

MINUTES

JOINT CITY/COUNTY WORK SESSION
MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 9, 2013
COUNCIL CHAMBERS
211 WEST ASPEN AVENUE
4:00 P.M.

1. **CALL TO ORDER**

Mayor Nabours called the Flagstaff Joint Work Session of September 9, 2013, to order at 4:03 p.m.

Notice of Option to Recess Into Executive Session

Pursuant to A.R.S. §38-431.02, notice is hereby given to the members of the City Council and to the general public that, at this regular meeting, the City Council may vote to go into executive session, which will not be open to the public, for legal advice and discussion with the City's attorneys for legal advice on any item listed on the following agenda, pursuant to A.R.S. §38-431.03(A)(3).

2. **ROLL CALL**

PRESENT:

ABSENT:

Flagstaff City Council

MAYOR NABOURS
VICE MAYOR EVANS
COUNCILMEMBER BAROTZ
COUNCILMEMBER BREWSTER
COUNCILMEMBER ORAVITS
COUNCILMEMBER OVERTON
COUNCILMEMBER WOODSON

Coconino County Board of Supervisors

SUPERVISOR BABBOTT
SUPERVISOR BABBOTT
SUPERVISOR FOWLER (Arrived at 4:16 p.m.)
SUPERVISOR RYAN

CHAIRWOMAN ARCHULETA
SUPERVISOR METZGER

Others present: City Manager Kevin Burke; County Manager Cynthia Seelhammer; City Attorney Michelle D'Andrea; County Senior Civil Attorney Bill Ring.

4. **Public Participation:**

*Public Participation enables the public to address the Council about items that **are not** on the agenda. Public Participation appears on the agenda twice, at the beginning and*

at the end of the work session. You may speak at one or the other, but not both. Anyone wishing to comment on an item that is on the agenda is asked to fill out a speaker card and submit it to the recording clerk. When the item comes up on the agenda, your name will be called. You may address the Council up to three times throughout the meeting, including comments made during Public Participation. Please limit your remarks to three minutes per item to allow everyone an opportunity to speak.

Joe Farnsworth, Flagstaff, spoke against the proposed Wildlife Ordinance, indicating that a Referendum Petition would be circulated if it was adopted.

Joe Ray, Flagstaff, spoke in support of the AA Meetings held at the Visitor's Center.

5. Presentation on the Cherenkov Telescope Array

Jeff Hall with Lowell Observatory gave a PowerPoint presentation, Exhibit A attached hereto and made a part hereof, which addressed the following:

- CHERENKOV
- CANDIDATE SITES
- EXAMPLE TELESCOPE ARRAY: VERITAS
- A VERITAS TELESCOPE
- OBSERVING CHERENKOV RADIATION
- CTA – NORTH TELESCOPES
- 20-30 TELESCOPES
- CTA IN ARIZONA
- ASTRONOMY IN ARIZONA
- ASTRONOMY IN FLAGSTAFF

Supervisor Fowler arrived at this time.

- ASTRONOMY AT LOWELL OBSERVATORY
- PROPOSED SITES IN ARIZONA
- YAVAPAI RANCH
- SITE SELECTION TIMELINE
- PRIORITY SITE: METEOR CRATER

Supervisor Ryan said that he appreciated Mr. Hall's work on this, indicating that there was good collaboration in the community.

Mayor Nabours asked if there was anything as a City or County that they could do to assist with this. Mr. Hall said that any contact for assistance through the State and Arizona Commerce Authority for funding to support the project would be beneficial. He said that they would be doing site visits later in the fall and he would be in contact with the City/County for appropriate introductions.

Councilmember Brewster thanked Mr. Hall and Supervisor Babbott thanked everyone who had been working on the project.

6. ADOT Interstate 11 Corridor Justification Report

FMPO Manager David Wessel introduced Carlos Lopez with Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) and Marissa Walker with Arizona Commerce Authority (ACA).

Mr. Lopez gave a PowerPoint presentation, Exhibit B attached hereto and made a part hereof, regarding the proposed I-11 Corridor which addressed the following:

- INTERMOUNTAIN WEST CORRIDOR – UPDATE
- BACKGROUND

He said that in 2012 a Transportation Bill was passed that identified I-11 between the Phoenix metro area and Las Vegas metro area, but there were no additional funds available. As a result, ADOT partnered with Nevada Department of Transportation (NDOT) to do a joint planning study which would entail the justification and business cases.

