

# MINUTES

## City of Flagstaff

### REGIONAL PLAN CITIZEN ADVISORY COMMITTEE

3:30 p.m. – 6:00 p.m. March 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:

<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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Alex Frawley	<input type="checkbox"/> Judy Louks	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Eva Putzova
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Ben Anderson	<input checked="" 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Richard Henn	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Jerome Naleski	

##### Alternate Members:

<input type="checkbox"/> Don Walters	<input type="checkbox"/> Julie Leid	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Trish Rensink
--------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	---

#### III. APPROVAL of MINUTES for February 3, 2011 CAC Meetings

RECOMMENDED ACTION: Recommend changes and approve 2/3/11 [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. NEW BUSINESS

##### A. State Lands Presentation

(est. 30 minutes)

PURPOSE: Present on-going discussion items with the State Land Department

FACILITATORS: Jim Cronk

HANDOUTS: [State Land Parcels Map](#)

[Staff Summary to City Council 2/22/11](#)

Facilitator recapped visit by State Land Commission (SLC) several months ago. They discussed their constitutional fiduciary responsibility with managing state trust lands.

- manage their properties to maximize the return to state and those funds go to education

- plan the properties,

The cities and counties are left to zone the properties. The CAC has the responsibility to plan for the property within city limits (~7,000 acres) and county parcels within the FMPO Boundaries (~4,000-5,000 acres). Staff continues to keep an open dialogue with the SLC.

The State Land Commission:

- does not have to participate in the same process the Regional Plan does
- can plan their own properties
- can tell CAC what they want on their property
- has veto authority.

To continue this discussion, a part of the goal was to have the SLC become active in the process, instead of waiting until the end where they give us an answer on how to deal with the land. Two important things occurred at the last meeting:

- Did not agree to a lot of open space.
- They agreed some parcels are more appropriate for less dense development than previously discussed in the Regional Plan 2001
- They (SLC) agreed to continue the conversation using their own discretion

Facilitator opened the floor to questions regarding clarification of the recap or otherwise.

- As far as State's authority for fiduciary duty, is the economic duty to the state spelled out clearly? Are there procedures for this to change? *Yes, there are specific procedures that were summarized earlier. They retain the authority to plan their property and they are required to seek the highest return possible when they sell or lease it. And these two points are important to us as we make decisions.*

- Assuming a conflict between the city and the state as to how the parcel can be used, what authority, or discretion, does the city have on giving access to utilities, etc., on those parcels? *In terms of planning the property, if there is a disagreement between the city or county and state, the state wins the discussion. As far as implementing the extension of water, sewer, etc., the city has some ability to play hardball at the development stage.*

Discussion on planning ensued.

- Example of Villaggio planning process, where the green space plan was not accepted by the state.
- Methods to purchase STL lands, a potential to swap state lands, etc.

Facilitator talked about key environmental issues that entered into SLC discussion regarding land parcels near Picture Canyon and Walnut Canyon:

- How far can we convince the State to preserve or not develop those properties?
- Discussion about Observatory Mesa
- Market in Flagstaff is smaller than in Maricopa county
- Section 4, Picture canyon. The lowest they will start talking about is 1 unit/acre which they (SLC) view as the smart growth minimum.
- Section 10b, south of I-40 could be set aside and never developed since we cannot get utilities there.
- 10a may be appropriate for a fair amount of density, and might be appropriate for commercial and/or industrial development as seen in the memo.
- To some degree there is an attempt to reduce the development in section 4 and correspondingly increase it in 10a.
- Section 2 is in county, near Turkey Hill, for now will stay at 1 unit/acre. We must be careful of a 89-bypass that comes through area - transportation and land use link.

