

# Draft Minutes

## City of Flagstaff

### REGIONAL PLAN CITIZEN ADVISORY COMMITTEE

September 6, 2012 – Thursday – 2:30 to 6:00 p.m.

*Aquaplex, 1702 N Fourth Street, Flagstaff, AZ*



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.***

#### **I. CALL TO ORDER**

Chair Babbitt called the meeting to order at 2:36 p.m.

#### **II. ROLL CALL**

##### **Committee Members Present:**

Paul Babbitt (Chairman)

Susan Bean

Richard Henn (arrived late)

Judy Louks

Jerome Naleski

Alex Wright

Carol Bousquet (Vice Chairman)

Shaula Hedwall

Maury Herman (arrived late)

Devonna McLaughlin

Don Walters

##### **Absent:**

Ben Anderson

Nat White

Julie Leid

Eva Putzova

##### **Attendees:**

Theresa Gunn, Facilitator

Mark Landsiedel, Community Development Director

Kimberly Sharp, Acting Comprehensive Planning Mgr.

David Wessel, FMPO Manager

Vice-Mayor Coral Evans, Councilmembers Jeff Oravits and Celia Barotz, Betsy McKellar, Rick Miller, Tish Bogan-Ozmun, Bill McCullough, Lina Wallen, Tom Wyatt, Stacey Button, John Saltonstall, Erika Mazza, Jim Corning, John Stigmon.

#### **III. PUBLIC COMMENT**

Councilman Jeff Oravits stated he is concerned the CAC is losing an intended balance of representation due to vacancies. Chairman Paul Babbitt stated staff sent a memo to CAC members today regarding these concerns. Because the item was not part of the posted agenda, the CAC will be unable to discuss the issue or to take action. Members will be provided an opportunity to make individual statements about this issue as part of the new business agenda.

#### **IV. APPROVAL of MINUTES**

**Mr. Naleski made a motion to approve the Minutes for the August 16, 2012 CAC Meeting and Mr. Walters seconded. Motion passed unanimously.**

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

##### **A. Economic Development Element** – pages 1 through 9

Ms. Gunn began by providing a procedure to facilitate discussion of the Economic Development Element, asking for committee members' issues and concerns.

Issues identified for discussion were:

1. "Incentives," from Policy ED.3.5
2. "Social vitality"
3. "Public comment"
4. Tools/leveraging
5. Context
6. STEM/Education/Work
7. "Retention," from ED.3
8. "Transparent government," from
9. "Business incubators," from ED.3.7
10. "Opportunities," from fifth paragraph of the Introduction.

Discussion ensued concerning identified verbiage relative to the Economic Development Element beginning with Policy ED.3.5.

Judy Louks stated her concern that the word "incentives" was not clear enough; and do we want to have that as a stated policy? During discussion, suggestion was made to change "Take advantage of" to "Consider" with respect to local incentives.

Public Comment: Attendee John Stigmon with ECoNA (Economic Collaborative of Northern Arizona) stated he had found sixteen different items of concern to him in the Economic Development Element, most of which were places where the language was in conflict. He was also concerned about limited references to land use since available land and infrastructure is often the most important economic development tools for a business owner.

Chair Babbitt clarified that the Regional Plan's state statute mandate includes many elements beyond Land Use. Ms. Sharp noted that there were to have been changes made to the second paragraph on page 2 (where "opportunities" is bolded), but were not. She assured the CAC that they would be done on the next draft.

Chairman Paul Babbitt called for a vote on whether or not to change the language of Policy ED.3.5. **Devonna McLaughlin made the motion to retain the language, without change, to Policy ED.3.5. Motion was seconded by Don Walters. Motion passed with three dissenting votes: Judy Louks, Carol Bousquet, and Shaula Hedwall.**

Mr. Stigmon noted that ED.7.4 gives prospective developers a negative connotation in absorbing full cost of public infrastructure for educational costs. He urged the Committee to be aware of the conflicting language in the Plan. Goal ED.7.4 was discussed. **Jerome Naleski made a motion to remove paragraph ED.7.4. Motion was seconded by Don Walters.** After further discussion, Chairman Babbitt called for the vote. **Motion passed unanimously.**

