



MINUTES

City of Flagstaff

REGIONAL PLAN CITIZEN ADVISORY COMMITTEE

3:30 p.m. – 6:00 p.m. April 7, 2011

Northern Arizona Healthcare Educational Offices: 1000 N. Humphrey's Suite 241, Flagstaff, AZ;
in the Fort Valley shopping center, south of the hospital.



In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, if you need assistance to participate in this meeting, please contact Bonita Sears at 928-779-7632, ext. 7294 (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

II. Roll Call

A. Committee Members:

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Paul Babbitt (Chairman)	<input type="checkbox"/> Michael Chaveas	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Maury Herman	<input type="checkbox"/> Mike Nesbitt
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Carol Bousquet (Vice Chairman)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Alex Frawley	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Judy Louks	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Eva Putzova
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Ben Anderson	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Jean Griego	<input type="checkbox"/> William Ring	<input type="checkbox"/> Eunice Tso
<input type="checkbox"/> Susan Bean	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Shaula Hedwall	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Devonna McLaughlin	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Nat White
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Richard Henn	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Jerome Naleski	

Alternate Members: Don Walters Julie Leid Trish Rensink

III. APPROVAL of MINUTES for March 3, 2011 CAC Meetings

RECOMMENDED ACTION: Recommend changes and approve 3/3/11 [Meeting Minutes](#).

Quorum present. Motion to approve minutes. Motion seconded. Vote to approve minutes.
Minutes approved.

- Carol Bousquet: Recommended tracking of absences and excused absences. Notes that minutes were not approved by the Chair at last meeting and must be corrected.

IV. 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/>

Councilwoman Celia Barotz was present and ensured the CAC that she want to support the Regional Plan process, and invited comments and questions via email regarding the planning process.

V. NEW BUSINESS

A. Schedule Update

PURPOSE: Discuss remaining elements & upcoming PARA Grant process. Need for two meetings for May 2010 and/or as needed.

FACILITATOR: Bob Caravona

HANDOUT: [Updated Regional Plan process calendar 040111.pdf](#)

Chairman reported that the City Manager requested a group meeting with the committee for an hour on Apr. 28th; CAC is to send available times to staff.

Facilitator reviewed accomplishments to date process calendar/chart shown, and noted that the calendar/schedule will be updated monthly. Handouts of schedule, working outline and progress report made available to group.

Facilitator pointed out what decisions need to be made in today's meeting, including a CAC sub-committee to help guide the design charrettes and ASU Decision Theater process for the PARA Grant.

Facilitator asked group to approve potential meeting dates in May 5th and 19th, with the caveat that these meetings will be involved and time consuming. The CAC consensus was to meet at the normal May 5th, but for 1.5 to 2 hours longer, preferably starting earlier.

The 'Design Charrettes' are the 2nd Land Use and Circulation Focus Groups, as discussed at the beginning of the planning process. It is important that all CAC members participate.

A. PARA Grant CAC Sub-Committee formation

PURPOSE: Form 2-3 member sub-committee as advisors on the PARA Grant process

FACILITATORS: Dave Wessel

HANDOUT: [MEMO PARA Grant process.pdf](#)

Facilitator gave grant updates: "HUD grant" not funded. "Healthy Communities" not funded. PARA grant is funded. This enables testing of the CAC integrated policies against future potential land use patterns. This is achieved through computer modeling and digitalization to help the group arrive at a consensus. The video "Decision Theatre ASU" was presented. <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=scKSeEuljEw>

The grant funding allocation was calcified as follows:

\$250K cap for the grant.

- *\$230K technical consultant: develop 3 land use scenario;; review transportation and open space issue;; review of policies to date; initial professional editing exercise*
 - *\$40K requested goes toward the Decision Theatre (DT) + FMPO \$40K = \$80K total*
 - *\$10K grant for contingency for coordination*
 - *\$20K (or 25%) of the grant to go toward public involvement and outreach.*
- *What is the role of the CAC in this grant? Break down the technical consultant fee? Response by Dave Wessel: Role of the CAC is to 1) help develop scenarios; 2) help evaluate scenarios and modeling down the road, including involvement in design studio/DT and elsewhere. The contract is managed by ADOT and the consultant they have selected is Kimley-Horn. The consultant will gather information re: population, employment, housing, slope, floodplains, land use patterns, water usage, and open space, etc. Data staff has been collecting, NAU Rural Policy Institute is compiling, and other sources.*

