



**FLAGSTAFF
REGIONAL
PLAN 2012**

Draft Minutes
Regional Plan Citizen Advisory Committee
3:30 p.m. – 6:00 p.m. – Thursday, October 4, 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
Judy Louks	Jerome Naleski	Nat White
Alex Wright	Don Walters	

Absent

Shaula Hedwall	Susan Bean	Richard Henn
Julie Leid	Devonna McLaughlin	Ben Anderson

Attendees

Theresa Gunn, Facilitator
 Kimberly Sharp, Acting Comprehensive Planning Mngr.
 Jim Cronk, Planning Director
 David Wessel, FMPO Manager
 Justine Otto, FMPO Administrative Specialist Temp
 John Aber, Coconino County Asst. Community Development Director
 Tiffany Antol, Coconino County Senior Planner
 Stacey Button, Economic Vitality Director
 Gordon Taylor, State Trust Land Department
 Tom Wyatt, Director of Government Affairs, Chamber of Commerce
 John Stigmon, VP, ECoNA
 Diane Chung, Superintendant, Flagstaff National Monuments, National Park Service
 Marilyn Weissman, President, F3

Visitors

Lynn Bartlett, Earlene Smith, Betsy McKellar, Lina Wallen, Bruce Higgins, Tish Bogan-Ozmun, Anja Wendel

III. PUBLIC COMMENT

None.

IV. APPROVAL of MINUTES

Mr. Naleski made a motion to approve the Minutes for September 27th, 2012 CAC Meeting and Mr. White seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

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

A. Style Guide

Ms. Sharp overviewed the Style Guide and confirmed its purpose was to give guidance to the Technical Editor in producing a readable, interesting and contextual Regional Plan. The following notes were made:

- Use of “Healthy” throughout the Plan

- Address Tribes in all sections
- Clarify “Government”—City, County, Municipal government, FMPO
- Housing—Key challenges to Opportunities for the future, will all other sections use this type of info?
- When do we need to state/list government agencies & when we don’t because it is inferred

Mr. Naleski moved to approve the Style Guide and Mr. White seconded. The motion passed with one abstaining and no opposed.

B. Economic Development Element

Ms. Wright presented the new draft of the Element (Oct. 4, 2012), outlining the specific changes the working group had made based on the CAC’s previous suggestions. The following points were discussed:

- Mr. Stigmon recommended that Policy 3.8 [Support and Incentivize local food system and food security] be moved to a different place, as it did not seem to fit in Economic Development.
 - Policy 3.8 may have unintended consequences, i.e. increased water consumption.
 - “Incentivize” needs to be defined.
 - Ms. Wright stated that the policy was not to promote exportation, but local generation and consumption. She defined incentivize as: “Making available, City-owned land open for local gardeners.”
 - The CAC agreed that the idea was good but suggested changing the language to state the purpose more clearly, and recommended moving the policy to the Land Use section.
 - Other members of the CAC agreed that the word “incentivize” needed to be changed or removed, stating that doing so may diminish water-related concerns, but also stated that the policy belongs in Economic Development, as it is an economic strategy.
 - The language of Policy 3.8 could not be too restrictive (which would prevent growers) or too broad (which may allow misuse.)
 - Current Flagstaff zoning allows indoor growing.
 - “Local” may need to be defined in this context, while community gardens may be meant to get preferential treatment, “local food systems” does not necessarily mean grown in Flagstaff.
 - The CAC recommended that Policy 3.8 be re-worded as “Support regional food systems.”
- In the Business Attraction section, it was suggested that the phrases “and additional growth sectors as they arise” and “future technologies” be added, but it was pointed out that similar language was used in the Introduction and may be redundant to repeat- reference the growth sectors in the Introduction, as it applies to BR&E as well as attraction.
- Criteria for (and definitions of) Activity Centers should be given, not specific locations.
- Activity Centers are hard to plan and the ones that tend to develop naturally over extended periods of time are a bit haphazard; if the City / community wants to encourage well-planned activity centers in specific areas, they need to designate the land and lay out some guidelines.
- It was suggested that this section define what Activity Centers are and go into more detail in the Land Use section.
- Mr. Herman stated for the record that he did not believe Innovation Mesa was a good location for an employment center, and should rather be classified for use as housing.
- A Local Preference policy was proposed in the Redevelopment and Infill section, though it may fit better in the Responsive Government section.
 - Mr. Cronk interjected that the law prevents specific language to that effect, though a general statement might be all right. He deferred to the City Attorney for clarification.
 - The Assistant City Attorney stated that a policy with a rational basis would be permitted, but not a policy to blindly favor locals. They also stated that the topic has been litigated before, and most City Finance Officers recommend against having a policy to that effect.

