

## Flagstaff Regional Plan 2045 Planning and Zoning Commission

| NO. | Chapter | PAGE | Original Comment   | Change Description - Final Language   | Recommended by                             | Add to Conditions                | Vote              | DECISION DATE | Staff Comments  |
|-----|---------|------|--|---|--|----------------------------------|-------------------|---------------|---|
| 64  | 1       | 12   | Make the six priorities have equal weight. Change Ch.2/Ch.3 language so that 3 priorities must be supported by a proposal for plan amendment.  | Make the six priorities have equal weight. Change Ch.2/Ch.3 language so that 3 priorities must be supported by a proposal for plan amendment and the other priorities are not harmed.               | Ian Sharp                                  | Yes                              | 5-2               | 09/24/25      | No staff recommendation. This alternative approach could be done quickly so long as there are no new priorities and we don't try and reorganize the policies. Also change p.2-4 and 3-1   |
| 95  | 1       | 12   | Support core and complementary priorities, would like to see them treated in a balanced manner, considering complementary priorities as well as core.  | Discussed with related comments, see #64.   | Michele James (in person comment)          | Discussed with comment #64       |                   | 09/29/25      | No staff recommendation. Relates to vote on comment #64.  |
| 5   | 2       | 7    | Revise Category 3 to "Urban Growth Boundary: Expanding the UGB to provide water and sewer services."   | Same as original comment  | F3   | No                               | 4-3               | 09/24/25      | The phrase proposed for deletion is intended to cover areas where wells may be failing or existing residents may be hauling.  |
| 73  | 2       | 7    | Establish an acreage threshold of 5 gross acres, allowing smaller sites to be processed as Minor Plan Amendment. Proposed language: "Requests affecting 5 gross acres of land or less shall be processed as Minor Plan Amendments. Requests of 5.1 acres or more shall follow the established Plan Amendment procedures when otherwise applicable."  | Commission requests staff look into this further for discussion at Council, in regard to language to prevent piecemealing and which amendment categories it would apply to.                         | Hillary Turby                              | Tabled for Council consideration | Unanimous         | 09/29/25      | Staff does not support this because most lots in Flagstaff are more than 5 acres and this would create a loophole to allow property owners to avoid a major plan amendment by breaking their parcel into smaller projects.  |
| 102 | 2       | 7    | Recommend that the plan establish an acreage threshold to allow small sites to be processed as minor plan amendments, specifically less than 5 acres of land. Currently, the plan applies the same amendment requirements regardless of parcel size which creates a disproportionate burden for small land owners who lack resources. Minor amendment pathway would encourage infill and missing middle options, streamline resources, and balance inefficiencies. Many other jurisdictions have thresholds. 5 acre cut off would bring flagstaff into alignment with peer jurisdictions and promote clarity. "Requests of 5 acres or less ..." [language in written comment]. | Discussed with related comments, see #73  | Hillary Turby, Symmetry Companies (online) |                                  |                   | 09/29/25      | Staff does not support this because most lots in Flagstaff are more than 5 acres and this would create a loophole to allow property owners to avoid a major plan amendment by breaking their parcel into smaller projects.  |
| 1   | 2       | 8    | Add a category #7 to Administrative Changes that states, "Changes to the Future Growth Illustration that match plan amendments and specific plans to the Flagstaff Regional Plan 2030 with effective dates after the adoption of the Flagstaff Regional Plan 2045 currently scheduled for October 9, 2025."  | Same as original comment  | Sara Dechter                               | Yes                              | Unanimous         | 09/10/25      | Recommended after a conversation with F3 where we discussed what kind of applications might be submitted between adoption and ratification.   |
| 68  | 2       |      | Add a statement to the plan clarifying how any conflicts between maps and text will be addressed.  | Add a statement to the plan clarifying how any conflicts between maps and text will be addressed. Text overrides map.   | Christine Sheehy                           | Yes                              | 6-1               | 09/24/25      |   |
| 21  | 3       | 1    | Under "Core Priorities," revise second sentence to "... they make up the declared objectives that define..."   | Under "Core Priorities," revise second sentence to "... they make up the objectives that define..." (Note: This is contingent on comment #64 and should only be considered if #64 is not approved.) | OS Commission                              | Yes                              | Unanimous         | 09/24/25      | No staff recommendations.   |
| 69  | 3       | 1    | Support the well researched suggestions of the OS commission. Personal concern about "housing attainability and equity and climate change are two non-negotiable objectives in the plan." Replace the phrase "non-negotiable objectives" with "principle themes." As written, this relegates other important issues to only complementary. Housing attainability is a moving target with many factors. Housing and climate are themes, not non-negotiable priorities.  | Discussed with related comments, see #21  | Nat White (in person comment)              | Discussed, but voted on #21 only |                   | 09/24/25      |   |