- Section 8 near Country Club Bridge is currently at 7 units/acre; providing utilities for area are is unknown, SLC agreed to 1 unit/acre.
- Sections 22, 28 and 30 are inside the Picture Canyon study area and hopefully will be at the lowest development rate possible. Waiting to hear results from study.
- Area around section 20 is outside of Walnut Canyon study area, and it was assumed it could be a developable area – or portions, taking topography into consideration.
- Section 30 is unknown as far as what direction development will occur in the Walnut Canyon study area.
- Concern for developing sections 20 and 30 would have a domino effect.
- Considering 40% of these two sections to be left as open space could result in preserving about 500 acres.
- Discussed that the remaining 60% for development can be set at 3 units /acre, potentially developed in clusters, or little villages, but this has not been recommended yet. Recommended that the CAC needs to spend time thinking about these two sections, 20 & 30.
- The state is agreed to a 47% reduction in density (~ 7,000 fewer housing units than they have in the current plan).

Questions:

- When looking at the map, the most relevant in his mind is the urban growth boundary (UGB). Discussion ensued:
  - Importance of mapping exercise will help determine the growth pattern of state land sections
  - Reiteration that the CAC needs to come up with recommendations about the sections for development regarding growth boundaries.
- The projected map shows Forest Service land and in the handout it was shown as private land. *Error noted, and discussion continued*
- State Trust Lands are a different arena.
- Discussions with State Trust will continue, and the state land commissioners will be invited to participate early in the process along with the CAC in discussing parcels.

**VI. OLD BUSINESS - Continued, postponed, and tabled agenda items.**

**A. Land Development Code (LDC) / Zoning Code Update** *(est. 10 minutes)*

PURPOSE: Present process update and answer questions

FACILITATORS: Roger Eastman

Eastman:

Planning and Zoning commission has given recommendations to City Council, recommending that the city should approve it, subject to amendments. Council is working through the document division by division and established a three part process:

1. Look at each division, which is a policy discussion, to ensure the document reflects the council's vision for the community.
2. If there are changes, they acknowledge that to staff and provide policy direction. At the next meeting, make amendments that are approved by council.
3. Make changes to and approve the document.

On March 22 they will continue with the chapter on zones. They hope to be done this summer. He opened the floor to questions.

- Relationship to state trust? What's the discussion with the trust and the zoning? *That will happen after the Regional Plan process has commenced.*
- Plans to change any zoning? *The zoning code update process is not rezoning anyone's property; only combining zones and coming up with new names for zones reflected on the map. Individual property owners are not getting the advantage of this code process to have their zoning changed – that would have to be a separate effort.*
- How many the "zoning code universities" have there been, and how long did it last? *Seven. They were held every other week for seven weeks.*
- When the regional code is revised will you go through and make sure everything complies with the regional plan? *With the updated Regional Plan, yes, there is are allotted time and resources for Zoning Code amendments (updates) based upon the voter-approved Regional Plan in 2012.*

Discussion continued about codes conforming to regional plan

- Where voters stand
- They synergy between departments working on codes in relation to regional plan
- Resolutions to potential issues when codes do not match regional plan
- Changes in the zoning code are never voted on, but they go through a public hearing process, advertising, etc.
- Planning documents have different cycles
- How and when to amend zoning code once regional plan is ratified
- Timing being placed into new code so that issued are dealt with in order better

## **B. Environment & Conservation (cont'd); Open Space, Parks & Recreation**

PURPOSE: Discuss and recommend goals and policies

FACILITATORS: Jim Cronk

HANDOUTS: [Environment and Conservation Goals and Policies \(Continued 5\); Open Space, Parks & Recreation Goals and Policies](#)

Chairman Babbitt: noted that we are here to finish some of the environmental and conservation questions. Also, that there is a recommendation to defer some decisions until a later date.

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

Recap of previous watchable wildlife discussion and recommendations. Requested to review the discussions and recommended strategy from last time; opened up the floor to comments.

**"Support the development of watchable wildlife recreation opportunities."**

- The reworded policy works well for the recommendation and strategy and supports it.

Motion to approve. Motion seconded. Any discussion?

