expect answer to that question today but would like to address that in the future.

Question – impoundment: is there an operations plan that supports flood control and other issues discussed today? Army Corps of engineers to plant trees and plants in disturbed areas.

Observation: public benefit, huge economic benefit. Does the public benefit directly? *Yes, in the way of opening financial / development opportunities currently not allowed by the banks; by reduction in insurance premiums.*

Discussion regarding the Rio de Flag flood plain and best method to contain 100 year flood water continues with concern over different areas including mistakes that were made with the Cheshire area.

Discussion turns to definition of the term “restoration”. What does that term imply?

Discussion includes:

- Different methods of containment.
- Composite design versus open channel.
- Downtown a 90' wide manmade open channel would provide views of peaks.
- In other areas restoration would be better. Restoration would apply to Wildcat Reach.

Committee states that the State of Arizona defines “enhancement” as recharge health of area. Definition of “restore” is bringing the land back to historic condition.

Panel asks what the potential for that stream or reach is. Some parts are beyond restoration. What is potential for that site & how might it best be used? Impacts of biodiversity with open channel vs. composite?

Biodiversity immediate upfront cost is what city decided to go with. Doesn't have to be replaced in 70 years when concrete breaks up. Daylighting being done in many places. Water is being brought back to the surface in many cities.

Committee begins discussion about language of the plan with comments from Susan Bean. Visitor expresses concern that restoration wording has been lost. Many options offered by committee for satisfactory wording. Committee feels there should definitely be definitions of the terms restoration and enhancement.

Visitor questions if plan applies to areas other than Rio de Flag?

Panel and committee affirm that it does.

Tossed to CAC committee: Facilitator asks if there is a motion and is it

seconded? Motion was seconded. Chairman Babbitt called for vote, but discussion continued for specific wording.

Is policy designed to support stakeholders or to maximize ecological potential? What are we trying to modify? Susan Bean. What is goal of ecosystem health? Change maximize to improve?

Support and encourage collaborative multi-stakeholder efforts for riparian restoration or enhancement to improve ecological potential along the Rio de Flag and other watercourses.

Support collaborative efforts to return native vegetation, channel structure and where possible/applicable, preservation of in stream flows.

Motion and 2<sup>nd</sup>. Chairman Babbitt inquires as to any further discussion? Calls for vote. Further wordsmithing discussion continues. Chairman Babbitt calls for vote again by show of hands.

Those in favor: 4 Those opposed: 5 Motion failed.

Facilitator called for new motion on policy.

Eva Putzova proposed splitting it into two policies. Additional wordsmithing continues. Bill Ring questions if policy is to support stakeholders or maximize ecological potential. Use of "maximize ecological potential", introduces troublesome language. Asks for clarification of what is being modified. Committee clarifies goal as, "Improve and restore ecosystem health across all land ownerships in the Flagstaff region". Discussion returns to wording of policy regarding restoration. Should the two policies remain policies or be strategies? Discussion resolves to leave as policy as worded.

Motion is entered and seconded by committee members.

Chairman Babbitt calls for vote. Those in favor: 5 Those opposed: 4 Motion passed.

#### **WATCHABLE WILDLIFE VISION DOCUMENT**

Will remain in parking lot for next month's agenda. Short discussion of strategy versus policy. Policy is broader, strategy is something specific. Continue next month.

##### **b. Dark Skies – complete goal and policies**

Staff strived to capture committee's comments. Discussion turns to question of economic benefits of dark skies? Benefit to the astronomical community.

Lowell Observatory receives 80,000 visitors annually

Naval observatory has a large number of employees.

Chairman Babbitt requests that Nat White provide some information regarding the Discovery Channel telescope. Nat White indicates a long term benefit is that the discovery channel reaches 1 billion people worldwide. Eva Putzova states that the telescope could be of branding value to Flagstaff.

Eva Putzova observed that she felt that the 2<sup>nd</sup> policy seems more like a strategy: Protecting Dark Skies by lighting regulation.

Facilitator asks is there a motion to accept Dark Skies goal, 2 policies and 2 strategies? Motion and Seconded. Facilitator asks if any discussion before vote?

Bill Ring proposes possibility of doing transfer of development rights for lumens to darken zone 1 but is too complicated to discuss in depth with short amount of time remaining and suggests more discussion of that proposal in a future meeting.

**Vote: Those in Favor: 9 Those opposed: 0 Vote is unanimous.**

**c. Natural Quiet – complete goal and policies**

**Goal: Preserve natural quiet, soundscapes through reduction of noise pollution.**

Committee discusses wording of goal. Need definition for 'soundscape' and 'Natural Quiet'.

