

MINUTES

City of Flagstaff

REGIONAL PLAN CITIZEN ADVISORY COMMITTEE

3:30 p.m. – 6:00 p.m.

September 1, 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 Paul Babbitt (Chairman)

x Carol Bousquet (Vice Chairman)

E-4 p. Ben Anderson

E Shaula Hedwall

x Jerome Naleski

E Michael Chaveas

X – late Alex Frawley

 Jean Griego

X Devonna McLaughlin

X Don Walters

x Maury Herman

x Judy Louks

x>5.30 William Ring

x Nat White

E Mike Nesbitt

x Eva Putzova

x>5 Susan Bean

x Richard Henn

Alternate Members:

X Julie Leid

E Trish Rensink

III. APPROVAL of MINUTES for August 4, 2011 CAC Meetings

RECOMMENDED ACTION: Recommend changes and approve 8/4/11

Handout: [CAC Meeting Minutes](#), 8/4/11 -

<http://www.flagstaff.az.gov/DocumentView.aspx?DID=14371>

Quorum present. City manager, Kevin Burk, introduced the new deputy city manager, Jerene Watson. Chair Paul Babbitt requested comments or corrections to minutes. Comment was made that the vote to approve subcommittees was not unanimous. Chair Babbitt said the minutes would be corrected to say this. Motion to approve minutes was made by Jerome Naleski. It was seconded. The motion carried. The vote was unanimous.

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://flaqregionalplan2012.wordpress.com/>

No public comments were made.

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

A. **Progress to date**

(est. 5 minutes)

PURPOSE: A brief overview of CAC progress made to date displaying outline, sections complete. Per CAC member request, provide Comprehensive Plan example, Tucson, Arizona.

FACILITATOR: Bob Caravona

HANDOUT: [Regional Plan Progress](#) to date.

<http://www.flagstaff.az.gov/DocumentView.aspx?DID=14372>

[Tucson General Plan: http://www.flagstaff.az.gov/DocumentView.aspx?DID=14373](http://www.flagstaff.az.gov/DocumentView.aspx?DID=14373)

B. Regional Plan Community Design Charrette Report *(est. 60 minutes)*

PURPOSE: Beginning with Scenario B, continue discussion from previous 8/4/11 meeting. Review Community Design Charrette process and outcomes from the July event. Discuss how public input, comments and suggestions are part of Growth Scenarios and land use planning. Next steps towards the Kimley-Horn consultant report.

FACILITATORS: D. Wessel, B. Caravona, Martin Ince, Mark Sawyers, Elaine Evaritt, Judy Louks, Jerome Naleski, Julie Leid, and Alex Wright

HANDOUTS: Please note, these are previous handouts from August 4, 2011 CAC meeting.

[Development Scenario 'A' map](#)

[Development Scenario 'B' map](#)

[Development Scenario 'C' map](#)

Development Scenario 'A' map: <http://www.flagstaff.az.gov/DocumentView.aspx?DID=14168>

Development Scenario 'B' map: <http://www.flagstaff.az.gov/DocumentView.aspx?DID=14169>

Development Scenario 'C' map: <http://www.flagstaff.az.gov/DocumentView.aspx?DID=14170>

Susan Bean commented that the population figure is an area in which the CAC needs to look ahead, but that projecting a figure for 2050 is too far ahead due to shifting variables. She suggested the committee split the difference and lower the projection growth number to the year 2030 with a population of 103,000 partly because there are going to be two more plans before 2030 arrives and also because people are alarmed by the larger 2050 population figure. If they leave the number remaining at the 2050 figure, she proposes that it is represented as being a projected number that will be highly affected by many unknown variables and is a number intentionally representing stress to the system.

David Wessel stated that the group needs to consider true build out numbers to understand what the impact of CAC policies are. The numbers need to be explained well.

Susan Bean talked to people that did not understand what the number 150,000 really meant. Corporate expansion bases their expansion on projected numbers. The numbers become a self- fulfilling prophecy. The 2050 number needs to be represented clearly.

Susan Bean is concerned that Decision Theater has more effect than she expected or wanted and that it seems increasingly less applicable to what the CAC is doing now.

David Wessel said it is difficult to add too many variables at the scenario level of plan consideration. It is more efficient to wait until the scenarios are narrowed down before details are fine tuned.

Nat White commented that the 150,000 population number needs to be clearly represented as maximum build out so that it is recognized as a stress number, not expectation.

Paul Babbitt stated that the original writing needs to be refined. He recommended that the committee members look at the Tucson plan for which the link has already recently been provided.

When the committee returned to the charrettes issue later in the meeting, Bob Caravona introduced the presentations of the scenarios. David Wessel presented the assumptions that would drive population into pattern B, the pattern of "growing both in and out." Assumptions were in the areas of regulations, economics, and demographics.