| 22  | 3       | 1    | Under "Core Priorities," add new sentence after the first two; in applying the core priorities, the City will co-optimize housing and climate outcomes with open space, trails, and community integration to deliver equitable, health-forward, balanced neighborhoods.  | Same as original comment  | OS Commission                              | No                               | 5-2               | 09/24/25      | That is the intent as written.  |
| 23  | 3       | 1    | Under "Core Priorities," revise first sentence to "...should address their conformance with the core and complementary priorities."  | Delete the last sentence under Core Priorities.   | OS Commission with staff recommendation    | Yes                              | 5-1 (1 abstained) | 09/24/25      | This suggestion could just be deleted as it is covered in Chapter 2.  |
| 57  | 3       | 4    | Revise PK.3 to "Pursue public parking and related operations and maintenance to support reductions in private parking and promote affordability."  | Same as original comment  | Mary Norton                                | No                               | 4-2 (1 abstained) | 09/24/25      | Council already has supported this policy through other decisions. The purpose of this policy is to provide support for the reconsideration of the winter parking ordinance. The proposed language does not reflect that intent clearly and could lead to disagreement on the implementation.         |
| 24  | 3       | 7    | Revise MT.5 to "Prioritize the accessibility, connectivity, and use of pedestrian..."  | Same as original comment  | OS Commission                              | No                               | 6-1               | 09/24/25      | The verb "Prioritize" is a vaguer and less useful verb in this context because someone could argue that they are prioritizing connectivity while also reducing what is planned. Increase is a stronger verb for this policy.  |
| 13  | 3       | 9    | Revise final sentence in "Best Practices for Creating a Sense of Place" to "... used in conjunction with Guidelines for All Land Use Categories [link to 4-14]."   | Same as original comment  | F3   | No                               | 6-1               | 09/24/25      | Not necessary.  |
| 14  | 3       | 9    | Revise 2nd best practice to: Creating a mixed use pedestrian-oriented design at street level and creating vibrant and active civic spaces for residents, neighbors, and visitors.  | Same as original comment  | F3   | No                               | Unanimous         | 09/24/25      | No staff recommendation   |
| 15  | 3       | 9    | Revise 3rd best practice to "Repeating the patterns of streets, alleys, buildings, lot sizes, and civic spaces from within nearby historic districts..."   | Same as original comment  | F3   | No                               | Unanimous         | 09/24/25      | This suggests adding lot sizes - To be discussed at the hearing.  |
| 16  | 3       | 9    | Add new best practice: Creating walkable density within close proximity to open space.   | Same as original comment  | F3   | No                               | 6-1               | 09/24/25      | Walkable density is not a term used in the plan. Need further clarification.  |
| 17  | 3       | 9    | Add new best practice: Creating fine-grained visual diversity that reduces sameness such as variation in color, style, and/or architecture.  | Same as original comment  | F3   | No                               | 5-1 (1 abstained) | 09/24/25      | Staff is unclear what this means. There are architectural standards in the Zoning Code on how to determine and locate materials and the articulation of buildings.  |
| 18  | 3       | 9    | Add new best practice: Ensuring transit access, connectivity with adjacent neighborhoods, and a comfortable pedestrian environment that provides shade and shade trees.  | Same as original comment  | F3   | No                               | Unanimous         | 09/24/25      | The first two parts of transit access and connectivity are covered elsewhere in policies and guidelines. Staff Proposed alternative: Provide for shade structures and trees in walkable areas with consideration for solar exposure in the winter. Shade in Flagstaff equals icy sidewalk conditions. |
| 19  | 3       | 9    | Add new best practice: Providing mixed use with a concentration of missing middle housing types and commercial.  | Same as original comment  | F3   | No                               | Unanimous         | 09/24/25      | Covered in other policies and guidelines  |

|     |   |    |   |  |   |                 |                   |          |  |
|-----|---|----|---|--|---|-----------------|-------------------|----------|--|
| 20  | 3 | 9  | Add new best practice: Providing a variety of differently-sized public and private social spaces such as "public squares" where people can congregate, socialize, rest, people-watch, and enjoy life.   | Same as original comment   | F3  | Yes             | 6-1               | 09/24/25 | This would be difficult to require for a small infill parcel.  |
| 25  | 3 | 9  | Add new DP.8: Design and align the Flagstaff Urban Trail System (FUTS) within new developments to create a natural experience that interconnects neighborhoods and increases safe, low-carbon consumption access to community infrastructure.   | Staff proposed alternative: Policy TS.7: Design trail systems to provide safe and comfortable connections between trails that emphasize the natural setting and Landscapes and those that provide comfortable low carbon transportation within Neighborhoods, Districts and Centers. | Staff recommendation based on OS Commission comment | Yes             | 6-1               | 09/24/25 | Repeat of Comment 31 in a different location. The wording of this policy is inconsistent with the full breadth of FUTS contexts and uses terms that are unclear and not defined in the plan. There are locations where the FUTS is not in a natural setting such as along Route 66. A similar type of FUTS is expected along JW Powell. DP is also not the correct goal to attach this idea to. Staff Proposed alternative: Policy TS.7: Design trail systems to provide safe and comfortable connections between trails that emphasize the natural setting and Landscapes and those that provide comfortable low carbon transportation within Neighborhoods, Districts and Centers. |