Comments: Natural Quiet is void of human generated sounds; Urban sounds vs. nature sounds.

Suggestion: **Encourage reduction in noise pollution through the preservation of natural quiet.**

Eva Putzova proposed the goal read: **Reduce noise pollution to improve quality of life.**

Discussed ways to manage levels of noise in respect to land use.

Suggested Goal: **Maintain areas of natural quiet and reduce noise pollution**

Motion by Eva Putzova to accept this as the goal statement. Motion was seconded. No additional discussion by committee. Vote requested by Chairman Babbitt

**Those in Favor: 9 Those opposed: 0 Motion Carried.**

**Policy 1. Recognize urban environment soundscape differs greatly from rural areas through the creation of applicable noise ordinance with respective measurable criteria.**

Motion to approve as worded. Motion seconded.

Discussion:

- Urban environment soundscape differs greatly from rural areas and should create applicable noise ordinance to preserve natural quiet in residential neighborhoods and open preserves.
- City Council has been working on noise issues in various contexts and the current noise ordinance in the city has no decibel level measurements so it is very hard to enforce. Asks if language could include decibel levels.
- It is good that when noise is unreasonable, people can take action. Policy could direct council and the county to consider appropriate criteria for the context which surrounds the land use.
- Committee agrees that the term "measurable criteria" should be added; jurisdictions will quantify what is disturbing.
- Several strategies could include interior and exterior ordinances. Zoning code could include language in which Regional Plan sets guidelines for.
- Recommending County to adopt a noise ordinance for various activities (construction, for example). Could site plans be evaluated as to potential impact and ways to mitigate noise?

Carol Bousquet: Policy 1 should include sound management tools and respective /measurable criteria.

Eva Putzova proposes using noise ordinance as one of the strategies to achieve policy 1.

Motion to accept the policy as it is on the board. Motion seconded. Any discussion? None. Chairman Babbitt put policy 1 to a vote.

**All in Favor: 9 Opposed: None. Motion carried.**

**Policy 2** may not be needed - may be incorporated as strategy 1. Is this one of the tools? Are activity centers being proposed considered major commercial areas? Response is some.

Discussion:

- Policy 2 changed to say “all” instead of “major commercial areas” to be evaluated.
- Bill Ring states that as a developer he has no objection. It should be common sense neighborly consideration. Public works has to have straight shot in and out. Dumpster decides site plan.
- Evaluate all land uses for their noise impact.

Policy 2 to read: **Evaluate all land uses for their potential noise impact.**

Motion and seconded. Discussion? No further discussion wanted by committee

Chairman Babbitt calls for vote:

**Those in Favor: 9 Those opposed: None. Motion carried.**

**Suggested Policy 3 - Manage recreational activities to mitigate negative impact on soundscapes.**

Incorporate into policy 2 or as standalone policy? Stand alone policy.

Discussion: various issues of forest service, ATV's, city parks to define recreational activity. Decided to leave policy statement in broad definition of recreational activity to be all inclusive.

Motion to approve this policy offered. Motion was seconded. No further discussion. Chairman Babbitt called for vote.

**Those in favor: 9 Those opposed: None. Motion carried.**

## **VI. NEW BUSINESSES**

*(est. 120 minutes)*

2. Picture Canyon Presentation
3. Open Space Element

Discussion - need to preserve priority open space land. Picture Canyon needs to be elevated to a priority. Chairman Babbitt inquired about previous discussion of task in establishing acquisition priorities. Response was the Bond Task Advisory Force.

Facilitator requested ideas of what to work on to bring back for the next meeting.

Procedural question: How to approach elevation of Picture Canyon without excluding other potential areas; need broad policies not site specific.

Reply: don't elevate higher than others, but bring it up to level of others.

Dave would like the committee to see the fruits of their labor. Do something about these areas or they're just words on paper.

Facilitator requests that committee reread text of Open Space prior to next meeting.

## VII. ANNOUNCEMENTS

1. [Who is the 'Expert Forum'](#) – information as requested by CAC at 1/3/2011 meeting.
2. Economic Development Focus Group (4) with SEDI and ECoNA Board Members: Feb. 10, 2011; 11 a.m. to 1 p.m. City Hall, Council Conference Room, and *Lunch is included*.  
RSVP: [ksharp@flagstaffaz.gov](mailto:ksharp@flagstaffaz.gov)
3. **Next regular CAC Meeting:**

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

The chairman referenced previous discussion about synchronizing the regional plan and the zoning code and would like to revisit that discussion and that opportunity that is before us.

### **Agenda Items:**

- a) Recreation - 5 goals and policies total: 1 goal, 4 policies
- b) Community Character

## VIII. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned by Chairman Babbitt at 6:56 p.m.