



Draft Minutes
Regional Plan Citizen Advisory Committee
3:30 p.m. – 6:00 p.m. – Thursday, July 12, 2012

Aquaplex
1702 N. Fourth Street, Flagstaff, AZ 86004

I. CALL TO ORDER

Chair Babbitt called the meeting to order at 3:37 p.m.

II. ROLL CALL

Committee Members Present:

Jeff Babbitt, Chair
Carol Bousquet, Vice Chair
Susan Bean
Richard Henn
Maury Herman
Julie Leid
Judy Louks
Devonna McLaughlin
Jerome Naleski
Eva Putzova
William Ring
Nat White

Absent

Ben Anderson
Shaula Hedwall
Don Walters
Alex Wright

Attendees

David Wessel, FMPO Manager
Kimberly Sharp, Acting Comprehensive Planning Mngr.
Jim Cronk, Planning Director
Justine Otto, FMPO Administrative Specialist Temp
Betsy McKellar, Rick Miller, Trish Bogan-Ozmun, Bruce Higgins, Lina Wallen, Tom Wyatt
Theresa Gunn, Gunn Communications, Facilitator

III. PUBLIC COMMENT

The members of the public in attendance were reminded that the Committee was under time restrictions and must adhere to the agenda in order to meet the restrictions. Public comments must therefore be kept to the appropriate times in the agenda. There were no public comments.

IV. APPROVAL of MINUTES

Mr. Naleski made a motion to approve the Minutes for June 21 and 22, 2012 CAC Retreat and Ms. Leid seconded, the motion passed unanimously.

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

Path Forward: Schedule for CAC Meetings

The Meeting Schedule was presented, Mr. Naleski moved to approve the new schedule and Mr. Henn seconded, the motion passed unanimously.

B. Base DATA Demographics

The committee discussed the Community Profile Summary, which had been summarized into one page from the original 15-page document. It was agreed that the summary is very helpful, but a debate emerged on whether certain items need to be included in the summary. The word usage "historic" in reference to the Sunnyside neighborhood was questioned, as well as the term "homes." "Dwelling units" or "housing units" were recommended to replace the term. It was questioned if 9000 projected units was an overestimation based on various factors, including but not limited to the potential rise in people per unit. It was determined that people per unit was taken into account when projecting the numbers. It was agreed that the Sunnyside neighborhood, being over 50 years old, qualified for the term "historic." The number of current unit owners, renters, and second-home owners was mentioned, and the number and percentage was agreed to be included in the document. The impact of student renters on the demographics was also discussed. It was determined that while students and non-students could not be immediately distinguished in the current data, it may be possible to analyze census data to better account for the amount of renters that were non-full-time residents. It was recommended that the growth of the student population be taken into account to prevent data from being skewed in the future. A brief overview was given of the recommended changes to ensure that there was a consensus of understanding. There was discussion only.

VI. **NEW BUSINESS (Continued, postponed, and tabled items.)**

A. DRAFT Regional Plan Document

An overview of the draft was presented. The previous changes were outlined, as well as editor's suggestions. It was pointed out that in the original table of contents there were 3 main categories, called "umbrellas," that had been split into 12 categories in the new draft. The committee discussed whether or not the separate categories needed to be re-consolidated into 4 main sections. Some members enjoyed the easy-to-navigate design of the more detailed index and stated that it made the overall document more accessible, while others argued that sticking to a small number of sections would keep the document focused. The committee discussed how the document and its index would translate into multimedia, and how easy or difficult different formats might make it to peruse. A member of the committee stated that there was a "preserve and protect" feel to the document in regards to the regional area. It was agreed that a "sense of place" would benefit the future Flagstaff community, but in the present it may deter basic economic development. The committee discussed how hindering land developers short-term would promote long-term preservation of the area's natural beauty and resources, but would likewise hinder Flagstaff's basic economic growth in the short term. It was mentioned that doing so would make the area more appealing to telecommuters and entrepreneurs, and that such people would be drawn to the area. It was reiterated that in the meantime hindering industrial growth was not a good for short-term economic development. A member stated that the document was incomplete without also including the worth of human and social capital. The topic returned briefly to the 4 original umbrellas used to index the document, which were stated for the benefit of the group. The committee did not make a decision regarding the index at this time. The Style Guide was introduced, and it was explained that once the committee created the Style Guide it would be implemented by the editor of the Regional

Plan. Samples were shown of other cities' plans and it was explained how the Guide would aid understanding, accessibility, and visual appeal of the Plan. Volunteers were requested to work on the Guide. It was suggested that the style should depend on the intended audience of the Regional Plan, and a simple-language approach was recommended to make the document understandable to the community at large. As an extension of this idea it was debated how and if the language should be defined to prevent future misunderstandings. It was pointed out that as the committee members are a sampling of the larger, varied community, they themselves are a reliable representation of the level of understanding the completed document will be approached with. Therefore, if the committee members understand the document, the community they represent will as well. August 2nd was set as the date for a draft of the Style Guide to be presented to the CAC, and the following CAC members volunteered to draft the Style Guide: Susan Bean, Devonna McLaughlin, and Nat White. The topic moved to strategies included in the document, and if certain ones needed to be cut or consolidated. It was agreed that while this is not a high priority, it needs to be done before the document is completed. It was recommended that the introduction language for the strategies appendix be written in a more positive approach. It was also recommended that the draft policies be completed by the end of December, and the committee could then turn its attention to the strategies. There was discussion only.