- ALIGNMENT

Mr. Lopez noted that the public may have seen other routes proposed in the past, but he wanted to clarify that no routes have been determined; the maps are speculation at this time.

- UPDATE SUMMARY – PHASES 1 & 2 DELIVERABLES
- POSSIBLE ECONOMIC SCENARIOS AFFECTING THE CORRIDOR

Mr. Lopez then skipped to Slide 14

- POSSIBLE ECONOMIC SCENARIOS AFFECTING THE CORRIDOR
- SETTING THE FOUNDATION FOR THE STUDY
- CORRIDOR FEASIBILITY ANALYSIS
- EVALUATION PROCESS
- STUDY WEBSITE: WWW.I11STUDY.COM

Vice Mayor Evans asked about the forecast of I-17. Mr. Lopez said that within the Justification Report they have forecasted out to 2040 and with or without the I-11 project there will continue to be congestion on I-17.

Vice Mayor Evans said that it came to her attention from the hotel industry that they were worried about the concept of I-11 taking traffic off I-17 and moving it to the west. She said that the real economic impact is referenced with the metro Phoenix and Las Vegas areas, but she asked about the impact to those cities bypassed such as Flagstaff, Williams, Seligman, and Ashfork.

She said that there is concern because it was being called the I-11 Justification Report as the lodging industry was concerned with the economic impact on Flagstaff. Another issue that came up was that it talks about it running through rural Arizona, but it benefits two metro areas and the rural communities do not want to pay for it. Mr. Lopez said that no funding has been identified at this time.

Ms. Walker with ACA said that they were just now starting. The process is getting more sophisticated, but the ACA has never been involved with this nor has ADOT ever done a business case for a project. She said that the implications for their study, which is scoped out to be completed around November, do not get into specific communities. It addresses more what the implication is for the state. She said that it is a long-term journey on the project. They will need to get a deeper dive, and she was sure that Flagstaff was not the only one concerned with it.

Mayor Nabours said that it looks like the plan is to get a whole corridor from Mexico up to the Northwest. He asked if they would anticipate that any section of the corridor would be built if there was not a commitment for the entire corridor. He asked if there was any good to build the corridor from Phoenix to Las Vegas if it was not connected at both ends. Mr. Lopez said that they were certainly aware of connectivity needs beyond the Phoenix/Las Vegas section, but the scope of their study was for that segment. He said that there would be additional plans developed by the northern states.

Mayor Nabours asked if there was any timeline to even do the segment between Phoenix and Las Vegas. Mr. Lopez said that it largely depended on funding, whether it was through a P3 or some other type of funding mechanism; that would be the next step in searching for funding alternatives.

Mayor Nabours asked if there was the possibility that the study would show there was a need for a freeway between Phoenix and Las Vegas regardless of whether it was connected. Mr. Lopez said that they were working through justification and the major trends, such as freight movement. He said that the trade movement and linking economies of Phoenix and Las Vegas were driving factors.

Ms. Walker noted that the initial Business Case is available on the website.

Supervisor Ryan clarified that P3 meant public/private partnership. He added that citizens could go to the website to find out more information and they could also comment on the website. Ms. Walker said that they will continue having stakeholder meetings as they get into the study and would be coming back in the future.

7. ***Flagstaff Regional Plan 2030: Place Matters*** – Transmittal of document from the Citizen Advisory Committee (CAC) to the Council and Board of Supervisors

Comprehensive Planning Manager Kim Sharp began the PowerPoint presentation which addressed the following:

- HOW THE CITY/COUNTY HAVE WORKED TOGETHER ON THIS
- SCHEDULE FORWARD
- OVERVIEW
- GOALS, POLICIES & STRATEGIES
- HOW THE REGIONAL PLAN WORKS

Mr. Burke thanked the citizens group and staff support on the Regional Plan. He said that it was a vision of what they want their community to look like and be like in the future. Goals are smaller bites of the vision and policies are deliberate courses of action to achieve the goals.

