



Flagstaff Regional Plan - Economic Development Working Group MEETING NOTES

April 4, 2012 – 4 to 5 p.m.

City Hall, Council Conference Room

Attendees: Alex Wright, John Saltonstall, Karl Eberhard, Maury Herman, Tish Bogan-Ozmun, Ron Hubert, Judy Louks, Bill Ring, John Stigmon, Kimberly Sharp, Brian Foley

Meeting Notes

Focusing on Sub-sections:

1) Activity Centers

- a) Understand different activity centers (focus / need / market / output):
 - 1) Employment Center (NAU, FMC, Innovation Mesa, etc.)
 - 2) Regional Center (Mall, Fourth Street, Woodlands Village WM, etc.)
 - 3) Urban Center (downtown)
 - 4) Neighborhood Center (Humphrey's Basha's shopping center; Cedar Safeway shopping center, etc.)
- b) Place types – consistent with Smart Growth and transects
- c) Do not take the (T6) potential off the table – if the 'urban cores' or activity centers are to be truly urban. The potential for high-rise / density is in the core, not industrial areas.
- d) Historical neighborhoods must keep their own identity
- e) How many roof-tops to support a grocery store? How much density to truly support an activity center?
- f) What is the market for vertical? Only if there are robust activities and public spaces within walking distance will vertical be viable.
- g) Understand the three dimensions of an activity center, as well as the suburban neighborhoods which feed it.
- h) Each Activity Center has a certain amount of compression activity and scarcity (uniqueness to each one)
- i) Urban Growth Boundary / Existing Service Boundary – Activity Centers inside (Belmont?)
- j) Investment focus on Activity Centers? YES – potential for employment and critical mixed-use residential. How to foster this density and ancillary amenities? Retail / residential / workplace / employment centers / higher paying jobs.
- k) Industrial areas? Employment centers – use Sheffield, England model



Flagstaff Region Activity Centers discussed	
Existing	Potential Future
Airport	Enhance Visual Gateway R&D/tech cluster and related services, yes light Industrial, stage 2 incubation Enterprise Incentives Broadband Connectivity Mixed use? Have to have mixed use to support industrial business growth – restaurants for lunch w/o travel trips.
Fourth Street	Contextual Promote redevelopment – recognize and reward reduced municipal expense vs. green fields (incentive) Employment center vs. just retail May be the next local “go to” area What about Steves?
Milton Road	Walk ability/bike, ped access Cross traffic (ped) for NAU Context – gateway – multimodal Its late, but some design graphics – ie brick/stone Lacks focus Fix it Seems to be growing west a bit Infrastructure – Stormwater reap makes ED difficult.
Innovation Mesa	How promote mixed use? Infrastructure context Cost of development? – high Is it near transportation or restaurants?
Downtown	Historic preservation and parking To exist Gov & tourism. Add creative employment Surround with high density housing Brick new retail Wcals& vigitor hub – ability to interact Central Business District General professional services and support T-6 high rise around Incentivize by common parking and nixing requirements for onsite private parking
Butler Ave	Needs to be very missed use Local and visitor use I-40 interchange – traffic/visibility Clear signage/direction for drivers Is truck stop viable? Walkable – evening activities Cultural center? AC at I-40 interchange, not 4 th & Butler
East mall Area	How to promote mixed use? Enhance visual gateway (89 & I-40) Route 66 preservation/promote



	Park & ride? NAIPTA Let it be a mall
Neighborhood Center - FMC/ North Humphreys/ Ft. Valley	Professional medical services & support Housing for FMC guests (of patients) Activities for hospital staff/guests Context Support services Residents
Neighborhood Center – Lone Tree/JW Powell	Future – not existing only if Jun, point builds it. For walkability of new residents Impacts of transportation plans
Neighborhood Center – Cedar Safeway Shopping	Who & how does area serve? Context Pressure Leave it alone Other side of Cedar – Enhance area vs. just plaza

2) Responsive Government

- a) A responsive government FOR a resilient economy to implement the policy & goals.
- b) Government entities which are visionary and practical (a challenging combination).
- c) Why is government currently not responsive? – People are afraid to make mistakes, but is it ok to make a mistake (take risks)– yet, do government employees get fired like the private sector?.
- d) Clarity or purpose from governing body.
- e) Responsive is reactive, but also must be proactive, balance with master plan – coordinated foundation on which to say “yes” or “no”.
- f) Government needs to not compete with private sector – define the boundaries and play appropriate role. **Have clarity of purpose.**
- g) Sometimes government is the last to manage the Economic Development; yet without the larger organization – it doesn’t happen. How to balance?
- h) Let private sector solve the problems. (*Is this contradictory with n. below?*)
- i) Public/private partnerships can compromise desired control.
- j) Amendments to zoning code and engineering standards to make the plan happen.
- k) Government role – build the infrastructure – be 10 - 25 years out ahead (set the table) of private sector – organization/mechanism to respond (ECONA).
- l) State government – dysfunctional.
- m) Allow for self management of activity centers (organize selves).
- n) Issues – ok with planning – not at other departments – how to allow the courage to change them?
- o) Government – balance vision and format. Reorganize themselves instead of more government.
- p) Management needs to have the courage to say “make it so”. Ex: Engineering standards
 - 1) Infill/redevelopment has different Engineering Standards then new build -> different b/c different needs.
- q) Flagstaff has amazing resources (NAU, I-40, I-17) yet Prescott is much more responsive



- r) Ex: Whistler – rather than making standard form of government fit the new idea, they created a new form of government to fit the idea & implement the plan. Gov. is the machinery to implement the plan.
- s) Incentivize staff so that their participation is imp. To this community – currently – not allowed (no silos! – leadership in city hall and the community) to have the courage to reform what we have.
- t) Extreme lack of public trust – does not see between public/private – need more internal/external conversations. Right hand and left hand need to know what we’re doing. Planners – rules, regs, engineering -> cooperation does not happen.
- u) Ideas = rules in a way that impede projects. Why not rules that are easy to do and understand?

ADJOURNED AT 9:40

Regional Plan Economic Development Working Group members:

- CAC Members: Trish Rensink, Bill Ring, Don Walters, Alex Wright, Eva Putzova, Judy Louks, Susan Bean
- Community Experts: Rich Bowen, Ron Hubert, Ken Berkhoff, Charles Hammersley
- City/County Staff: Darrel Barker, Bob Caravona, Karl Eberhard, Brian Foley, Sue Pratt, John Saltonstall, Kimberly Sharp, John Stigmon
- Review: Heather Anardi (CVB), Stacey Button (Econ. Vitality), Barney Helmick (Airport), Chamber of Commerce, NABA, NA Assoc. Realtors, F3, NAU, CCC, , ECoNA, FUSD, SEDI