



**FLAGSTAFF  
REGIONAL  
PLAN 2012**

**Draft Minutes**  
**Regional Plan Citizen Advisory Committee**  
**3:30 p.m. – 6:00 p.m. – Thursday, September 27, 2012**

---

Aquaplex  
 1702 N. Fourth Street, Flagstaff, AZ 86004

**I. CALL TO ORDER**

Chair Babbitt called the meeting to order at 3:35 p.m.

**II. ROLL CALL**

**Committee Members Present:**

Paul Babbitt, Chair	Carol Bousquet, Vice Chair	Maury Herman
Julie Leid	Judy Louks	Devonna McLaughlin
Jerome Naleski	Nat White	Alex Wright
Ben Anderson	Eva Putzova (4:15)	Don Walters (4:26)

**Absent**

Shaula Hedwall ( <i>excused</i> )	Susan Bean ( <i>excused</i> )	Richard Henn ( <i>excused</i> )
-----------------------------------	-------------------------------	---------------------------------

**Attendees**

Theresa Gunn, Facilitator  
 David Wessel, FMPO Manager  
 Kimberly Sharp, Acting Comprehensive Planning Mgr.  
 Jim Cronk, Planning Director  
 Sue Pratt, Coconino County Community Development Director  
 Tiffany Antol, Principal Planner, Coconino County  
 Michelle D’Andrea, Assistant City Attorney  
 Mark Landsiedel, Community Development Director, City of Flagstaff  
 Justine Otto, FMPO Administrative Specialist Temp  
 Erika Mazza, Planning Mgr, NAIPTA

**Public**

Betsy McKellar, Lina Wallen, Bruce Higgins, Tish Bogan-Ozmun, Jim McCarthy, Tom Wyatt

**III. PUBLIC COMMENT**

None

**IV. APPROVAL of MINUTES**

Ms. McLaughlin made a motion to approve the Minutes for September 6th, 2012 CAC Meeting and Mr. Naleski seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

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

**A. Plan Name**

The list of previously-selected Plan names was presented for review. The following points were made:

- The current Plan name should distinguish itself from previous Plan names
- To aid this, a date should be included – the date the vision is looking towards
- The term “Regional Plan” should be included for clarity, as should the word Flagstaff

- Round numbers (2020, 2030) are used for dates because they are more solid than the Plan's actual horizon date, 2034
- The Plan is made for a 20-year horizon but reviewed after 10 years
- The use of the word "vision" in the name with any year but 2020 makes the name sound "blurry."

Ms. Leid moved to adopt the in-progress name **Flagstaff Regional Plan, Vision 2030**. Ms. Louks seconded, the motion passed unanimously. The group agreed to have the consultant PR firm recommend a slogan to accompany the plan name.

### **B. Economic Development Element**

Ms. Wright presented an updated draft of the Economic Development Element, outlining the specific changes the working group had made based on the CAC's previous suggestions. The following points were discussed:

- The term "public investment" on page 2 of the draft refers to taxpayer dollars; the word role in the same section seems limiting, replacing growth.
- The word expedient evokes the sense of cutting corners. Replace with expeditious.
- The use of City or County as clarifiers is a style issue.
- "Economic best practices" are determined by research and implemented by City and County administrators in the place of incentives.
- "Best practices" vary greatly based on a number of factors; the specific ones encouraged by the Plan should be clarified for the Plan's future users.
- STEAM had been added to the Education and Workforce Training portion to include the arts, a good move in Flagstaff's culture.
- The phrase "employee-owned" gives the wrong impression and should be replaced with "owner-operated"; "stability" should likewise be replaced with "sustainable."
- A time commitment might help keep businesses, though it has been suggested before.
- In policy 7.4 the word voluntary means willing to sell.
- Language requests should be sent to staff, meeting time should be saved for significant changes, and the minutes should reflect the details of those changes for the working group's benefit.
- The editor will fix style and grammar issues, not change policies.
- The working group should review the Boise regional plan for language ideas.
- A policy to target desired industries may need to be added to the Responsive Government or Business Retention, Expansion & Entrepreneurship sections.
- A Food policy or goal was suggested to be added, perhaps to the Economic Development section, though a more thorough look at the purpose and benefits would be needed to put it in the most appropriate section by the working group.
- Separate policies may be needed for activity centers outside of Flagstaff.
- The focus on public investment for infrastructure will be reinstated in the element.
- Add a policy to address telecommunications need
- Add information from STEM proclamation to intro on page 4
- Will need a strategy on how to keep incubator businesses local

### **C. CAC Vacancies**

Ms. D'Andrea, the Deputy City Attorney, informed the CAC that there had been a possible violation of the Open Meeting Law at the September 6<sup>th</sup> CAC meeting, and that in order to legally discuss the previous meeting, the meeting would need to be ratified. The draft minutes were distributed for the Committee's review. **Mr. Naleski moved to ratify the meeting, Mr. Walters seconded, and the motion passed unanimously.**

Chair Babbitt overviewed the Steering Committee notes, focusing on the portion that pertained to the CAC membership. Vice Chair Bousquet stated that she heard from the County Board members on the Steering Committee appreciation for them being brought into the discussion. Ms. Bousquet said that the Board representatives indicated that they felt the Council should take what action they saw appropriate, and if they did choose to make an appointment, the Board would consider whether they also wanted to fill any vacancies. The Steering Committee had discussion but no recommendation for the City Council. The Council would discuss the topic at their next meeting, October 2<sup>nd</sup>, and applications would be opened to gauge interest in potentially filling the positions.

After confirming that the Steering Committee had received the same Staff Summary as Council and copied to the CAC members, it was inquired if the CAC had any recommendations for the City Council.

- Mr. White stated that a smaller group was more efficient and required less time to receive everyone's input on topics.
- Ms. McLaughlin inquired the time frame for appointment if the County decided to fill any vacancies as well.
- Sue Pratt, Director of County Community Development, replied that the earliest the Board could make an appointment is within one or two months, but that they would wait and see what action the Council takes and then take the matter under advisement.
- The membership categories were presented to the CAC and the changes from the original demographics were discussed.
- Ms. Putzova stated that discussing the members' political affiliations was highly inappropriate, and pointed out that based on ethnicity, age, or income level, the group demographics were already unbalanced from the Flagstaff region population's.
- Mr. Anderson expressed dissatisfaction with the implications of the discussion, stating that it seemed disrespectful of the CAC's strenuous efforts to maintain balance in perspectives for the Flagstaff population, even when the different perspectives may not be directly represented in the CAC.
- Chair Babbitt again inquired if the CAC would make a recommendation to the Council, and confirmed that it would depend on the recommendation.
- Ms. Leid stated that their recommendation may not matter, as the Council was already intent on discussing the issue.
- Mr. Herman pointed out that elements which have taken part in recent elections seemed to be underrepresented.
- Mr. White stated that a new appointment would not make a difference as long as the CAC still adhered to the rules, as they have been.

**Mr. Herman moved to table the issue, Mr. Anderson seconded, the motion passed with one opposed and no abstaining.**

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

**A. Preferred Scenario Exercise**

The CAC was split into two groups, each group given a series of overlaying maps. The groups were given "chips" roughly representing place and area types. The groups were directed to work together to place the chips on the maps to create a group consensus of a preferred land use plan. The results are not definite and will evolve over the course of the next few months. At the end of the exercise the two maps were preserved for the next meeting.

**B. Maps**

The agenda item was postponed due to time constraints.

**C. Announcements**

None.

**ADJOURNMENT**

Chair Babbitt adjourned the meeting at 6:01 p.m.