He said that the document is generally used by the Council to make decisions on predictable occasions such as with rezones, major plan amendments, Capital Improvements plans, etc.

•HOW THE REGIONAL PLAN WILL BE USED

Ms. D'Andrea said that by ordinance the Council must consider whether a development plan is consistent with the Regional Plan before approving a zone change. Council would look at the goals and policies in the Regional Plan and would decide what is most compelling in any particular case. A court would almost never overturn the Council's decision as it gives great deference to legislative action. She said that this was a policy document; it does not have the force of law like the Zoning Code. It is used to help the Council make decisions based on the vision the citizens of Flagstaff laid out.

•HOW THE COMMUNITY ARRIVED AT THIS POINT

Mr. Burke said that with that context he asked that the Council review the draft document with two perspectives—1) it is a vision, an aspiration; and 2) it is about balance and compromise.

•COCONINO COUNTY COLLABORATION

John Aber, Coconino County Acting Community Development Director, continued with the PowerPoint noting that from a County perspective, it was important to remember that the Regional Plan holds a different position in the hierarchy of plans at the City versus the County. At the City, the Regional Plan serves as the City's General Plan. By contrast, in the unincorporated County areas, the Regional Plan becomes another member of their "family" of plans under the umbrella of the Coconino County Comprehensive Plan.

County Senior Civil Attorney Bill Ring then gave a history of how the Regional Plan 2030 came to be, starting back in the 1990's with the development of the Flagstaff Vision 20/20 and Flagstaff Open Spaces and Greenways Plan. During that time the Arizona Legislature created the Growing Smarter Versions I and II requiring cities and counties to maintain, and update, comprehensive plans.

He said that the County's role was to consider and support policies that discouraged sprawl in to the County as a way of supporting the planning discipline that was happening in the City. Within the Flagstaff Metropolitan Planning Area the Council would support a "regional" approach to land use. The City and County have been communicating and coordinating their efforts because they choose to, not because they had to.

Mr. Ring said that for the City, the 2030 plan provides guidance to the entire organization on things like the size and location of infrastructure such as streets and stormwater, the community design of buildings and places, and the importance of the downtown as a focal point of community character. For the County, the desires are similar but the focal points are different.

He said that State statute requires that a City General Plan be approved by a vote of its citizens, which makes sense because for City residents it is their one, comprehensive, all-inclusive Plan. County comprehensive plans are adopted by vote of the Board of Supervisors because the County is composed of several municipalities.

Paul Babbitt, Chairman of the Citizens Advisory Committee, said that on behalf of the Regional Plan Citizen Advisory Committee, he was pleased to present this formal presentation of the draft Flagstaff Regional Plan 2030 to the elected officials. He and the Committee's Vice Chairman, Carol Bousquet, both appreciate the dedication of the community consisting of many volunteers, including those that had to leave and those that joined part way into the process.

He said that it was a very diverse group and each member wore an array of hats within the community. They were careful not to fall into representing a singular interest, but rather the entire community. He said that they began the process with agreeing that the 2001 plan, which this was an update to, was a solid base on which to build. The plan seeks to balance the diverse opinions and competing interests on the CAC and within the region.

•GUIDING PRINCIPLES

Vice Chairman Bousquet said that she saw the plan as a jigsaw puzzle with lots of little pieces that they have worked to fit together to represent their community's vision for the future. She said that the process of getting the pieces to fit required many careful deliberations to find balance. Further refinement will now take place, but she urged the Council and Board to consider careful adjustments that will, in the end, maintain an even and balance vision represented by the jigsaw puzzle.

•FUTURE GROWTH ILLUSTRATION

Ms. Bousquet said that the process involved nearly five years of robust public discussion and debates, evolving into the document before them. It is clearly a policy general plan and not a prescriptive code. It enhances property owners' choice and provides flexibility for future market trends. Rather than a traditional Land Use Map, it includes a Future Growth Illustration, and is quite different from a Zoning Map.

She said that currently all maps are available on the website as a .pdf document, but it is their intention to have the maps available via an interactive GIS system, in which they can turn the layers on and off, and zoom in and out. She said that during the process the members and general public often had great ideas for possible implementation strategies. While not adopted as part of the Plan, they did not want to lose them so they have been listed in Appendix B, and can serve as an excellent resource for implementation.