Bob Caravona introduced Elaine Averitt, who sat as the facilitator for scenario B for two hours during the charrettes. The participants outlined the areas they thought should be preserved such as federal public land, state land, Fort Tuthill, and land needed for wildlife corridors and hiking trails. They decided on areas that could grow, such as the Belmont area and Doney Park. Areas of strong disagreement were growth on Observatory mesa, and US 80 bypass road. Denser development chips were placed around NAU. Job development potential was identified along Huntington, the mall, and the hospital. It was commented that job development was insufficient in number to match population growth. They wanted job development areas to look nice.

Nat White questioned the university population which represents about 20 percent of the Flagstaff population. How does that affect the Charrette results?

Bob Caravona introduced Scenario C, the "growing dense" compact scenario.

The presenter explained the placement of the chips on Scenario C. The participants were reluctant to place chips in the downtown area and on state land area, choosing instead vacant areas for those chips. Areas to transform were Milton and Fourth Street. Areas to grow were NAU and mesa. They wanted the area around the airport reserved for industrial growth. Area of disagreement was how much to protect Walnut Canyon. Scenario C was the best plan for wastewater, sewer and wildlife corridors. Concerns of downtown congestion and parking. Comments were: more parks were needed in the downtown area; and, the areas of population density would greatly impact the environment areas directly next to them. The areas chosen to preserve were very similar through all scenarios A, B and C. The Community Value Survey had an 80 percent response to preserve open space which all scenario plans reflected this value.

Judy Louks pointed-out the need for more land for industrial growth. She believes the land at the airport is insufficient and that housing addressed for industrial was insufficient. Very little land is available in the city for mobile homes and other attainable housing.

An audience Member, commented that all three scenarios would put highly increased growth in adjacent to the Walnut Canyon area.

David Wessel said the staff hopes to come back in October with the first round of analysis over the information the scenarios provided.

C. Community Character

(est. 30 minutes)

PURPOSE: Continuation of review and complete approval of goals and policies. Begin with Parking Lot: NP 1.3, then proceed to NP 1.4 where 8/4/11 CAC meeting ended. There are 2 Goals and 6 policies remaining for review and approval.

FACILITATORS: Jim Cronk, Planning Director

HANDOUT: [Community Character – 9/1/11 Presentation](#)

<http://www.flagstaff.az.gov/DocumentView.aspx?DID=14374>

Tabled until October

D. Regional Plan Process – Path Forward

(est. 50 minutes for Section D)

PURPOSE: Continued discussion on three outstanding issues:

(1) Update/feedback:

(est. 30 minutes)

Purpose: Per 5/5/11 CAC Meeting, Mr. Burke is "...checking back in..." with the CAC to discuss process forward.

FACILITATOR: K. Burke, City Manager

This agenda item discussed first due to City Manager's time commitments. Kevin Burke continued the discussion from June and was "checking back in". The CAC has spent much time talking about resources. Past implementation has been that the document has not been used on a day to day basis outside of community development. They asked the staff departments what their top ten accomplishments were.

(2) Top 10 Accomplishments by Division

(est. 5 minutes)

FACILITATOR: K. Burke, City Manager

Kevin Burke asked, does the CAC want to look back to see how well the last plan was implemented, or would they rather staff focus on how to increase the use of the plan in the future?

Chair Babbitt commented that the regional plan is not a legal, but rather a moral plan. He believes the real importance is that when the city hires staff that they hire employees that have a vision for the plan because the citizens will vote on it and the approved plan should be implemented.

Bill Ring commented that there is evidence of the plan having been put into place, whether it was by accident or by design. He is concerned that the city does not have infrastructure in place that could support the compact design. The city could commit to the regional plan by committing dollars to infrastructure.

Kevin Burk stated that a way to start is by raising the consciousness of the need to check the regional plan before making decisions. This can be done by both the staff and by the city council. A check off menu could be implemented that lists compliance to the regional plan as one of the criteria in decision making.

Richard Henn said the city must set a culture of supporting the regional plan, and city council can set that from the top. Some have communicated that the past plan was a good plan, but was difficult to use. He believes the current plan needs to be easier to implement.

Kevin Burk said what makes the plan easier to implement is for the regional plan to focus on the main ideas and not be overly detailed about its implementation, leaving that part to the departments.

Eva Putzova would like a report to be prepared about how well the last plan was implemented in past projects. She suggested tying the annual city budget process to the regional plan.

Nat White said the Guide 2000 was passed in 1987 and was the first regional plan. He sees directly how the points of that plan were implemented in the area.

Kevin Burk asked if the CAC wants to continue forward by examining past accomplishments as they relate to the present?

Judy Louks would rather see a study of the weaknesses of the last plan rather than of its strengths, so that the CAC can improve on them.

Bill Ring wants to request future information input with the idea of being forward looking and expecting implementation in stead of focusing on accomplishments of the past.

Susan Bean would like to hear from the departments about what would make the plan more usable in the future and relevant.

Kevin Burke took a straw vote of the CAC to gauge what direction he should take in acquiring information for them. After the vote he stated that he will focus on forward looking rather than on past history in gathering information. Kevin Burke also suggested that future Staff Reports to Council will include a "Regional Plan Section" clarifying how the proposal(s) affect/implement the regional plan.

