

# RETREAT NOTES

## City of Flagstaff

### REGIONAL PLAN CITIZEN ADVISORY COMMITTEE

June 21-22, 2012



*In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, if you need assistance to participate in this meeting, please contact Bonita Sears at 213-2611 (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.*

#### **June 21, 2012 - Thursday**

---

**I. CALL TO ORDER** – Chairman Paul Babbitt called the meeting to order.

**II. Roll Call**

**A. Committee Members:**

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Paul Babbitt (Chairman)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Julie Leid	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Maury Herman	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Don Walters
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Carol Bousquet (Vice Chairman)	<input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/> William Ring	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Susan Bean
<input 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			

**B. Public:**

Jim McCarthy	Bill McCullough	Tish Bogan-Ozmun	Marilyn Weissman
Lina Wallen	Betsy McKellar	Margo Conley	Jim Babbitt
Norm Wallen	Bruce Higgins	Julie Pastrick	Tom Wyatt

**C. Elected Officials:**

Supervisor Mandy Metzger                      Councilmember Celia Barotz

**D. Staff:**

Kimberly Sharp	Sue Pratt	Mark Landsiedel	Jerene Watson
David Wessel	John Aber	Andrew Stocker	Rosemary Rosales
Jim Cronk	Alicia Becker	Kevin Burke	

**E. Consultants:**

Theresa Gunn, Gunn Communications, Inc.	Rob Rae, Kimley-Horn
Justin Feek, ADOT	Brent Crowther, Kimley-Horn

### III. 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/>*

There was no public comment.

### IV. WELCOME

County Supervisor Mandy Metzger and Flagstaff Councilmember Celia Barotz thanked the CAC members for their ongoing work in developing the regional plan.

### V. WHAT ONE WORD BEST DESCRIBES FLAGSTAFF TODAY?

Chairman Babbitt turned the meeting over to the new facilitator, Theresa Gunn. Theresa asked each CAC member and the public to use one word to describe Flagstaff today. Their responses are listed below.

- Muddled
- Exceptional
- Bright
- Underfunded
- Authentic
- Hometown
- Great potential
- Frontier
- Complete
- Not Phoenix
- Fun
- Family
- Opportunity
- Active
- Funky
- Diverse
- Wonderful
- Outdoors
- Beautiful
- Friendly
- Hot
- Sense of place
- Sacred
- Inspiring
- Vibrant
- Dry
- Unique

### VI. ADMINISTRATIVE

As facilitator, Theresa Gunn reviewed the retreat purpose, ground rules, her role as a facilitator and an overview of the CAC member input received prior to the retreat.

- **Retreat Purpose**
  - Reconnect as a full group
  - Agreement on the future we are building and how to illustrate that future
  - Timeline for the next 6 months
    - Action Plan
- **Ground Rules**
  - Review the rules
  - Cell phones
  - Be respectful
  - Everyone responsible for advance agenda
  - No cheap shots
  - Speak for yourself – don't know who "they" are?
  - Focus on constructive conflict
  - HAVE FUN!!!
- **Facilitator Role**
  - My Charge: Help you complete plan by end of year
  - Responsible for process --- not content
  - IAP2 Core Value – People should have a say in decisions that affect them
  - Citizen Engagement – Decision making process
  - Focus on decisions to be made

- **What You Told Me.....**
  - Process not broke
  - We disagree but we are respectful
  - It's been difficult for staff to play both roles
  - We need someone to take charge
  - Want more interactive meetings – shorter presentations
  - No clear agreement on vision and role of scenarios
- **Process Changes to Address Concerns**
  - Presentations by CAC members when possible
  - Focus on overview of key elements – what is important
  - End with discussion questions or recommendations for decisions
  - Use small group discussions and interactive exercises to help group with difficult issues

**VII. Celebrate Success**

Kimberly Sharp reviewed the progress chart and each CAC member reflected on what achievement to date they were most proud of. Several members were pleased to see the plan finally coming together and feel we are making progress.