•COMMUNITY CONTRIBUTORS

Planning Director Jim Cronk thanked the CAC, elected officials, and the Steering Committee and staff cooperation. He thanked all of the community members who participated, including the multiple groups that have hosted discussions in the last year.

Mr. Burke added that it was a reference document and can be referenced in the annual goal setting by Council, and can guide all staff summaries, showing the connections related with the Plan, and also through the capital improvements program process.

A short break was held from 5:38 p.m. to 5:51 p.m.

Supervisor Ryan asked if any members of the CAC wished to speak at this time.

Nat White said that he would like to make two assertions. First, twelve elected officials looked at the volunteers and selected the members that did a wonderful job, not based on those they knew but more on how they were involved in the communities, the types of businesses they had, etc. and they did a good job.

Second, he said that he was involved with the Guide 2000 and 2020 Visioning efforts, as well as the Greenways Plan, and worked on the first Regional Plan. There has been a continuous, non-changing theme clearly reflected in the Guiding Principles. It was a wonderful vision and plan for a region like theirs which is isolated from influences of surrounding towns as in the Valley.

Mayor Nabours said that it is a plan that State law requires of cities every ten years. Back in 2008 the Council and Board started the process by appointing a citizens committee. The Plan has to be sent for approval by the voters. The Council has the difficult job of trying to determine the will of the voters and presenting what they think they will vote for.

Supervisor Ryan said that he was a member of the Steering Committee, and speaking on behalf of the Board, the last Plan had a lot of foresight in that they acknowledged that they were separate but it made sense to consider what happens in one place affects the other, and they decided to work together on the Plan. He said that there was a broad cross-section of community considered and appointed and they appreciated their time, expertise and love of the region.

The following individuals addressed the Council opposed to the current proposed Regional Plan:

- Joy Staveley
- Judy Sall (letter read by Ms. Staveley)
- Carol Kendall
- Don Peavey
- Rob Wilson
- Bill McCullough
- Mike Sistak, representing the Flagstaff Chamber of Commerce
- Gaylord Staveley
- Sandy Burns
- Sophia Katz

Michelle Thomas, North Country Health Care, said that she was supportive of the Plan as healthy citizens are fundamental.

Mayor Nabours recognized Bruce Aiken, an artist specializing in Northern Arizona scenes, for his picture which became the cover of the Regional Plan book. Mayor Nabours and Supervisor Ryan then presented a framed, signed print of the picture to each member of the CAC, thanking them for their hard work on the committee: Paul Babbitt, Chairman; Carol Bousquet, Vice Chairman; Michael Chaveas; Jean Griego; Richard Henn; Maury Herman; Julie Leid; Judy Louks; Jerome Naleski; Eva Putzova; Trisk Rensink; William Ring; Larry Stevens; Nat White; Alex Wright; Ben Anderson; Susan Bean; Bea Cooley; Shaula Hedwall; Ken Kaemmerle; Devonna McLaughlin; Mike Nesbitt; Eunice Tso; Don Walters; and Cynthia White.

Mayor Nabors noted that many people submitted photographs that were used throughout the document and they were listed at the front of the Plan and he thanked them.

He said that they have found that it is easier to edit than to create a document, and he thanked the committee members for presenting them with the hard work done. He appreciated that they have brought this forward to the Council.

Supervisor Babbott thanked the members as well. He said that his observation is that strong and vibrant communities don't happen by default. They happen by a long slog of a process and he appreciated Carol's comments. It clearly is not a broken community. They have incredible assets and he thanked the CAC and the community for starting this process. He said that there would be more public opportunity input. He said that is exactly why their region is so different. They don't always agree, but they often agree on the outcomes.

8. Public Participation

Supervisor Ryan welcomed Cynthia Seelhammer, the new County Manager for Coconino County.

9. Informational Items To/From Chairman, Supervisors and County Manager/Mayor, Council and City Manager.

10. Adjournment

The Joint Work Session of the Flagstaff City Council and Coconino County Board of Supervisors held September 9, 2013, adjourned at 6:52 p.m.

MAYOR

ATTEST:

CITY CLERK