Judy Louks questioned who were the “regional economic development partners” which the element speaks of? Are they in agreement with the policy language? Ms. Sharp asked for any regional economic development partners in the room to identify themselves. Identified representatives attending: Chamber of Commerce Government Affairs Director; Coconino Community College workforce development and Small Business Development Center (SBDC) member (CAC member); Sustainable Economic Development Initiative (SEDI) executive director (CAC member); City of Flagstaff Economic Vitality Director, Business Retention and Expansion Manager, Economic Development Manager; ECoNA Vice-President; Coconino County community development staff; Bothands Affordable Housing Executive Director (CAC member); Hopi Tribe Economic Development Council rep (CAC Member); Flag 40 / Northern Arizona Builders Association (CAC member); Northern Arizona Board of Realtors (2 CAC members). These members were given an opportunity to speak on how they have participated in developing the Economic Development Element. It was noted that there are many other economic development partners in the community, but these were representative at this meeting, and have participated in developing the Economic Development Element through the working group meetings and at CAC meetings.

It was determined during discussion, that the Economic Development Working Group should do the following:

1. Introduction – emphasize the need to “broaden” or “grow the tax base”; the stated goal of ‘focus business retention and expansion of small knowledge-based.....’ seems in conflict with the ‘opportunities’ stated on page 2; Innovation Mesa needs to be its own sentence and clarify intention of that space; last paragraph – “The consolidation of hundreds of public comments...” change to “The public and working group has ascertained...”.
2. Relationship to Vision and Guiding Principles – make clear “social vitality” or use different words that everyone understands.
3. Responsive Government – define ‘economic development tools’ in glossary / strategies
4. Goal ED.1 – reword to include: ‘open, transparent government processes’; articulate ‘healthy environment for business’ more clear. Suggestion: ‘A balance of the allocation of resources between society, business and the environment’.
5. Policy ED.1.3 and 1.5 – seem to be basic, common sense consider- if they are needed.
6. Policy ED.1.4 -- determined if it needs to be reworded after the goal is changed; ‘Municipal government’ changes to ‘City and County’.
7. Policy ED.1.3 -- look at it with respect to “public information” - do we need to add easy to understand/?
8. Policy ED 1.6 – reword to discuss fiscally responsible and risk management without creating an expectation that incentives will be provided. Define incentive tools – correspond to ‘Cost of Development’ or list in appendix.
9. Education and Workforce Training – STEM in normal, local language? Note any federal initiatives for this.
10. Policy ED 2.3 and 2.4 – can these be combined? The group agreed to use the work STEAM and to discuss adding “become a leader.” Coordinate the last sentence of the introduction (K-12 education) and Policy 2.3. “Promote the success of K-12 and post-secondary education....”
11. Section 3 – Opening paragraph add references to mid-size businesses.
12. Policy ED 3.7 – Business incubators – coordination? Land / space to collaborate, share resources? “Incubators” – spell out how far the incubator project should go, work on language to make intent clearer.

13. Policy 4.1 – Publicize all developable property (with owner’s knowledge)
14. Policy 7.4 – remove
15. Policy 7.5 – reword regarding the use of the word ‘assemblage’. Discussion of how Tempe voluntarily bought property over time, assembling it for the purpose of fulfilling a known redevelopment plan. The assembled property was then turned over to the private sector to develop it.
16. Clarify the use of “government” terms throughout.
17. Emphasize “mid-size” businesses as defined by Small Business Administration.
18. Topic #2, “Social vitality” and “tax base” wording was referred back to the Working Group for rewording.
19. Policy ED.1.7 – issue of respect for tribal lands as sovereign lands; add “tribes” where appropriate in Plan.

Devonna McLaughlin and Judy Louks gave their appreciation to the Working Group in changing the tone of the section to be more positive. It no longer reads like a textbook.

The members requested the working group bring a final draft to the CAC for review before the committee adopts the draft for editing.

## **VI. Additional PUBLIC COMMENT**

### **A. NAIPTA 5-Year and Long-range Transit Plan**

Erika Mazza, Transit Planning Manager, announced that from September 10 through October 10, 2012, Flagstaff Transit Plan will publish an on-line questionnaire available at [www.flagstafftransitplan.com](http://www.flagstafftransitplan.com). All participation is greatly appreciated.