| 75  | 3 | 9  | Add "accessible" to Goal DP: "...support attainable, accessible housing..."   | Same as original comment   | Russell Randall                                     | No              | 3-2 (1 abstained) | 09/29/25 | No staff recommendation  |
| 26  | 3 | 10 | Revise PROS.1: Provide parks and complementary open spaces within a 10-minute walk of all residents, prioritizing underserved...  | Same as original comment   | OS Commission                                       | Yes             | 5-1 (1 abstained) | 09/24/25 | No staff recommendation.   |
| 104 | 3 | 10 | Revise TS.1 to "Prioritize accessibility for and the safety of vulnerable road users as the primary consideration..."   | Same as original comment   | FBO   | Place on Errata | Unanimous         | 09/29/25 | No staff recommendation  |
| 109 | 3 | 10 | Include a definition for vulnerable road users that is more typically used in transportation planning and limited in scope. For example, the FHWA uses the term to refer to people who have less protection than occupants in motor vehicles, making them more susceptible to serious injury or death in a crash. This category specifically includes pedestrians, bicyclists, and others using personal conveyance devices such as wheelchairs, scooters, or micromobility devices... Policy TS.1 should be clear in that it prioritizes transportation for pedestrians, bicyclists, wheelchairs, scooters, and micromobility devices. | Discussed with related comments, see #96.  | Bicycle Advisory Committee                          | Yes             | Unanimous         | 09/29/25 | No staff recommendation. Also G-, 3-10, 6-11   |
| 27  | 3 | 11 | Add a callout or asterisk on Map 3-1: "Parks and Open Space needs are not limited to areas addressed on the map."   | Staff Proposed Alternative: "Map 3-1 only identifies needs for large scale parks and open spaces. Needs at a smaller geographic scale are identified in the appropriate Master Plan."  | Staff recommendation based on OS Commission comment | Yes             | Unanimous         | 09/24/25 | Proposed Alternative: Map 3-1 only identifies needs for large scale parks and open spaces. Needs at a smaller geographic scale are identified in the appropriate Master Plan.  |
| 28  | 3 | 12 | Revise PROS.4: "...through interagency coordination (For example: U.S. Forest Service, State Land Department, National Park Service, Coconino County) and local trail partnerships.   | Same as original comment   | OS Commission                                       | No              | 6-1               | 09/24/25 | Do not recommend adoption of this recommendation. Such lists were struck throughout the policies because they can be seen as limiting rather than illustrative in a development review context.  |
| 100 | 3 | 13 | Prevent, inventory, treat and remove invasive plant species to and preserve native plant communities to preserve indigenous cultural practices, and reduce the risk of uncharacteristic wildland fires.   | Same as original comment   | Sat Best (written comment)                          | No              | Unanimous         | 09/29/25 | Native plants is too broad.  |
| 29  | 3 | 14 | Revise OS.2: Focus the purchase, dedication, and management... natural resources, while integrating an open-space network that supports compact housing, climate action, and the 10-minute Walking Access Standard.   | Revise OS.2: Focus the purchase, dedication, and management... natural resources, while integrating an open-space network that supports compact housing, climate action, and to support a 10-minute walk to open space.  | OS Commission with staff recommendation             | No              | 4-3               | 09/24/25 | To be discussed at public hearing.   |
| 101 | 3 |    | Under Core Priorities, open space integration must be prioritized. The complementary priorities of promoting a walkable mixed-use community and our natural and cultural resources are absolutely aligned with the core priorities of climate change and housing affordability.   | Same as original comment   | Myles Schrag  | No              | 5-1               | 09/29/25 | No staff recommendation. Relates to vote on comment #64.   |
| 4   | 4 | 9  | Expand the Urban Center along both sides of Milton Rd southward to W Forest Meadows St.   | Expand the Urban Center along both sides of Milton Rd southward to W Forest Meadows St, bounded to the west by Woodlands Village Blvd and including the Suburban Center parcels east of Milton Ave.  | F3  | Yes             | Unanimous         | 09/10/25 | Staff has some concern that breaking up this block to create an urban grid may take a decade or two. Other infrastructure could support urban environment over time per the HOH readiness study.   |
| 30  | 4 | 9  | Change parcel APN 106-10-003 from Suburban Center to Suburban Neighborhood.   | Same as original comment   | OS Commission                                       | No              | 6-1               | 09/24/25 | Not supported by staff, there is no land use basis to make this change.  |
| 3   | 4 | 14 | Under "All Categories," revise first guideline to "...areas already served by existing and planned infrastructure and public facilities."   | Under "All Categories," revise first guideline to "...areas already served by existing and future infrastructure and public facilities."   | F3 with edit from Commission                        | Yes             | Unanimous         | 09/10/25 | Staff recommended changing future in the comment letter to planned. F3 felt this was acceptable.   |