**VIII. The Future We Want**

Theresa Gunn asked the CAC members and public to imagine it was 2032 and the regional plan had been fully implemented. She asked the members to visualize the Flagstaff they wanted in 2032. The attributes of each person's future Flagstaff were written on cards and categorized by the group. The following is a verbatim list of the cards under each category. The categories are in no particular order.

Built Environment	Community Character
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• As I drive into Flag from the I-17 the ENTRANCE into the town is <u>beautiful</u>-not just the backdrop of the mountains, but the buildings, signs, LANDSCAPING, lights all provide a picturesque VISTA-everyone "ooohs" and "ahhhs" as they drive, bike or bus in</li> <li>• Protected Walnut Canyon</li> <li>• No more Milton Vibrant downtown; dense urban population between NAU and hospital</li> <li>• Reclaimed water we can drink</li> <li>• Maintains unique community character</li> <li>• Community core with neighborhood centers</li> <li>• New places in town to DISCOVER <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Urban centers</li> <li>• Trails leading to.....</li> <li>• People going places looking engaged/excited</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Build of historical style and character</li> <li>• Traditional character maintained</li> <li>• Dark skies</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A community based on activity not consumerism</li> <li>• No more Milton</li> <li>• It's not a picture but identifying values <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• People have choices in where (type) they live and commute</li> <li>• Strong social programs and support for those in need</li> <li>• A community that supports health and wellness</li> <li>• Affordable</li> <li>• Sustainable in a sense that we have creative solutions to water and energy needs</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Unique</li> <li>• Not Phoenix... Still</li> <li>• I will be 91, still running and thankful I have lived in Flag for 63 years</li> <li>• Better integrated society including surrounding areas</li> <li>• Clean</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A resilient, creative, people-and nature-friendly community</li> <li>• Diversity</li> <li>• Music</li> <li>• Town and country here-now everywhere</li> <li>• Tolerance</li> <li>• Families continuing to be able to come together and relax and enjoy the splendor of the area</li> </ul>
--	--

Economy	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Our job base currently not what we want, good things happening but where we're falling down is we are not SETTING THE TABLE <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Infrastructure; specific properties/areas for business set and ready for them</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Jobs <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Gore-need more like this not another Rt. 66 Hamburger Stand</li> <li>• Once decision is made about built environment it must be a deliberate one time decision</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Healthy economy supports our other systems <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Built environment/natural environment</li> <li>• Open space \$</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Education supports our economy</li> <li>• How to put ourselves in the position to attract the jobs</li> <li>• Does this dichotomy really exist? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• We need to benchmark INTERNATIONALLY</li> <li>• We elect public officials who will take environment and employment into consideration</li> <li>• Cultural obstacles- people come here and are not happy</li> <li>• What technology needs to survive</li> <li>• Do we have real diversity (a mosque? Synagogue?)</li> <li>• Small university to small town to small city----- next?</li> <li>• Dreams about Flag becoming a <u>research center</u> of AZ science, astronomy, earth sciences</li> <li>• What draws folks here education and environment. Brings the PhDs, assistants, etc.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Distinction between priorities and needs <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Need priority of action-attention to economy</li> <li>• Natural environment and built environment balanced to provide pallet for economic development</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The entrepreneur jobs are big business, and Flagstaff is known throughout the country for its craftsmen, hand-blown recycled glass products, locally made windows and wood beams, bricks, tile, bicycles, photovoltaic' s, and Gore, SW Wind, Senestec, TGen, etc. have all doubled in size</li> <li>• Wider range of job opportunities</li> <li>• A community based service rather than commerce (service in the broadest sense)</li> <li>• A vibrant, self-sustaining, dynamic, mountain rustic beautiful community</li> <li>• Partnerships and collaboration <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• We all work together on common goals</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Competitive in marketplace</li> <li>• A community that has and will continue to have weathered the ups and downs of the global picture</li> <li>• Opportunities for livelihoods</li> <li>• Economy→balanced <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Education, tourism, government, research, medical, services</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Diverse jobs available</li> <li>• A more prosperous community with more people gainfully employed in industries we can't even imagine</li> <li>• Tourism that protects cultural and environmental resources (authenticity)</li> <li>• Business, jobs, tech, industry, health</li> <li>• Dark sky</li> <li>• Use tourism to bring more retreats to community</li> <li>• Local agriculture</li> <li>• Local businesses emphasized employment opportunities</li> </ul>