The Chair then opened the floor to public comment. A member of the public requested that cultural heritage be mentioned in the document, and perhaps be discussed at greater length, not simply touched upon in passing. Another member of the public was of the opinion that the unwritten preserve and protect policy may be the source of Flagstaff's lower unemployment rates and therefore not hindering economic development.

DRAFT Regional Plan MAPS

The committee was presented with in-progress regional maps and instructed to comment on them individually using markers provided, particularly to determine which maps would prove most useful if included in the document, and if any should be left out. It was inquired if the maps literally illustrate the future impact of policies, and it was clarified that the maps would simply be used as background information to provide context to the document to aid land usage, preservation, and development. Due to time constraints the overview of the maps was also used as a break period. The comments on the maps are included below. The committee reconvened afterwards and quorum was noted to be present.

Example Land Use maps were shown and discussed. Several members appreciated the simplicity of the Chandler example, while others were unprepared to comment without more information. An example Land Use map in the opposite extreme was presented, but declared overcomplicated. It was agreed that Flagstaff was more topographically complex than Chandler, and that they should go with a more defined map, while trying to keep it understandable. Someone commented that zoning must agree with the Regional Plan. It was suggested that when presented in its online format the maps could be layered, so simple and complex maps could both have their uses. It was widely agreed that an overly simple map would not enhance the document. It was questioned and confirmed that the online map ideal is doable with the current budget. There was discussion only.

C. Regional Plan NAME

The committee was advised to brainstorm names for the Regional Plan and email them Theresa Gunn, facilitator. There was no discussion, as quorum was not present.

ADJOURNMENT

Chair Babbitt adjourned the meeting at 5:45 p.m.

PROPOSED FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS

1. "Human/Social Capital" in the Regional Plan
2. Explore Assumptions the Recommendations are Based On
3. Plan and Maps in Digital Format-Presentation, Organization, and Updates
4. Protect and Preserve Cultural Heritage Sites

Comments left on maps:

Map 2: Circulation: Roads and Transit

1. Delete- No money for this in for foreseeable future. No mission. Re-introduce 10 years from now.
 - 1a. Agree with this.
 2. Keep in TIP?
 - 2a. Yes! Link to from RP

Map 3: Circulation: Bikes, Peds, and FUTS

1. This could be kept in the TIP and inked by the Regional Plan
2. I would reference i.e. referral link
3. Keep in Plan
4. Urban/Rural Growth Boundary- Too hard to read/distinguish

Natural Environment: Concentration of Natural Resources

1. Some presumptions of open space

Map 4: Natural Environment: Existing Conditions

1. State Trust Lands- High Priority for Retention- For what?

Map 7: Heritage Resources

1. Public comment—Walnut Canyon is all culturally sensitive, as is the San Francisco Peaks

Map 8: Community Character

1. [Indicating a point where a Gateway might need to be]
2. Reference
3. Is this somewhat a duplicate of the Future Land Use map? Could we address this on that map?

Map 9: Redevelopment/Infill Potential

1. Link-reference
2. I believe sewers and water in downtown rebuilt in 1990
3. This map needs clarification, confusing
4. At least three requirements met by ARS 9-499.10 —?
5. Public comment—Important to show potential growth

Map 10: Economic Development: Industry Clusters

1. [Indicating a point] More industrial?

2. Correction: The Arboretum has been repositioned as a research center since SEGA grant—I'm on their Board (Susan Bean)
3. Retail Clusters- Milton?
4. 2 Coconino Community College Campuses
5. [Note redirecting Arboretum to Science Cluster column]
6. [Museum of NA, Coconino Center for the Arts, Pioneer Museum] Ft. Valley Road Corridor Plan
7. Public comment—Walnut Canyon National Monument/To conservation too
8. Public comment—Science^ and Conservation^ Clusters, Grand Canyon Trust Conservation
9. Public comment—Use business license data to show all businesses by NAISC
- 9a. Public comment—Different map?

Map 11: Public Facilities: Facilities, Parks & Recreation, Schools

1. Would reference in RP
2. This is a great map but I don't think it's necessary in RP
3. The map is locational. Can you show connectivity between sites?

Map 13: Facilities: Fire and Safety

1. Not needed in RP-Reference and provide link
2. Would use as reference

Map 14: Land Ownership and Jurisdiction

1. Would reference in Plan
2. The 3 light greens are hard to distinguish
3. Not needed in RP, ownership will change and become obsolete. Reference and link

Other comments:

6 maps included: In general they provide information on the following:

- Map- Environmental Quality
- Map- Community Character and Neighborhoods
- Map- Development/Trains/Growth
- Map- Economic Development (Utilities, Location, Access)
- Map- Recreation
- Map- Public Buildings/Facilities

Land Use Map:

- Express our geography
- Not parcel based
- Simple display
- Overlay maps to capture complexity