| 6   | 4 | 14 | Under "Public Facilities and Infrastructure," revise first guideline to make clear that it applies to any proposal that requires a development application, whether it's for new development or for an existing development/home requiring drinking water and sewer, and that they must be located within the UGB.  | Same as original comment   | F3  | No              | Unanimous         | 09/24/25 | The Regional Plan can only apply to certain kinds of decisions. It can be considered when the Water Services policies are updated.   |
| 7   | 4 | 14 | Under "All Categories," revise first guideline to "...areas already served by existing infrastructure and public facilities while minimizing and mitigating displacement."  | Same as original comment   | F3  | No              | Unanimous         | 09/24/25 | To be address by Housing staff at the hearing - The City has limited ability to control this on private property and it is hard to determine what is sufficient to support temporary or permanent relocation.  |
| 9   | 4 | 14 | Under "All Categories," revise 3rd guideline to "Limit public and private green spaces that require irrigation and provide reclaimed water only for ecosystem and public recreational beneficial use."  | Same as original comment   | F3  | No              | Unanimous         | 09/24/25 | To be discussed by Water Services staff at the hearing.  |
| 10  | 4 | 16 | Add new guideline under "Design and Other Considerations": Activation of street fronts is desired. Blank or inactive walls are discouraged."  | Same as original comment   | F3  | Yes             | 4-3               | 09/24/25 |  |
| 76  | 4 | 16 | Update first guideline under "Parks" to "Create central, accessible, and activated public spaces."  | Same as original comment   | Russell Randall                                     | No              | Unanimous         | 09/29/25 | No staff recommendation  |
| 77  | 4 | 20 | Update first guideline under "Parks" to "Provide inclusive social gathering places"   | Same as original comment   | Russell Randall                                     | No              | Unanimous         | 09/29/25 | No staff recommendation  |
| 78  | 4 | 30 | Add a new guideline under "Mix and Location of Uses" stating "Consider universally designed structures" for Urban, Suburban, and Rural Neighborhood.  | Same as original comment   | Russell Randall                                     | No              | Unanimous         | 09/29/25 | Topography in Flagstaff and the limitations of grading sites in the Zoning Code to retain natural terrain would make implementation of universally designed structures in all neighborhoods challenging. Also page 4-31 and 4-32   |
| 31  | 4 | 34 | Under "Building Blocks: Active Transportation Plans," add final sentence: Trail design and alignment should integrate natural experiences that interconnect neighborhoods and increases safe, low-carbon access to community infrastructure.  | Under "Building Blocks: Active Transportation Plans," add final sentence: Trail design and alignment should integrate natural experiences that interconnect neighborhoods and increases safe, low-carbon access to community infrastructure, where appropriate.                      | OS Commission with staff recommendation             | Yes             | Unanimous         | 09/24/25 | Some Trails are not in natural areas and we would not want to miss trail connections in tighter infill locations. Staff Recommended edit: Add "where appropriate" after experiences.   |
| 79  | 4 | 34 | Under "Great Streets and Gateways," update the second sentence to "...pulse of civic activity, creates a sense of place for all, and..."  | Same as original comment   | Russell Randall                                     | No              | 5-1               | 09/29/25 | No staff recommendation  |

|     |   |    |  |   |   |                                  |           |          |  |
|-----|---|----|--|---|---|----------------------------------|-----------|----------|--|
| 59  | 4 | 36 | Add more specific street connections for "area subject to future connectivity study" on Symmetry and Little America properties.  | Same as original comment  | Mary Norton   | No                               | 4-3       | 09/24/25 | The location and need for street connections on these properties is currently unknown.   |
| 74  | 4 | 36 | Be specific about meaningfully connecting the JWP area (including the Little America property) to the rest of the city as it is a "critical connection point from all directions for a number of critical regional systems including the Inlet Rio de Flag Canyon and Bow and Arrow Canyon open space system, the accompanying FUTS and the Arizona Trail, and the associated canyon riparian system including wetlands, the stormwater management system, and associated wildlife corridors... If the vagueness of the proposed policy map and text in this area is formalized, then chances of successfully securing these aforementioned critical system connections and public access are at risk effectively for the rest of time." | Same as original comment  | John Silva  | No                               | Unanimous | 09/29/25 | The final disposition of roads within the blue area will require transportation analysis and a better understanding of future land use proposals in this area. The area has difficult terrain and floodplain issues.   |
| 11  | 4 | 37 | Add clarity to trail alignments for properties over 400 acres.   | Remove map distinction between alignments for properties over and under 400 acres. Make all planned trails a dashed line.   | F3 with edit from Commission                                      | Yes                              | Unanimous | 09/24/25 | No staff recommendation - unify under the dashed line  |
| 12  | 4 | 37 | Ensure that future trail connections at Cedar/Lockett, north of FMC, and any others identified in the ATMP and other appropriate city maps are added to maps in the Regional Plan  | Staff clarification: request is to add single track and neighborhood connector routes from the ATMP to the plan.  | F3  | No                               | 5-2       | 09/24/25 | Staff clarified that the request is to add single track and neighborhood connector routes from the ATMP to the plan.   |