Natural Environment	Education
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Health</li> <li>• Strong water conservatory ethic</li> <li>• Singing birds</li> <li>• Warm pine-scented breeze</li> <li>• Camping, hiking, snow play in nature</li> <li>• Unburned forest</li> <li>• Natural quiet</li> <li>• Dark skies</li> <li>• Quality of life</li> <li>• Walnut Canyon National Park</li> <li>• Healthy forest, clean air, open space</li> <li>• Views, trails, parks, open space are even better than 2012</li> <li>• Active, outdoor, pedestrian and bike friendly</li> <li>• Accessible recreation and outdoor opportunities</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• NAU - dense resident population and center for remote learning</li> <li>• Flagstaff nationally recognized as national/international student STEM science/technology</li> <li>• The best education in the state</li> <li>• Flagstaff's education system is the BEST in Arizona and SW, from Pre-K through university, with FREE leadership training and the <u>friendliest</u> customer service</li> <li>• Research <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Flag is an intellectual and research center of south west</li> </ul> </li> <li>• A community based on understanding of one another and the natural world</li> <li>• Family friendly</li> <li>• Education → available and the BEST <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• FUSD is a model of success</li> <li>• CCC- the same</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

Housing	Transportation
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Trade-off <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• More dense (increase or more single family) → view shed</li> <li>• More open space</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Multi-generational housing</li> <li>• Choices</li> <li>• Mixed housing, the tight urban growing out to single family homes</li> <li>• Safe, affordable homes = access and attainability</li> <li>• Balanced housing opportunity for wide income range and type of housing</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bikes everywhere, trails, roads, outdoors</li> <li>• Not so car-oriented; multiple transportation options, more walk-able</li> <li>• Milton Road is improved <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Visual and multimodal</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Public transportation county wide</li> </ul>

Social	Not Categorized
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Family</li> <li>• Peace</li> <li>• Cultural diversity</li> <li>• Family oriented, kids and grandkids still live here</li> <li>• Quality of life</li> <li>• Laughter</li> <li>• Collaboration with our native neighbors</li> <li>• Focused social services to break the cycle of crime/substance abuse/incarceration</li> <li>• No hunger</li> <li>• Sound of children playing</li> <li>• Family friendly activities inclusive and accessible to all</li> <li>• People are engaged with each other's interests and have an active ongoing dialogue</li> <li>• Tolerance</li> <li>• Level of incarceration at international norms rather than among highest in nation and world</li> <li>• Health</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Flagstaff region is exceptional (environment, culture/community, aesthetic) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Those things are preserved</li> <li>• It is easier for people to live here <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Jobs-housing</li> <li>○ Education system</li> <li>○ transportation</li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> </ul>

## IX. Elevator Speeches

Each CAC member and public was asked to give a 2-3 minute elevator speech describing Flagstaff 2032 to a visitor. The following are the key elements of the speeches.

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Vision goals policies—30 page document provides direction</li> <li>• Roads, water, sewer systems to meet the vision</li> <li>• Metropolitan area unique mini-metropolis</li> <li>• Be kind to the environment</li> <li>• Treat the people with equality</li> <li>• Values</li> <li>• Small mountain town community</li> <li>• 7000' closer to God</li> <li>• Surrounded by outdoor activities</li> <li>• Great transportation system</li> <li>• Tourism—mom and pop shops, local/diverse stores and restaurants, electric planes to Grand Canyon, great weather→ four seasons with no humidity</li> <li>• Close to nature 24/7/ 365 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Everywhere- well integrated</li> <li>○ Wildlife viewing-hiking and biking</li> </ul> </li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Discovery-activities</li> <li>• Creativity</li> <li>• Culture <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Whole community participates in Native American celebrations/festivals</li> <li>○ Microcosm of music</li> <li>○ Art, plays, books, museums</li> <li>○ But have relationships</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Live/work/raise families <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Sense of community- all share sense of place/love diversity</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Grow local food—local agriculture <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Know people all over town</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Live in VACATION TOWN</li> <li>• Microcosm of DIVERSE JOBS- year-round entrepreneurial BUSINESS</li> <li>• Infrastructure set up for redevelopment/reutilization</li> </ul> |
|--|--|