## **VII. NEW BUSINESS –**

### **A. CAC Membership Vacancies**

Chairman Babbitt reminded the members that the Committee cannot vote or act or take any action on any item that was not on the Agenda 24 hours prior to the meeting. This is in reference to a memo from Ms. Sharp to the CAC, dated September 6, 2012, concerning City Council discussions to fill CAC vacancies – this was submitted as an informational announcement to the Committee.

Mr. Henn recommended that this be placed on the Agenda for discussion at the next meeting, September 27<sup>th</sup>.

Ms. Sharp indicated that no action could be taken, recommendations or vote made.

Councilmember Evans stated that she was there to hear the CAC’s opinion on the matter. Each member then expressed their personal opinion regarding filling vacancies on the CAC. The facilitator put the opinions on a flip chart.

- Richard Henn: We have only had a 20% turnover which is not a large turnover for a group who has been meeting this long. We are on task and have lots of input. A new person would have a lot of catch up since we are so close to being done. No need for additional members to the group.
- Jerome Naleski: We’re OK and on track.
- Judy Louks: Have had concerns for a long time. Felt the working groups were a tactic used to divide and conquer the group, and feel it has inhibited participation. The loss of Bill Ring was the loss of a significant voice. The process shouldn’t be accelerated and the group seems unbalanced. We are under-represented by business, realtors, and developers.

- Chairman Babbitt: Have been very encouraged how this group has not relied on traditional/exclusive segments of the community. A goal was to be inclusive and comprehensive. We're so far into this process now and have had plenty of opportunity for input. I don't feel the need to recast.
- Carol Bousquet: I have looked at the self-identifications. We all wear multiple hats within the community and as a group we have found compromise and have had rich discussions, not just focused on individual sectors but what is best for the community. There has been lots of change in several areas (of representation). The numbers of member self-identified with the business community is still strong (5 previous, 5 now); while the environmental stewards has declined from 6 to 2; tribal representation has gone from 1 to 0. I'm not in favor of bringing a new person in. It would be unfair to the individual and the group (to try to get that person up to speed). This plan still continues to be influenced by the members who have come and gone. We still have their legacy.
- Susan Bean: The original commitment was for three years. If we had not been this diverse of a group, we would have already completed the plan. Because we are diverse, it has not been easy. We have rich discussions with the members.
- Alex Wright: It would take too much time to catch people up. Our ground rules on the back of the table tent state we are to make decisions in the best interest of the community and I feel the group does so. We do maintain a good balance.
- Don Walters: When I joined the group in the middle of the process, I thought I was drowning when I tried to get up to speed. I can't imagine how new people will be able to get up to speed now. Yes we lost Bill's voice, but think we still have lots of balance. It would take a really special person to come on board now. I have lots of concern for bringing new people on and changing the dynamics at this point.
- Shaula Hedwall: I would not recommend new people be brought on.
- Maury Herman: Designations have changed. I really miss Bill's presence. I don't think we need seven (7) new people, but maybe a couple of special people – the conservative viewpoint is missing. [I was listed in the category of business/Realtor/Chamber. While I am a business owner, I am neither a chamber member nor a Realtor. I left the Realtors when their PAC spent a lot of money on advertisements against Paul Babbitt's congressional candidacy \(2004\) and more recently let my chamber membership lapse because of dissatisfaction with their position on health care policy.](#) We need people who know what it is like as a business person to operate in this community. I don't see as much understanding on the Committee right now. Often I am seen as the conservative one in the group, [when really I am not.](#)

## A. Maps

Ms. Sharp reported on the Comprehensive Planning Memo, dated September 6, 2012, regarding the issue of a Regional Plan Land Use Map. City Councilwoman Celia Barotz voiced her feeling that the Memo promotes discussion on the need for a land use map.

Discussion ensued.

Conclusions are:

- How to produce a land use map –an evolving process with the CAC and public as an illustration to policies.
- Must clarify how the land use map will be used – must be used in conjunction with policy.
- Suggest that the map be digitized, on-line, easy-to-use and legally binding.

Chairman Babbitt requested a straw poll show of hands as to which members would be in favor of a land use map. Most members were in favor of having a land use map.

No further action was taken due to the fact that a quorum was lost at 6:05 p.m.

**B. Preferred Scenario Exercise**

The agenda item was postponed due to time constraints.

**Adjourned at 6:05 p.m.**