(3) Staff Consultant Model

(est. 25 minutes)

Purpose: Complete discussion of the following:

(i) Reconsideration Voting; and,

(ii) Working Groups - Formation, function, schedule and seek CAC Volunteers for Working Groups: (a) Housing; (b) Economic Development, and Cost of Development; (c) Circulation and Bicycle; (d) Land Use and Growth Areas.

FACILITATORS: M. Landseidel, Community Development Director

Handout: [BC Rules of Procedure – Reconsideration](#)

Mark Landsiedel explained how members can ask for reconsideration of a vote. It can only be done during the same meeting, the next succeeding meeting and before the final implementation.

VI. NEW BUSINESS - Introduced agenda items.

A. Introduction to Housing Element

(if time permits)

PURPOSE: Review state statute requirements and process leading up to 'Housing Element' Packet 1 DRAFT. Obtain CAC volunteers for Working Group for Packet 2.

REQUEST: CAC volunteers for a "Working Group" to help prepare and review Packet 2.

FACILITATORS: Sarah Darr, Justyna Costa, Bob Caravona, Darrel Barker

Handout: [Packet 1, Housing Element](#)

<http://www.flagstaff.az.gov/DocumentView.aspx?DID=14396>

Mark Landsiedel reported on the proposed Staff Consultant Model of subcommittee work groups. This is where the CAC would be broken into four work groups: housing, development, circulation and bicycle, land use and growth areas, which were the same areas as used in the scenarios.

Bob Caravona explained that the Working Groups would be a collaborative effort between CAC, staff and community experts. CAC would self-select/volunteer to serve on the Working Group, ideally 3 members. The Work Groups would suggest Community Experts to invite. These work groups would then draft elements and the CAC will review. This creates a peer review element that is not cumbersome and CAC's best effort. He explained the suggested roles of the subcommittee members, time commitment and elements remaining.

Judy Louks wants to be able to be abreast on all of the more important elements, not leaving them to subcommittee members. She is interested in all of the committees and all of the information and wants to receive all of the packets.

Carol Bousquet explained that the current process would continue, having a first packet and second packet. The subcommittees are created to give a layer of deeper thought and refinement before the CAC addresses the issues.

Bob Caravona stated that staff can provide agendas and meeting minutes for every subcommittee to CAC members.

Jim Cronk explained that this is additional input, not taking away from the CAC's input. Smaller groups are easier to schedule meetings for.

Maury Herman suggested that an auditor position might be added for each subcommittee.

Carol Bousquet suggested that every CAC committee member could be considered an auditor and receives all materials the subcommittees would receive, unless some CAC members decided to opt out.

Eva Putzova is afraid that subcommittees will cause the CAC to receive less balanced information and she would rather the information received by all CAC members in their regular meetings. She does not want CAC members to participate as members of the subcommittees.

Jim Cronk stated that the city staff had already thought about this and considered that each group should have members from opposing sides and one representative from the middle ground to keep discussions balanced.

Paul Babbitt inquired how the CAC members feel about having one pilot sub committee to see if it works acceptably.

Nat White sees the subcommittees as more of a conversation that forms a draft that is then brought to the full CAC group to begin the full CAC process.

Paul Babbitt, Chair, stated that the CAC could provide guidelines for each subcommittee group topic.

Mark Landsiedel commented that the subcommittee model is built on a past, small committee pattern that was successful.

Susan Bean says that she is not satisfied in retrospect with the past results of the small committee model. She would like to have input on some issues of the charrettes but she needs to leave today's meeting in ten minutes.

Paul Babbitt, Chair suggested the meeting shift to the charrettes topic at this time.

In returning to this topic later in the meeting, Bob Caravona recommended the trial work group model be the housing subcommittee that will start up in about two weeks.

Judy Louks requested knowing who is participating in that committee. She commented that all the members seemed to be concerned with public housing rather than with individual housing.

Maury Herman sees a deficiency in the housing information that is to be distributed in the next two weeks. The deficiency is the fact that information from the last two years is not included.

Paul Babbitt asked if there was further comment on the issue of the housing subcommittee.

Maury Herman suggested that at least one member from the private sector be on the committee. He also wants the CAC to request two more members be added to the trial housing committee.

Paul Babbitt said the additional committee members must be volunteers. The CAC can send recommendations for committee members to the staff.

Nat White suggests Devonna should be the chair and that two more members from the CAC be added to provide balance. He said the balance we want may not be represented in the subcommittee, but the balance comes later when the full committee addresses it.

Bill Ring suggested the CAC move forward with the subcommittee.

Paul Babbitt said that it would be done.

Jim Cronk said the housing working group currently has a two o'clock start time. If it is a burden for the CAC, it could be moved to 3:30 instead for October.

VII. ANNOUNCEMENTS

(est. 5 minutes)

1. Tentative regular CAC Meetings Schedule:

Next CAC Meeting: October 6, 2011, 3:30 to 6 p.m. at N.AZ Healthcare

VIII. ADJOURNMENT

Chair Paul Babbitt adjourned the meeting at 5:49.