- Education-STEM-young critical thinkers
  - CCC—steps to university-workforce training
- Light rail to Tucson- with margaritas
- Balance- economic/preservation environment
- Transportation
- Discovery
- Right size
- Diverse
  - Something for everyone
    - Not for everybody
  - Different things
  - Mom and pop
  - Outdoor/art
- Tourism- year round
- Social issues
  - Poverty
  - Hunger
- Respectful
- Multicultural
- Employment
  - Lots of opportunities
  - Science/government
  - Technology/research
  - Retail
- Education-research
- Forest
- Black skies
- Volunteers
- Housing
- Success- maintain unique character
  - Grown smart
  - High tech industries
  - Every home has solar power
  - Forest health
- Buzzing with activity and outdoor adventures
- Town for YOUNG and YOUNG at heart
- Neighborhoods with neighborhood centers and groceries walk-able neighborhoods-mixed use
- No traffic jams
- Older folks LIVE IN THEIR HOMES
- Clothesline outside
- Community is PRO BUSINESS and PRO ENVIRONMENT
- Sustainable economy- sustainable TOURISM
  - Quality authentic
  - Local shopping
- Right size
- Ambitious (like Portland, OR or Davis, CA)
  - Unpretentious
- NAU- 30,000 students
  - Elite and prestigious university
- Lowell observatory
  - (700 acre research campus\_
  - Technology- digital- world transportation
  - USGS/NAU/FMC
- Quiet
- Weather- 4 seasons- think Colorado Mountain Climate
- Housing choices-affordable to folds who come so they can stay
  - Can have apartment, townhouse, garden cottage or house
- Great Fire of 2023-lost much of our forest
- State capitol-Prescott
- Balance environment conservation and economic opportunities
  - Robust economy
  - Robust cultural opportunities
- Entrepreneurs

## **X. Process to Complete the Plan and Action Planning**

The group discussed the schedule for the next six months. After discussion the group made the following decisions.

- **Printed Draft Plan** – The latest version of the complete DRAFT plan will be posted online as soon as it is available. A printed version will be provided to each CAC member at the July 12 meeting. Any CAC member wanting a printed copy prior to July 12 should contact Kim to make arrangements to pick it up after July 1 at City Hall. *(The printed version will not include track changes. A version showing tracked changes will be posted online.)*
- **July 12 Meeting Agenda** – Review of the printed draft; agreement on structure of the document; agreement on how strategies will be documented; agreement on maps to be included and level of detail for land use map.
- **Additional Monthly Meetings** - To ensure the CAC is able to have enough time to adequately discuss the remaining elements, a second meeting will be scheduled for each month (July – December). If the CAC has enough time to discuss the issues during the first meeting, the second meeting will be canceled.
- **Future Meeting Agendas** – Future agendas will address policies first. At the end of the meeting, the group will discuss how to illustrate the policy (maps, drawings, etc.). The land use map will evolve over the remaining meetings.

## **XI. Preview Friday's Agenda**

Theresa Gunn reviewed the agenda for Friday and reminded members to be ready to start the meeting at 8 a.m. A continental breakfast will be available at 7:30 a.m.

## **XII. Adjourn**

Chairman Paul Babbitt adjourned the meeting at 11:45 a.m.

## June 22, 2012 – Friday

---

I. **CALL TO ORDER** – Chairman Paul Babbitt called the meeting to order.

II. **Roll Call**

**A. Committee Members:**

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Paul Babbitt (Chairman)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Julie Leid	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Maury Herman	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Don Walters
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Carol Bousquet (Vice Chairman)	<input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/> William Ring	<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	<b>PUBLIC COMMENT</b>		

*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.