| 60  | 4 | 37 | Revise map to remove distinction between private land under and over 400 acres.  | Discussed with related comments, see #11  | Mary Norton   | Discussed, but voted on #11 only |           | 09/24/25 | No staff recommendation - this was the direction from the May 2 retreat. Already addressed in another item.  |
| 33  | 4 | 37 | Revise second sentence of the disclaimer on each map to "...Future trail lines are conceptual and will be aligned through developments to meet system connectivity, enhance user experience, maintain natural corridors, and support neighborhood livability."   | Same as original comment  | OS Commission   | No                               | 6-1       | 09/24/25 | 1. This list of the criteria for successful realignment is not exhaustive. 2. Staff would rather see a third sentence added to the disclaimer than the sentence revised because "system connectivity" is not specific enough. 3. The needs of the property for development and proportionality have to be considered as well.  |
| 34  | 4 | 37 | Add existing and planned access points and trailheads from the previous Regional Plan Map 26E to Policy Map 4-5 or include an additional map with these access points and trailheads.  | Add planned access points and trailheads from the previous Regional Plan Map 26E to Policy Map 4-5 or include an additional map with these access points and trailheads.  | OS Commission with staff recommendation                           | Yes                              | 6-1       | 09/24/25 | Staff recommends not adding existing points for readability at this map scale. Existing access points have permanent property rights already and infrastructure supporting them.   |
| 70  | 4 | 37 | Add "planned forest access" icons to the maps, as show in FRP2030 (Map 26e)  | Discussed with related comments, see #34  | FBO   | Discussed, but voted on #34 only |           | 09/24/25 | No staff recommendation. Relates to vote on comment #34.   |
| 35  | 4 | 37 | Revise the map to include trail easements across Fimbres and Flag Mesa HOA.  | Discussed with related comments, see #12  | OS Commission   | Discussed but voted on #12 only  |           | 09/24/25 | Similar to F3 comment #12  |
| 32  | 4 | 37 | Remove the "over 400 acres" distinction and combine into one category for "planned trails on private land with no property rights."  | Discussed with related comments, see #11  | OS Commission   | Discussed, but voted on #11 only |           | 09/24/25 | No staff recommendation - duplicated Mary Norton's comment   |
| 105 | 4 | 37 | Include the most robust representation of trails, both FUTS and the surrounding Forest Service and County systems  | Discussed with related comments, see #11  | FBO   | No                               | Unanimous | 09/29/25 | Unclear what steps will be. Relates to vote on comment #11.  |
| 106 | 4 | 37 | Add clear labeling for all segments of the Arizona National Scenic Trail and Flagstaff Loop Trail  | Same as original comment  | FBO   | No                               | 5-1       | 09/29/25 | Could be updated if we check easements   |
| 65  | 4 | 38 | Regional Trails Plan. Came from regional trails strategy. Concerned about unauthorized trails included. The trails in the plan are on forest service land but have not been approved by the FS. Also trails on the Navajo Nation. These trails were not in the strategy that the plans data comes from. Request is that the map is updated to remove unauthorized trails from the Regional Plan.   | Staff recommendation: Update the existing trails in the Regional Trails map and leave the planned trails that have not yet been authorized (for example, the Dry Lake Hills). Because the Observatory Mesa Trails Plan was recently adopted, the map should also be updated to reflect that document. Also recommend adding the short statement from the FTI that "Inclusion on this map does not imply formal approval for any individual projects." | Staff recommendation on based on Mike Popejoy (in person comment) | Yes                              | Unanimous | 09/24/25 | Staff recommends updating the existing trails in the Regional Trails map and leaving the planned trails that have not yet been authorized (for example, the Dry Lake Hills). Because the Observatory Mesa Trails Plan was recently adopted, the map should also be updated to reflect that document, also recommend adding the short statement from the FTI that "Inclusion on this map does not imply formal approval for any individual projects." |
| 71  | 4 | 38 | if the map shows any illegally built (AKA "unauthorized") trails, these should be removed; otherwise the implication is that these trails are part of the regional plan and are authorized and open for legal use. Most of these trails are likely on USFS land.   | Staff Recommendation: Create disclaimer for the map, see language proposed in comment #65.  | Jen Blue  | Yes                              | Unanimous | 09/29/25 | Staff recommends a disclaimer be created for the map. An interactive map can be created with more details but names would not be visible at this scale. Relates to vote on comment #65.  |
| 72  | 4 | 38 | is there language in the plan that details the USFS requirements for environmental review and analysis under the National Environmental Policy Act before planned trails can be implemented? If not, this should be included.  | Staff Recommendation: Create disclaimer for the map, see language proposed in comment #65.  | Jen Blue  | Yes                              | Unanimous | 09/29/25 | Staff recommends a disclaimer be created for the map. Relates to vote on comment #65.  |