Commented on the CAC member letter that came to the CAC and City Council bemoaning the lack of resources for the planning process. Expressed concern regarding the lack of resources that have gone into this effort to date to get data for DT project. That this project is in addition to staffs' other responsibilities, for which there is little time. Concerned that \$40K of local money can be spent on other projects. *The ASU DT will answer many of the questions the CAC has been asking from staff: If we implement these policies – what does that mean to (for example: our water supply? Our energy use? The average VMT per person?) The Decision Theater is a TOOL for the CAC, Council, Board of Supervisors and the public to SEE what potential effects policy may have to our built and natural environment and economics.*

Several comments ensued regarding the PARA Grant modeling/visualization efforts:

- *Louks argued the importance of this project. A problem the group encounters in this process is with visualization. Suggested the modeling/visualization effort would help make*

a better decision and thinks others would benefit also. Expressed concern that many decisions are being made using the input of only a few people.

- Putzova commented that she had gone through the DT process, in which a lot of work goes into the project. However, that there is a lot of data that still needs to be gathered to properly develop the models. Once that is completed the discussion that will ensue remains equally important and that it will take time.
- Cronk: Noted that the comparisons made by visualizations/modeling will make it easier to have an informed discussion and make final decisions about land use. EG: information on changes in water usage, carbon footprint, etc., using one model over another can be estimated and decisions can be made accordingly. Encouraged full participation by CAC.

Additional comments made on this project, pro and con:


Cons:

- Using local monies
- Data/information regarding resources is rapidly changing.

Pros:

- Excellent outreach and communication tool.
- Excellent for decision making process.
- It is already paid for.

Lengthier explanations:

Chair:  Expressed concerned that the world is changing rapidly. That the correct information must be of quality otherwise more questions will arise instead of decisions.

Rensink: She sees the value in the design tool for outreach and communication process long term as well as helping inform the decision making process. The community at large will understand the 'pictures' more than graphs and tables.

White: The money is there for making models, and we still need data. Visualization model is very helpful for making decisions.

- Hedwall: Development of questions is what makes the model work. CAC needs to be there for developing the different scenarios for models. Additional meetings supported.

Facilitator: Reiterated that the purpose of the Design Charrettes is for initial development of these scenarios; that it is why it is imperative that the CAC is involved this summer.

- Bousquet: What data do we need and whose time is going into collecting the data? How good is the data? *Response by Wessel: Rural Policy Institute is under contract to collect a lot of the data and making projections. Information also collected from water department, etc. Warned that there is a limit to how much visualization/modeling we can afford.*

The CAC members who volunteered to serve on the sub-committee: Julie Leib, Judy Louks, Jerome Naleski and Alex Wright.

Motion that sub-committee represent CAC. Motion seconded.

Discussion: Suggested that all of the questions be framed by entire group prior to sub-committee representing entire CAC. Future meetings may consist of focusing on developing questions instead of other items in agenda.

Vote on motion. Passed unanimously. Motion approved.

BREAK

Jim: Any questions before moving forward? Longer meeting at next month's meeting.

Questions posed regarding how to best prepare and develop guidelines for upcoming meetings. *Suggestions posed by committee members and facilitators to: review the goals; determine what drives potential scenarios; review vision statements, guiding principles; discuss triggered idea. These suggestions are a part of the DC.*

II. OLD BUSINESS - Continued, postponed, and tabled agenda items.

A. Definitions of 'Goal, Policy and Strategy'

PURPOSE: Refer to 2010 Handout "Vision, Guiding Principles, Implementation and Definitions of 'Goal, Policy and Strategy'".

FACILITATORS: Jim Cronk

HANDOUTS: [RP Vision, Guiding Principles, and Defining Goals, Policies and Strategies \(Oct. 2010\)](#)

[Memo: SBean – Defining Goals, Policies and Strategies \(March 2011\)](#)

No discussion.

B. Open Space, Parks & Recreation, (cont'd)

PURPOSE: Discuss and recommend goals and policies

FACILITATORS: Jim Cronk

HANDOUTS: *see below*

1. 'OPEN SPACE' – *complete goal and policies*
2. 'PARKS & RECREATION' – *complete goal and policies*

Facilitator began at **OS Policy 1.2**, which was discussed by not approved at the March CAC meeting. Facilitator opened it up for comments and discussion. Modifications suggested by staff presented.