III. **Today's Agenda**

Theresa Gunn reviewed the agenda which had been revised based on the outcomes of Thursday's meeting.

IV. **Reflections about Yesterday**

CAC members reflected on Thursday's discussion.

V. **What is a Regional Plan? How are Development Scenarios Used?**

Jim Cronk and Sue Pratt explained how the regional plan fits into both the City and County planning and decision processes. The plan establishes the direction and policies. The details of specific projects are developed through functional planning and implementation.

Sue indicated the County planners are watching for potential conflicts between the new regional plan and existing county plans. At this time, they have not found any conflicts. John stated in the past any county zoning change resulted in having to also file a regional plan amendment. County staff is hoping to correct this problem.

**Public Comment:**

- Public perception is the regional plan sits on the shelf and doesn't influence decision making
  - Kevin Burke commented his goal is to make sure the new plan is perceived as a city wide plan not just a community development division plan

## **VI. Development Scenarios – Working Group Report**

Jerome Naleski, Julie Leid, Judy Louks and Alex Wright provided an overview of the performance indicators for scenarios A, B and D. Based on the analysis; it appears the difference between the scenarios is not great, but that scenario D is most in line with the guiding principles.

The following are some of the comments made during the group discussion.

- \$20M over time, to buy unprotected open space, isn't a lot of money but probably off by an order of magnitude
- Water demand influenced more by population not type of development
- Does less land equate to fewer jobs?
- Need to determine how we spend our future tax dollars.

## **VII. Speed Brainstorming**

Members and the public were asked to provide responses to the following four questions:

- What did you learn from the scenario exercise?
- How does scenario D relate to yesterday's discussion?
- What trade-offs are needed to implement scenario A, B or D?
- How can we use this information to influence policy?

Flip charts were posted around the room and each person was asked to reflect individually and write their responses on the flip charts. The following is a verbatim list of the responses for each of the four questions.

### **What did you learn from the scenario exercise?**

- Isolation is not reality. One size doesn't fit all. Assumptions are just that
- Personally, I think there is value in the small differences and they shouldn't be overlooked
- That it really boils down to community values and what, where we as a community are willing to invest. I gave up 70% of my income to come and live in Flagstaff. It took 5 years to recap the difference. 30 years later, I feel it was worth it
- It's an exercise, amplified to the next 80-100 years. Our planning horizon is 10-20 years
- To look at the issue as I would an abstract painting—don't get lost in the detail—but see the larger image
- I am less and less concerned about mapping and more focused on values
- General health of the people and long-term environmental impact are the most significant factors
- It didn't give me a clear answer on direction for a land use map
- Using \$ as metric for energy use (or anything else) is too simplistic
- 150,000 is not a popular goal, it is a means of evaluating different growth scenarios
- Each scenario is similar, the change is in the values we place, not dense, or no density, we are making very small change

### **How does scenario D relate to yesterday's discussion?**

- My sense is that scenario D gives us more leverage/justification/incentive/space—to implement the goals/policies/guiding principles contained in the draft plan

- It gives us a way of “testing” the community values we identified yesterday and the possible results of some policies
- Gives picture of lifestyle within a framework of ecosystem conservation
- Vision for preserving values addressed in h.p.
- It preserves more of our open spaces and our natural environment
- Using crude metrics doesn’t capture the issues
- It comes down to values, not necessary data
- It provides a fuzzy tool, a broad brush, to place regional plan priorities that were raised yesterday
- Hold fast to our values and don’t shy away from making a bold and positive goal for the future
- Yesterday is values, how do we implement that into the scenario