| 98  | 4 | 38 | Include with the map language from the April 9, 2020 letter from the Coconino National Forest Supervisor regarding the 2020 Flagstaff Regional Trail Strategy, which states that the Forest Service has not provided authorization to proceed with construction or implementation of any proposed projects, and that specific projects will require more in-depth, site-specific environmental review and/or analysis under the National Environmental Policy Act before they can be implemented.  | Staff Recommendation: Create disclaimer for the map, see language proposed in comment #65.  | Mike Popejoy  | Yes                              | Unanimous | 09/29/25 | Can add disclaimer to Regional Trails map. Relates to vote on comment #65.   |
| 97  | 4 | 38 | Remove unauthorized trails from the trails shown as "existing" in the Regional Trails Plan map. The unauthorized trails include the following: trails in sensitive wildlife habitat especially in the Fort Valley and Mount Elden/Dry Lake Hills areas; unauthorized trails slated for naturalization/closure in the Mount Elden/Dry Lake Hills NEPA decision; unauthorized trails on land owned by the Navajo Nation in the Dry Lake Hills.   | Discussed with related comments, see #65  | Mike Popejoy  |                                  |           | 09/29/25 | Staff disagrees as stated during public hearing #1. Relates to vote on comment #65.  |
| 36  | 4 | 39 | Add disclaimer on the map that future arterial and collector roads will be incorporated into the bikeway network as they are planned as part of future development.  | Staff Proposed Alternative: Future streets not depicted on Maps 4-3 and 4-7 will be assigned a bikeway hierarchy classification administratively by the City Engineering Department.  | OS Commission   | Yes                              | Unanimous | 09/24/25 | Staff Proposed Alternative: Future streets not depicted on Maps 4-3 and 4-7 will be assigned a bikeway hierarchy classification administratively by the City Engineering Department.   |
| 61  | 4 | 39 | Add planned bikeways on the Symmetry state land parcel and Little America parcels.   | Discussed with related comments, see #36  | Mary Norton   | Discussed, but voted on #36 only |           | 09/24/25 | The location and need for street connections on these properties is currently unknown. Staff has recommended bikeways language to ask for new routes to be assigned a classification administratively.   |
| 2   | 4 | 41 | Add a gateway designation for Fourth St and Route 66   | Same as original comment  | F3  | Yes                              | Unanimous | 09/10/25 | Support.   |
| 46  | 4 |    | Address conflict between infill and floodplain regulations.  | Same as original comment  | Ian Sharp   | No                               | Unanimous | 09/24/25 | It is true that most infill would be in a floodplain but that doesn't mean it isn't possible, it just means that it will be expensive. This could be clarified in the background text.   |
| 80  | 5 | 3  | Under "Housing Insecurity," add a statement such as "This is likely to be especially true among members of the community who identify as having disabilities."   | Same as original comment  | Russell Randal  | No                               | 5-1       | 09/29/25 | No staff recommendation  |
| 81  | 5 | 5  | Revise first sentence "Housing insecurity can include..." to add "lack of ADA compliant accessible housing."   | Same as original comment  | Russell Randal  | Split                            | 3-3       | 09/29/25 | No staff recommendation  |
| 82  | 5 | 14 | Add mention of mental health facilities including The Guidance Center, Southwest Behavioral, Terros, etc.  | Same as original comment  | Russell Randal  | Yes                              | Unanimous | 09/29/25 | No staff recommendation  |
| 83  | 5 | 16 | In the second paragraph, revise fourth sentence to "Children, Hispanic, Black, and Native American populations, as well as members of the disability community, suffer from..."  | Same as original comment  | Russell Randal  | No                               | Unanimous | 09/29/25 | No staff recommendation  |

|     |   |    |  |   |  |       |           |          |   |
|-----|---|----|--|---|--|-------|-----------|----------|---|
| 8   | 5 | 18 | Revise 2nd high priority action item to "...to support infill development in existing neighborhoods while minimizing and mitigating displacement."   | Same as original comment  | F3   | No    | 5-2       | 09/24/25 | To be address by Housing staff at the hearing - The City has limited ability to control this on private property and it is hard to determine what is sufficient to support temporary or permanent relocation.   |
| 84  | 5 | 18 | Add Action Item: Continue to partner with the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development in facilitating the Mainstream Vouchers program, assisting non-elderly persons with disabilities to achieve housing stability. (Partner / Long Term)  | Same as original comment  | Russell Randall                            | No    | Unanimous | 09/29/25 | No staff recommendation   |
| 85  | 5 | 18 | Add Action Item: Continue to partner with the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development in funding and facilitating Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH), providing housing assistance and supportive services to households with at least one member with a disability. (Fund / Long Term)   | Same as original comment  | Russell Randall                            | No    | Unanimous | 09/29/25 | No staff recommendation   |
| 53  | 5 |    | Add language to track and evaluate the effect of short-term rentals and second homes on the availability and affordability of workforce housing.   | Same as original comment  | Ian Sharp                                  | No    | 6-1       | 09/24/25 | DP.5 covers this to the best of our current legal ability. Lobbying is outside the scope of the plan.   |
| 54  | 5 |    | Consider adding language to dedicate revenues generated from short-term rentals, including transaction privilege taxes and any future impact fees, to the City's affordable housing trust fund or similar programs supporting permanent workforce housing.   | Same as original comment  | Ian Sharp                                  | No    | 6-1       | 09/24/25 | Outside the scope of the plan.  |