Barbara Phillips asked about the use of the word "wildlife" and whether it applies to all of nature that can be envisioned in a place; the Forest Service perspective includes wildflowers, geology, and other natural aspects of an area. *This policy is under the watchable wildlife heading that attempts to define what is meant by wildlife. He asked whether we needed to broaden the definition.*

Chairman reiterated that there has been a motion and discussion and put policy to a vote.

Motion passes unanimously.

## 2. 'OPEN SPACE' – *complete goal and policies*

The following proposals originated with the Open Space Commissions, both city and county, reviewing existing definition of open space and the goals and policies from the 2001 Regional Plan. Regarding the definition – a paragraph definition was proposed by the Open Space Commission and commented on by various members of the public and CAC members. Betsy McKellar has proposed a bullet point formatted definition.

The floor was opened to discussion.

- Definitions are part of the prologue for all topics; recommend we review paragraphs in the text to see if it matches the all policies and strategies. Agreed to preliminary discussion. *True, all 'elements' include a definition or explanation, and these need to be reviewed for consistency with the editing process.*
- Discussion about the what the words “open space” mean:
  - Visualize all open space vs. an open field next to a house that can later be apartments
  - Designated for private development vs. or preserved land with minimal development
  - Examples of current RP map with OS labels on private lands – legal ramifications?
  - Impact on real estate purchases, development and appraisals
  - Impacts on development
  - An example of confusion: the toe of McMillan mesa that is colored green and designated in the current RP map as open space, but is scheduled to be developed.
  - Looking at the existing map may be inconsistent with an updated program for open space and the zoning classifications
  - Noted that “O” open space is a program that tends to be codified.
  - Indicators like this make it clear that there is some confusion about what is open space. Example: a granite sculpture that says, “designated open space,” but there is a real estate development sign behind it near University Heights.
  - Officially, recommendations can be made to make lands become open space that are not yet open space through the Open Space Commission. Then tools would have to be used to implement this recommended parcel(s)
  - Suggestion to place “designated” in front of “open space” to clarify intent and to indicate that it is a part of a program; also indicate tools to be used.
  - Requested to add “...or minimally developed...” to the definition, to allow for trails, trail heads, ramadas, etc. where appropriate and planned for.
- Tools for open space acquisition and management was highlighted; the importance of placing open space lands into conservation designations, zoning, buying, etc. once the policy is adopted was emphasized.

**Motion to accept bulleted format. Motion seconded. Any discussion? None. Motion carried unanimously.**

Chairman Babbitt noted that we need to revisit definitions of goals and policies and the hierarchy in April.

Facilitator moves discussion to the usage of “undeveloped” and “minimally developed” in the document and asked CAC to decide.

Discussion about meanings of terminology ensues.

- The county’s view and ARS definition of open space includes parks, golf courses
- Definition in the CAC document implies a more natural open space perspective than county definition