- It was requested that the City seeks public input before issuing proposals or proposal requests; it was later determined that is a strategy.
- The topic was deferred to the Working Group with the suggestion from Mr. Wyatt that “added value” be used in place of “local preference,” as it would allow more flexibility.
- In Policy 3.6 the phrases affordable and attainable were discussed. It was determined that the intent of this policy was not to subsidize rent or ask landowners to take less, and therefore the word affordable should be removed.
- It was recommended that the STEM proclamation be included in the narrative of the Education and Workforce training section.
- The CAC discussed the mention of constraints in the Introduction. It was determined that while the wording sounds negative, the CAC has a responsibility to address constraints as challenges and inform the public that the issues are being addressed. “Primary goals” is suggested to replace “constraints.”
- It is stated that the Economic Development Working Group is meeting October 15, and that the Element will be completed at the next CAC meeting.

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

Maps

The CAC filled out individual Land Use tables [see next page, Nat White’s vote added via e-mail] which were later combined for a general consensus on the purpose of the Land Use Map. Ms. Wright left, a brief break was called while quorum was confirmed, and the Committee reconvened at 4:55pm with Ms. Wright present. The following was discussed.

- Mr. Cronk overviewed the State Trust Land and confirmed for the CAC that “section” is a unit of measurement. Ms. Sharp agreed to bring in a map if possible to help clarify.
- Gordon Taylor, from the State Trust Land Department pointed out that some proposed growth (Section 30) is outside of the growth boundary; Mr. Cronk agreed to review the map.
- Ms. Chung, a representative of the National Park Service, pointed out that the same section 30 is inside the Walnut Canyon special study area, so any decisions the CAC makes regarding the area may be premature contingent on the study’s public draft in January. She also stated that any proposed development in this area was worryingly close to the Monument.
- The CAC determined that a new boundary could be decided in the new Plan.
- It was inquired if the Walnut Canyon special study area was determined as ‘conservation’ or ‘national park land’, if federal government was obligated to purchase state land, and who would pay for it.
- It was clarified that the State Trust has independence, but the City of Flagstaff has negotiation power as per its citizens; there is still latitude to negotiate the map, but compromises have already been made to get it to this point. The current understanding has 40% less development than the current Regional Plan shows.
- The discussion and ultimate decision on the topic was postponed until the Walnut Canyon study is completed in January.
- It was agreed that the Land Use Map was a guide, and any buyers should attempt to adhere to it.
- For State Land property, the 1-unit-per-acre rule will determine land value.
- The map handouts were explained.

[Results of maps survey:](#)

The following decisions were made about the list of maps to be included in the Regional plan by the CAC at the October 4 meeting. A quorum of voting members was present.	Map illustrates policy in RP	Map is background data in RP	Map is part of technical
Land Use: <i>area types / activity centers / growth areas / Open Space / Service Boundaries</i>	7	2	-
Circulation – A. Roads, Transit & Multi-modal - <i>Transit / Transportation overlay with growth areas, Road Use Classifications</i>	3	6	1
B. Bikes, Peds & FUTS – <i>bike lanes, FUTS masterplan, complete streets</i>	4	6	-
Natural Environment Existing Conditions <i>Illustrate known scientific data of critical natural environment and habitat</i>	3	5	2
Concentration of Natural Resources <i>Illustrate the overlay of resources, in which sensitive areas with multiple resources are highlighted, allowing conservation efforts to be focused on these areas</i>	2	5	3
Cultural Sensitivity <i>Illustrate the Culturally Sensitive Areas, enabling the request of Zoning ordinance and State Law for analysis before development</i>	3	3	3
Heritage Resources <i>Illustrate the Heritage policies from Community Character Element.</i>	3	3	3
Community Character <i>Illustrate Neighborhoods (date the ones pre-1965); Gateways- See Regional Planning Community Ch chapter; Viewsheds; and Scenic Corridors: I-17, Ft. Valley/ 89 A</i>	4	4	1
Redevelopment / Infill Potential <i>Illustrate Redevelopment and Infill areas - Infill by State Statute, Potential Redevelopment Areas by Activity Centers and infrastructure needing updated</i>	6	3	-
Economic Development: <i>Clusters of Arts & Cultural resources; Recreation; Tourism; Industry Clusters – Science, Education, Manufacturing, Service. Locate resources and future potential for better connectivity and possible expansion.</i>	4	4	1
Public Facilities: A. Public Buildings, Parks & Recreation Facilities, Schools	2	5	2
B. Utility Infrastructure (<i>how it supports Redevelopment area / Activity Centers / Future Growth</i>) <i>Water, Sewer, Reclaim, Service Boundary-Age of Utilities</i>	-	8	1
C. Fire, Safety, Emergency Evacuation	1	7	1
Land Ownership / Jurisdictions <i>Illustrate land ownership and various municipal jurisdictions within FMPO Boundary; State, Federal, County-owned, City Owned, Board of Regents</i>	4	3	2

B. Growth Areas

The agenda item was postponed due to time constraints.

C. Preferred Scenario Exercise

The agenda item was postponed due to time constraints.

D. Announcements

Chair Babbitt confirmed that the City Council had not appointed a new CAC member for now, but may revisit the issue in January, 2013.

ADJOURNMENT

Chair Babbitt adjourned the meeting at 5:25 p.m.