| 55  | 5 |    | Add language stating that Flagstaff will collaborate with other Arizona municipalities to advocate for state legislative changes that allow local governments to regulate short-term rentals in a manner that protects housing supply, neighborhood stability, and community character.  | Same as original comment  | Ian Sharp                                  | No    | 6-1       | 09/24/25 | Outside the scope of the plan.  |
| 56  | 5 |    | Consider offering development incentives (e.g. fee reductions, expedited review, density bonuses) for projects that record primary-residence deed restrictions on a share of units.  | Same as original comment  | Ian Sharp                                  | No    | 6-1       | 09/24/25 | This is already being considered by the LASS-CAP.   |
| 86  | 6 | 3  | In the last paragraph, following the first sentence, add "Some of these trails are accessible to individuals with mobility challenges or other disabilities."  | Same as original comment  | Russell Randall                            | No    | Unanimous | 09/29/25 | No staff recommendation   |
| 87  | 6 | 4  | Revise first sentence to "Providing enhanced, universally designed, and grade-separated crossings..."  | Same as original comment  | Russell Randall                            | No    | Unanimous | 09/29/25 | No staff recommendation   |
| 88  | 6 | 4  | Revise 3rd sentence to "Combinations of universally designed enhanced crossing treatments..."  | Same as original comment  | Russell Randall                            | No    | Unanimous | 09/29/25 | No staff recommendation   |
| 89  | 6 | 6  | In second paragraph, add a link for "ADA Guaranteed Ride Area" or include in the glossary and link.  | Same as original comment  | Russell Randall                            | Split | 3-3       | 09/29/25 | No staff recommendation. Link: <a href="https://mountainline.az.gov/wp-content/uploads/2017/07/Paratransit-Guide-Updated-7-14-2017.pdf">https://mountainline.az.gov/wp-content/uploads/2017/07/Paratransit-Guide-Updated-7-14-2017.pdf</a>  |
| 90  | 6 | 8  | Under "Safety and Convenience," revise the first sentence to "...vulnerable road users: people who walk, ride, roll, and use transit and people with disabilities."  | Same as original comment  | Russell Randall                            | No    | Unanimous | 09/29/25 | No staff recommendation   |
| 96  | 6 | 8  | Add "vulnerable road users" to the glossary and use the FHWA definition: "non-motorists... people walking, bicycling, using mobility aids (such as wheelchairs), or using most micro-mobility devices (whether motorized or not)." Clarify existing in-text definitions in Ch. 6.  | Add "vulnerable road users" to the glossary and direct staff to determine the appropriate definition so that the usage is consistent. Overrides previous vote on comment # 109.   | FBO  | Yes   | Unanimous | 09/29/25 | No staff recommendation. Also 6-1 and G   |
| 103 | 6 | 8  | Add "vulnerable road users" to the glossary and use the FHWA definition: "non-motorists... people walking, bicycling, using mobility aids (such as wheelchairs), or using most micro-mobility devices (whether motorized or not)." Clarify existing in-text definitions in Ch. 6.  | See vote on comment #96   | FBO  |       |           | 09/29/25 | No staff recommendation. Also 6-1 and G   |
| 49  | 6 | 13 | Add: Develop regional partnerships with Arizona DOT, National Parks Service, and private tourism operators to promote regional shuttles and coordinated transit systems serving high-volume destinations (Grand Canyon, Sedona, Snowbowl).   | Same as original comment  | Ian Sharp                                  | No    | Unanimous | 09/24/25 | Outside the scope of the plan   |
| 58  | 6 | 13 | Revise first high priority action item to "... to allow for parking and multimodal travel." (Remove year-round, on-street).  | Same as original comment  | Mary Norton                                | No    | Unanimous | 09/24/25 | Council already has supported this policy through other decisions. The purpose of this policy is to provide support for the reconsideration of the winter parking ordinance. The proposed language does not reflect that intent clearly and could lead to disagreement on the implementation. |
| 91  | 6 | 13 | Revise 13th regular action item to "... safe, functional, and accessible for all users..."   | Same as original comment  | Russell Randall                            | No    | Unanimous | 09/29/25 | No staff recommendation   |
| 52  | 6 |    | Amend Ch.6 and Ch.10 to explicitly acknowledge that visitor transportation emissions (and potentially their lodging) must be addressed as part of the City's climate strategy, rather than treated as incidental.  | Same as original comment  | Ian Sharp                                  | No    | Unanimous | 09/24/25 | This is more appropriate for the Carbon Neutrality Plan as it is not a measurable land use issue.   |
| 48  | 6 |    | Add requirement that the City and County track and report the share of GHG emissions and traffic congestion attributable to visitors. Incorporate this analysis into annual carbon neutrality and housing affordability progress reports.  | Same as original comment  | Ian Sharp                                  | No    | Unanimous | 09/24/25 | This is something we have not developed but may be developed as part of the Streets Master Plan. Not an appropriate addition to the Regional Plan   |
| 50  | 6 |    | Add: Establish incentives for tour operators and large venues to provide low-emission group transportation rather than relying on individual vehicles.   | Same as original comment  | Ian Sharp                                  | No    | Unanimous | 09/24/25 | Outside the scope of the plan   |