- Will City's 'Open Space' include parks? *Under state statues, recreation includes: parks and open space. Open space under ARS includes parks. It is an integrated system of our community's 'green infrastructure'.*
- Zoning categories for Open Space? *There are two public categories: one is that the public/city owns property, but is zoned for a facility (library, etc.) Second, that there is a public open space ownership (more of a preservation category) that does not preclude recreation. There is a suggestion for another category strictly for preservation, like a conservation easement category which has not come to council yet. Directed the CAC to recommend another category, if needed, as a policy recommendation.*
- It was noted that public parks are in the same zoning category as public facilities, whereby the city can turn a park into a building or a city yard without a zoning change. Inquired whether there is a way to prevent parks from becoming a public facility, perhaps by changing the zoning code for parks or changing definitions. *There would be an extensive public process before a public park would be built upon, allowing comments, suggestions and outcries to be heard clearly by City Council.*
- How districts are crafted will need to show up in the plan.
- Noted that all city property can be designated as many things, including affordable housing or open space.
- Suggestions made by F3 - match the zoning code to the regional plan, designating open space, and protection for parks - discussion ensued. *CAC will at some point hear from F3 about open space, but they are waiting to hear what the CAC comes up with and perhaps suggest additional recommendations at that time.*
- The city will not re-zone any city property until a recommendation is brought forward.
- Concern about CAC members representing themselves and their employers or affiliated groups was voiced and resolved.
- Staff discussed Open space packets 1 & 2 were culmination of working with the city and county open space commissions for months regarding what to bring to the CAC. Also, they've been working on map layers: of wildlife corridors, waterways, etc. There is a mapping opportunity coming up March 28<sup>th</sup> at the Aquaplex at the Open Space Commission.
- CAC Suggestion: 1) suggested that to add "designated" in front of Open Space in the bulleted version; 2) suggested to add statement to policy
- CAC proposed a revision to the bulleted statement **"Open space lands with a wide variety of qualities, values and purposes, affect all other elements of the regional plan."** She commented that policy will establish the categories that drive zoning codes, etc. that will further define the level of development for each category.

Clarification and philosophical discussion ensued.

- Links between this topic and potential connections between all elements of the regional plan, i.e.: tourism, ability to develop certain parts of an area for commercial purposes

**Motion made to modify first part of Betsy's revisions. Motion seconded.**

Those opposed: 6      Motion is adopted.

Review of Open Space GOAL:

- Betsy suggested addition of "cultural heritage" verbiage.
- Clarification regarding "balanced" system? The meaning of the term balance is unclear.

- Concern in existing wording, whether open space needed a list of open space types, or if it should be left open ended
  - Suggestion to add “such as” if to help refine the impression of the meaning open space
- Discussion about the word “balance” returns:

- Disappointment to see word the “balance” removed
- Suggestion to use “balance” in policy statement.

**Motion to approve goal with “balanced” removed. Motion seconded. Any discussion?**

**OS GOAL: The region will have a system of open lands, such as natural areas, wildlife corridors and habitat areas, trails, and greenways to support the natural environment that sustains our quality of life, cultural heritage, and ecosystem health.**

Chairman Babbitt pursued vote on goal. Motion passed.

### Review of OS Policy 1.1

Comments:

- Why is the same policy repeated here as from the 2001 Regional Plan? Did it imply that there was no institutional group formed to coordinate planning? *Correct, an inter-agency group was not formed for coordinated planning, acquisition and management of open space lands. This is still a need.*
- Facilitator responded by saying here are a lot of “to do” things in the current plan that have not been done due to lack of funds. He suggested the CAC recommend an annual report to promote and check on implementation progress for Regional Plan policies and strategies
- Staff noted that the beginnings of an inter-agency group was used to work on the Open Space Element draft – City Open Space Commission, County Parks, Rec and Open Space Commission as well as AZ Game and Fish. This cooperation can continue.
- **County Staff: Coconino** county parks and open space program (CPOS) has fulfilled many aspects of the Open Space Plan. 
- The Open Space and Greenways Plan included a memorandum of understanding that expired in 1997. The first goal under open space in the existing regional plan was to re-create this group, but this did not happen.

**Motion to accept reworded policy. Motion seconded. Any discussion? No**

**OS Policy 1.1: Form and use the appropriate Stake Holders Group (federal, state, city, county non-profit and interested citizens) for coordinated open space planning, acquisition, conservation and protection.**

**Vote in favor: all. Motion passes.**

- Note: strategies, as suggested, are listed with the coordinated policies. To complete the task at hand, strategies will not be reviewed during the CAC meetings, yet comments via e-mail are encouraged; and the final editing process will closely review applicability, duplicity and/ or gaps in strategies.