### **What trade-offs are needed to implement scenario A, B or D?**

- Change people’s perception of what a home looks like/feels like
- The economics of transportation/housing are forcing these changes---perhaps the trade-offs go away through market forces
- The higher paying jobs create demands for 350,000 to 600,000 (?) homes when developers survey need they look to where they can sell the most product. We need to look at maybe other industries that employ more masses and create more need for attainable housing. (*EDITOR NOTE: The largest number of housing needs forecasted for the distant future was an additional 27,600 homes.*)
- Trade-off: some higher tech jobs for line production type positions
- There needs to be a desire/commitment to the place types and demand for the PTs
- Investment/commitment to transit
- I’m concerned about how any scenario is impacted by the market forces—these seem to be the big unknown re: planning. If we build it (like we’ve envisioned) will that meet demand or will demand change our planning?
- Think about the broader impacts of open space on humans through ecosystem services
- We need to decide where we spend the money, we want it all, what is priority 1, 2, 3.....
- Gentrification
- Fiscal expenditures with a limited tax base
- Subsidies for favored projects. Penalties for “sprawl” projects
- Buy in fees that vary with location and density
- I see lifestyle changes and how other values such as environmental, economy and transportation are integrated, not trade-offs
- View sheds, neighborhood character, housing choices
- Trade-offs as described are too slight/vague/limited

### **How can we use this information to influence policy?**

- We have to ask, are we moving in the right direction. We seem to be. Let’s continue on path, finish policies, and then come up with land use and map
- Set strategies
- This information, if we allow it, provides a rough, information based way to discuss effects of general planning themes, therefore, how the regional plan can be both visionary and practical
- Recognize impact of decisions
- Too broad: assumptions
- Too limited: questions

- Remember redevelopment and infill without always thinking about Greenfield development
- We should **be inspired to be bold**
- We should be looking and thinking about these things in more general terms-and have the trust that the details will be resolved further down the pyramid
- Gives us trends and “big picture” – hopefully we stay out of the details quicksand that we sometimes sink into.....
- Not much-plan should adapt to changing priorities
- Not much until other elements are discussed. It is great to have a vision but reality is implementation
- Vision should drive action: people shape the community CAC represent the community interests

### **VIII. Small Group Discussions on Trade Offs**

Staff reviewed the notes from the speed brainstorming and created three topics for discussion by small groups. CAC members and the public broke off into small groups to discuss the following.

- How does regional plan policy influence or prioritize decision-making process? (Jim Cronk – Lead)
- Balancing neighborhood character, housing choices and view shed with housing density (Mark Landsiedel – Lead)
- How does land use drive what type of jobs our community can attract? (Kimberly Sharp – Lead)

#### **How does regional plan policy influence or prioritize decision-making process?**

- Public expenditure (a policies and regulations) should be focused on furthering the built and natural character in the plan
- Thread things together
- Intended consequences
- Regional plan has to be written in a way that makes a connection between vision and reality
  - Language is important!
- Water sustainability need to be given the highest priority
- Strategic decision to leverage economic development to result in:
  - Preservation
  - Community value
  - Conservation of natural resources

#### **Balancing neighborhood character, housing choices and view shed with housing density**

- Lots of opportunity in Design Demonstration project
- Architecture affordability with increased density
  - Maintain existing housing stock which is the most affordable
  - Value of financial education within a building
- NIMBY issues with view sheds
- Logistics of density such as:
  - Parking
  - Height limits
  - Historic preservation

- Can we identify important view sheds
  - Adjacent to historic neighborhoods are biggest concerns
  - Milton—lesser concern
  - Route 66—site specific concerns
- Density and transportation are closely linked
- Conversation with NAU about growth and cars

### **How does land use drive what type of jobs our community can attract?**

- Land use→residential, commercial, inst/ind/BP, mixed-use, open space, parks, right-of-way, utility easements, resource protection, transportation
- Indust/inst/BP—sustain tax base which supports our life-style
  - (690 industrial acres city- in an area that is not appealing to those types of businesses)—vacant ind. Land→airport (without) infrastructure
    - Alleviate this by changing some current “general” to BP/Ind. And put in infrastructure (opportunity costs—entitle with zoning)
      - Challenge: Wildlife corridor where people might want to build houses or businesses
- Residential does not provide the tax-base to pay its own way—2<sup>nd</sup> homes residential—part of market demand but does not contribute to services
- It’s not about total acres, it’s how it’s pieced together
- Belmont development conflicts with transportation goals
- Ownership issues with land use – personal goals vs. community vision
- Part of conflict in our definition of “industry”→ do we need highway/rail?
- Current biggest employers
 

