



MEETING NOTES

Regional Plan 2012 – Working Group for Circulation & Bicycle Element

Thursday, January 12, 2012

3:30 p.m. – 5:00 p.m.

Flagstaff City Hall, Staff Conference Room

CAC Members:

1. Julie Leid
2. Nat White
3. Ben Anderson
4. Mike Nesbit (excused)

Contributing Staff and General Public

1. Darrel Barker, Comprehensive Planning Project Manager
2. Bob Caravona, Advance Planning Manager
3. Dave Wessel, FMPO Manager
4. Martin Ince, Multi-modal Planner
5. Kate Morley, Coconino County Planner
6. Erika Mazza, NAIPTA Planning Manager
7. Brian Foley, FMPO and City of Flagstaff Intern
8. Rick Miller, General Public and Conservation Study Forum

Meeting commences: 3:34 p.m.

Darrel Barker, Comprehensive Planning Project Manager leads meeting discussion.

1. **Introductions:** Attending CAC members, staff and public state name and association
2. **Purpose of meeting:** Darrel Barker explains purpose of the meeting
 - a. **Recommendations:** To assist with review and drafting of the Circulation and & Bicycle Element, Darrel Barker asks for recommendations of experts and community members who may have knowledge and time to contribute to this effort. Staff will then contact these individuals to explain the Working Group and extend an invitation. David Wessel suggests to respect these volunteers time that some of the people could be identified as Stakeholders and be invited to the meeting for the specific topic. Bob Caravona and Martin Ince discuss the availability and meeting conflicts of the Bicycle Commission and Pedestrian Committee. It would be helpful for at least one person of these groups to attend. Likewise, a representative from the Accessibility Committee should be present as suggest by a CAC Member. The following names were submitted by the Working Group for staff to contact:

- i. George Bain - a member of the original Bicycle Commission
- ii. FMPO's Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) :
 - 1. Jeff Bauman, City of Flagstaff Transportation Manager, Chair
 - 2. Andy Bertelsen, Coconino County Public Works Director, Vice Chair
 - 3. Rick Barrett, City of Flagstaff Engineer
 - 4. Sue Pratt, Coconino County Community Development Interim Director
 - 5. Jim Cronk, City of Flagstaff Development Services Director
 - 6. Audra Merrick, ADOT Development Engineer
 - 7. Justin Feek, ADOT Senior Transportation Planner
 - 8. Erika Mazza, NAIPTA Transit Planner
- iii. Lisa Rainer, a bicycle commuter and advocate
- iv. Jim Tuck, Pedestrian Commission and Accessibility Committee
- v. Modal representatives/stakeholders
 - 1. Rail and freight
 - a. Latonia Finch of BSNF
 - b. AMTRAK
 - 2. Equestrian Community
 - 3. Mechanized trail users
 - a. Coconino Trail Riders – CTR
 - 4. Trails - Anthony Quintelli
 - 5. NAU Parking , Erin St...?
 - 6. Schools
 - a. FUSD
 - b. Charter Schools
 - 7. NAIPTA Committee on Accessibility
 - 8. Doney Park

b. Approach to drafting the Circulation and Bicycle Element

Darrel Barker outlines the use and approach to drafting Packet 1 and 2, similarly used by the CAC meetings. Packet 1 introduces the topic and provides background information. The focus of Packet 1 is the assessment of existing Goals and Policies which will help form Packet 2 containing the draft text, goals and policies of the updated Regional Plan.

A CAC member inquires about what should the CAC Members focus upon for the next meeting and what is the due date?

Darrel Barker discusses the overall Working Group schedule. In particular, he would like feedback and critique of goals and policy by January 18th to prepare for the January 26th meeting. In response to Dave Wessel's question, there will be an electronic format of Packet 1 distributed to the Working Group. In response to Kate Morley's question, the Working Group can submit their comments in any format they desire (e.g. track changes, email, hand written, etc.) Darrel will compile the comments. Darrel inquires about how the Working Group would like to receive the packet of information. The response is for the information to

be posted upon the Working Group's website with active links. Less email is preferred.

Nat White comments that there has been a lot of work placed into the existing RLUTP and is very close to VISION 20/20. It captures the history and direction of Flagstaff. Some of the information is still good and some out of date. Comments upon the goals and policies and expresses that some of the text provides the reasoning behind the goals and policies and hopes that it would not be lost.

Bob Caravona explains the current approach by the CAC is that RLUTP is working and to review each element to see what needs to be "tweaked" or changed in entirety. It is this group to determine.

David Wessel adds the Regional Transportation Plan validates the Regional Land Use and Transportation Plan. There are two concepts to consider: a) context solutions which the current RLUTP alludes to but does not name. One of the attempts in the RTP is to determine the context of the town. We don't know what the context is from the RLUTP. Sometimes the existing condition is not the desired context. We may need to look at our Development Scenarios; and b) complete streets.

c. Goals /expectations

d. How can staff best utilize your time

Darrel opens the conversation to Working Group as to their goals, expectations and how can staff best utilize your time.

Kate Morley, would like relevant plans and their effects – "what has been completed since the last plan?" She would like the links posted. Likewise, Nat White would like the information in a staff written synopsis. Bob Caravona inquires as to whether a synopsis would suffice or would the underlying studies/documents also be necessary. Sometimes this may lead to information overload. Julie Leid would like the information to be posted upon the Working Group's web page. A discussion occurs about Suggested Reading, material, studies, trends to include in the Working Group's webpage 'Document Center'.

Nat White suggests a list of acronyms along with their title, definitions and 'what they do' be compiled. Darrel states this approach has also been used by the Housing Working Group.

A discussion ensues about the role of CAC Working Group and how they view themselves in this capacity: "...see myself as oversight. Staff provides the synopsis. We will rely upon staff for expertise."

"I'm along the same lines. From a staff discussion, I would candor of 'what we like; what we could have; what keeps you up at night."

Bob Caravona explains the goal of the Working Group, overall schedule and roles. Discussion occurs about preparing the document when the CAC reconvenes. David Wessel thought it may be necessary for the Circulation and Bicycle Working Group to meet on some issues with the Development Scenario Working Group.

A brief discussion concerning attendees of the CAC Retreat occurred. There is a suggestion the CAC would most benefit if attendees and engaged conversation be primarily CAC members.

CAC Members discuss how they would like the meeting conversations to occur. In addition, the CAC Members would like a professional graphic designer be hired to accurately, concisely convey information. David Wessel would like CAC's candid feedback as to whether the information provided is 'too much', 'too little' or best served in a graphic.

Darrel Barker recaps the discussion, due dates and commitment to provide materials to the Working Group.

Meeting adjourns at 4:38 p.m.