### Review of OS Policy 1.2

#### Comments:

- Asked for clarification of the term “Neighborwoods.” Discussion ensued.
- Concerns about the implied treatment/management of the lands by Forest Service. Desire to know Forest Service perspective on the term “Neighborwoods.” *In the FS documents, the term “Neighborwoods” does not imply management of the. However, the Forest Service definition exists in Sedona as a management plan and one does not exist in Flagstaff currently, but may in the future. Doing so would recognize a change in the impacts in areas with public access in neighborhoods.*
- Recommendation made a technical change in verbiage.
- There is an opportunity to work with the county to make sure connections are addressed appropriately.
- In the current RP 2001, the definition of “Neighborwoods” is: “Land categorized as neighborwoods exhibit natural conditions that have been modified by humans. ‘Neighborwoods’ are open spaces near residents’ homes which can provide easily accessible places where people can remove themselves from urban environments to relax and spend time alone with family and friends.” The definition continues, and it is mapped in the document.
- “Neighborwoods” is discussed in detail in the Open Space and Greenways Plan, and the summary definition was included in the text for ‘Open Space Packet #2’ e-mailed to the CAC in January and available to the public.
- CAC suggestion to parking lot this topic and to discuss it at a later time. Motion to table was seconded. Vote resulted in failed motion.

Naleski: Made a motion to approve the statement as written, but to reference an approval of the definition of “neighborwoods” by the CAC. Don Walters seconded motion. Any discussion?

- Issue with the wording “...that open space will be used...”
- Issue with policy defining how open space will be used.
- Concern about how open space will connect neighborhoods. Clarification requested.

Discussion on open space and trust lands in regards to “neighborwoods” and connectivity ensued.

- Suggestion to insert text into language: change “will” to “may”; “...used to facilitate...”; “...conserving priority of open lands...” etc.
- What is the level of connectivity: is it to people? To other open space?
- Comments on issue with language in document “connecting neighborhoods and developed areas to each other...” and how it does not relate open space connecting to other open space
- Suggestion that this wording assists in defining what appropriate to call open space but is defined in the bulleted definition from earlier today

Suggested re-wording:

**Open Spaces may be used to facilitate connectivity, preserve natural lands, and promote opportunities for people to interact with nature.**

Jerome Naleski makes a motion to accept line as amended. Motion to second. Discussion?

Eva Putzova recommended the wording start with all policies with a verb.

Chairman Babbitt. Vote in favor of motion. Motion passed unanimously.

Facilitator asked everyone to review definition for next meeting. Open space discussion will commence next month.

Meeting adjourned.

‘PARKS & RECREATION – *complete goal and policies*

- Background Information for ‘Parks & Recreation’:
  - i. [DRAFT Recreation Element](#)
  - ii. [Coconino County Parks, Recreation & Open Space Masterplan](#)
  - iii. [City of Flagstaff Parks, Recreation & Open Space Masterplan Community Survey Results](#)

## VII. ANNOUNCEMENTS

*(est. 10 minutes)*

1. March 3, 2011, Thursday: 6:30 to 8:30 p.m. -Parks, Recreation & Open Space Masterplan Public Meeting; Flagstaff Aquaplex – 1702 N. 4<sup>th</sup> Street.
2. Economic Development Focus Group (4) with SEDI and ECoNA Board Members: CHANGED TO: March 24, 2011; 11:30 a.m. to 1:30 p.m. City Hall, Council Conference Room, and *Lunch is included.* RSVP: [ksharp@flagstaffaz.gov](mailto:ksharp@flagstaffaz.gov)
3. Open Space Commission – Open Space Lands analysis & mapping exercise – March 28, 2011, Monday 4:30-6 p.m. – Aquaplex – 1702 N. 4<sup>th</sup> Street.
4. **Next regular CAC Meeting:**

April 7, 2011, 3:30 p.m. to 6 p.m. at N.AZ Healthcare facilities

### **Agenda Items:**

- a) Open Space / Parks & Recreation – *finish parking lot items*
- b) Community Character

## VIII. ADJOURNMENT