○ Education	○ Science
○ Government	○ Computer
○ Biotech	○ Intellectual data
○ Research	
- What do these type of businesses need?
  - Business park
    - Campus
  - Vertical/urban mixed-use
    - Office bldg//research, medical
  - Pull “industrial” separate (Purina, ACStissue, etc.)
  - Jobs/housing→ close proximity
- What type of workforce?
  - “clean industry”
    - 5-10 years—great advances—too long of process (infrastructure/zoning) will lose...
- Higher income earners want life-style
 

○ Restaurants	○ Synergies
○ Recreation opportunities/OS	○ Connection to environment
○ Cultural activities	○ Education – STEM
○ Don’t lose next Gore because of trailing spouses not able to find jobs	○ Transportation—travel time expectations
- Options—drive, bike, walk would like to with options

- “Rise of the creative class”
- Location ideas for this type of
  - Workforce:
    - Integrated into various locations into town
  - Bulk re-zoning
    - Establish BP and/or mixed-use
  - Route 66—train noise
 

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ McMillan Mesa</li> <li>▪ Airport BP</li> <li>▪ Butler Corridor</li> <li>▪ West Route 66</li> <li>▪ FMC expansion</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ South Fourth Street—N. Fourth St. redevelopment</li> <li>▪ 89 AN—city/county—mall area</li> <li>▪ S. Milton—around campus</li> </ul>
--	---

**IX. How do we use the scenario information? Do we want to choose one as a starting point?**

CAC members discussed how they wanted to use the scenario information as they move forward into the planning process. The group also discussed whether or not they had agreement on density. After discussion the group was unable to reach a consensus agreement. The discussion was tabled to a future meeting.

**X. Visual Simulations**

Jim Cronk and Kimberly Sharp discussed the options for creating visual simulations to illustrate the regional plan policies. The group made the following decision.

- **Visualizations** – The CAC members agree visualizations are needed to illustrate the policies. However, the group did not feel it was necessary to use Decision Theatre.

**XI. Land Use Map**

Kimberly Sharp suggested the review of maps from other general plans be tabled until a future meeting. Land use MAP is not a scenario—but a more general idea of growth. After discussion, the CAC members made the following decision.

- After the policies for each element are approved, the CAC will do a map exercise similar to the public “chip game” to determine how to reflect that information on the map. A land use map will “evolve” through the August – October meetings.
- During the July 12 CAC meeting, CAC members will review all of the draft maps being prepared for the plan.

## **XII. Regional Plan Introduction**

Vice Chairman Carol Bousquet distributed a copy of a possible plan introduction written by Ron Hubert. The copy will be inserted into the next version of the draft plan for review and discussion at a future meeting. The purpose of the introduction is to set the context for how the plan should be used.

## **XIII. Action Plan**

The following are the actions documented during the retreat.

- **Policy Language** – For those policies most important to implementing the guiding principles (to be determined), the CAC will review the wording to ensure there is appropriate emphasis “oomph” to provide guidance to future decision making.
- **Additional Meetings** – Staff will poll CAC members to determine possible dates for the second meeting.
- **Visualizations** – Staff to cancel Decision Theatre and determine the best method for providing the requested visuals.
- **Homework** –
  - Edits (non-substantive) can be sent to staff anytime.
  - If any member needs content/technical support to understand the content, please contact staff to schedule time to discuss prior to the meeting.
  - After reading the draft elements, if there are any items you disagree with or represent potential conflict among the group, please notify staff at least one week in advance of the meeting during which the element is scheduled to be discussed. Your feedback will be used to help draft the agenda and prepare working group presentations.

## **XIV. Parking Lot**

The following issues were placed in the parking lot for consideration at a future meeting.

- Usage and size of the plan
- Need NAU dialogue about
- Growth
- Impact
- Develop policies re: view sheds/views public vs. private
- Elected officials invited to CAC meetings
  - Help them be more aware/involved

**XV. Adjourn** - Vice Chairman Carol Bousquet adjourned the meeting at 1 p.m.