Questions asked and discussion ensued on policy:

- Define "priority open land". *It is defined in the Regional Plan via the county and city open space commissions in more detail.*
- Concern about public vs. private open space:
- Concern that OS Policy 1.2 does not recognize private land ownership as stated, that access is limited.
- Encouraged that private open land is appropriately designated on maps.
- Access to public lands via private land - appropriate access, how will it be dealt with.
- Encouragement for easement sales when private lands provide public access to NF once private lands are sold.
- Change of wording from "may" to "will."
- Suggestion to change language to "green infrastructure facilitates" by removing "will".
Suggestion to use active present tense.
- The use of a Conservation Land System was discussed.
- Suggestion for map key for green infrastructure.

OS Policy 1.2: Green Infrastructure facilitates non-motorized connectivity, preserves natural lands and priority open lands, and promotes opportunities for people to interact with nature.

Motion to accept the newly worded OSP 1.2. Motion seconded. Vote to accept newly worded OSP 1.2. Motion carried unanimously. Approved pending grammatical edits.

- Alex Wright Wanted CAC to know that she will be working on the metrics and indicators for the regional plan process. eg: percentage of unconnected areas, etc.

OS Policy 1.3:

Facilitator: noted that there is overlap among policies. Staff recommended moving “preserve rural character” language to the ‘Community Character Element’.

Discussion:


- Concern that removing this policy here would not preserve community character within the open space policies.
- Suggestion that a policy be added under open space to protect natural environment.
- Suggestion to improve wording re: “protect natural environment.”

Motion to send rural character part of policy be moved to community character and discuss natural environment at this meeting. Motion seconded.

Discussion: This is in line with county view? Yes

Vote: Favor: 8 Opposed: 4. Majority wins.

Discussion continued on first part of policy:  Natural environment vs. natural attributes ensued after vote.

- Natural character vs. natural environment vs. natural aspects/attributes.
- Preserve as much of natural aspects/attributes of regional open space as possible.
- Discussion of cost associated with affordable housing and preservation of land costs.
- Disagreements on wording “as possible” and is removed.
- Need to identify resource values to help determine which areas are significant? Or which open spaces have significant resources? Including consideration of resources/values of land adjacent to open space.
- Recommendation to take  suggestions from regional open space plans to move forward. Suggestion to consider protection of “functional environment,” not “natural”
- There is a scarcity of information regarding what land has value based upon scientific data. Need to prioritize based on values, which will assist with parameters.
- Suggestion by Hedwall: “Promote protection of natural and cultural resources, wildlife habitats, and scenic views.”

Leid: If we have green infrastructure/open space, what are we protecting our existing open space from? Perhaps this will help us develop our policy. *Response by White: This particular policy has to do with all open space, present and future, including development attributes. Under the OS Goal, this policy would help us get to the goal by saying it has value based on natural aspects.*

Herman suggested iteration: “Identify significant regional environmental resources and endeavor to conserve them.” Discussion that this may be another policy in and of itself.

CAC agreed to PARKING LOT OS.13 - with assistance from a couple of CAC members to provide suggestions at May 5th meeting. Shaula Hedwall, Nat White and Tish Bogan-Ozmun

OSP 1.4:

Discussion:

- Suggestion that this policy becomes a strategy.
- Putzova suggested that the second part of OSP 1.4 and previous OSP 1.3 are combined - that the CLS and OSP 1.3 be combined.
- Suggestion to make sure that natural attributes are still protected in policy.

Facilitator: Is it reasonable to consider that a group (the one working on 1.3) comes together to work on OSP 1.3 & 1.4 to reword policies and send out to group in email? Group agreed. Email forthcoming.

OSP 1.5:

Nat: Discussed that a goal of open space is covered by the concept of green buffers. Potential to lose more green buffers (e.g.: I-40 adding a third lane in each direction) impending. Suggestion to consider areas around new roads considered as open space or buffers.

Discussion ensued:

- Potential for roads to by pass the city as a consequence of buffers.
 - Scenic corridors already exist in city. Suggestion that this model continues.
 - Carbon sinks and screening as strategy.
 - Discussion continued that this policy continues to promote green buffers as done in past.
- Motion to approve staff recommendation, and motion seconded. Vote passes unanimously.

OSP 1.6:

Staff recommendations of 'open space as non-motorized connectivity' are incorporated in OS Policy 1.2 - supported by CAC. Suggestion that this policy become a strategy under OSP 1.2

Earlier start to next meeting, start 2pm until 6pm, with food.

Meeting adjourned at 6 p.m.

III. ANNOUNCEMENTS

1. Next regular CAC Meeting:

May 5, 2011, 3:30 p.m. to 6 p.m. at N.AZ Healthcare facilities

Agenda Items:

- a) Open Space / Parks & Recreation – *finish parking lot items*
- b) Community Character