| 99  | 7 | 2  | <b>Coordinate invasive and native plant plans, programs, and resources with regional, state, tribal, and federal partners focusing on the Arizona Department of Forestry and Fire Management Invasive Plants of Concern, the University of Arizona's Cooperative Extension, and those identified by the City Fire Departments and Local Fire Districts because of their impact on fire risk throughout the Region.</b> | Same as original comment  | Sat Best (written comment)                 | No    | Unanimous | 09/29/25 | Native plants is too broad.   |
| 62  | 7 | 10 | Add map data for Ponderosa pines to Information Maps 7-2 and 7-3 or add an action item on gathering this data.   | Same as original comment  | Mary Norton                                | No    | Unanimous | 09/24/25 | This data is currently unavailable but can be added in the future if it does become available at a scale that can be accurately reflected at the City or Regional level.  |
| 94  | 7 | 12 | Include in the plan that we need a new historic inventory.   | Same as original comment  | Gwen Groth                                 | No    | Unanimous | 09/29/25 | Funding and timing of this needs to be part of the Historic Preservation Action Plan that is already in the action items  |
| 37  | 8 | 3  | Add new sentence after the first sentence on the page: Future open spaces and parks should be placed through developments to meet system connectivity, be accessible for residents, maintain natural corridors, and support neighborhood livability. [Paragraph break]   | Add new sentence after the first sentence on the page: Future open spaces and parks may be placed through developments to meet system connectivity, be accessible for residents, maintain natural corridors, and support neighborhood livability. [Paragraph break] | OS Commission with edit from Chair Mandino | Yes   | Unanimous | 09/24/25 | "should" is not an appropriate verb in Chapter 8 as it is not a location for guidelines.  |
| 38  | 8 | 4  | Revise first high priority action item to "Leverage available funding to negotiate for the purchase/dedication of greenfield lands for parks, open space, and trails in the John Wesley Powell Boulevard (JWP) extension area and other priority areas, to secure integrated alignments and sites." Update to "short term."  | Same as original comment  | OS Commission                              | Yes   | Unanimous | 09/24/25 | That is the intent as written. Agree to update to short term.   |
| 39  | 8 | 4  | Revise 2nd high priority action item to "Pursue a County and/or City bond or financing mechanisms for regional park, recreation, open space initiatives, including operations and maintenance."  | Same as original comment  | OS Commission                              | Yes   | Unanimous | 09/24/25 | No staff recommendation   |
| 40  | 8 | 4  | Add regular action item: Develop a comprehensive tree inventory that adds native tree species, highlighting the Ponderosa pine stands, as a significant natural resource to the mapped resources section in Chapter 7, p. 7-8.   | Same as original comment  | OS Commission                              | Yes   | Unanimous | 09/24/25 | No staff recommendation   |

|     |     |   |   |   |                                     |                                  |           |          |  |
|-----|-----|---|---|---|-------------------------------------|----------------------------------|-----------|----------|--|
| 41  | 8   | 4 | Add regular action item: Partner - Develop incentives, density bonuses, and expedited reviews, and partnerships to encourage developers to incorporate the 10-minute Walking Access Standard, FUTS connectivity targets, designate meaningful trail alignments, or designate neighborhood complementary open space or pocket parks in projects.   | Same as original comment  | OS Commission                       | No                               | 4-3       | 09/24/25 | Staff does not recommend creating zoning code incentives for open space as they may compete with existing incentives for sustainability and housing.   |
| 42  | 8   | 4 | Add regular action item: Plan - Conduct a code analysis to provide insight on how best to update or develop code or zoning tools to assist in the dedication of trail corridors, complementary open space, and pocket parks.  | Same as original comment  | OS Commission                       | No                               | Unanimous | 09/24/25 | The underlying issue is not the code but the available funding for purchasing lands for parks and open space.  |
| 66  | 9   | 8 | Define GPCD (used in Figure 9-4) and add to Acronyms and Abbreviations list   | Same as original comment  | Charity Lee                         | Yes                              | Unanimous | 09/24/25 | Add by staff - Staff concurs. This got missed.   |
| 107 | 10  | 1 | Chapter 10: Energy and Climate Action makes the statement "The City's goal of achieving carbon neutrality is intrinsically linked to APS's carbon-free commitment" in the background section. Then again, in the "Clean Energy Production" section, the plan lauds APS for its commitment to renewable energy. A fundamental flaw with tying ourselves so strongly to APS is that APS's commitments may change... What will the city and county do if APS abandons its renewable energy goals? I believe this is a fundamental flaw that needs significant attention before the regional plan is adopted. | Remove specificity about APS's commitment in line with staff's revisions.   | Valerie Piet                        | Yes                              | Unanimous | 09/29/25 | Sustainability should speak to this at the hearing. Also on p.10-3   |
| 108 | 10  | 4 | Reward the last sentence of the "Data Centers and Chip Manufacturing" section to more clearly indicate disfavorability toward resource-intensive data centers, as well as mentioning it throughout Chapter 9.   | Same as original comment  | Valerie Piet                        | No                               | 4-2       | 09/29/25 | No staff recommendation  |
| 63  | 10  | 7 | Revise 3rd regular action item to "... further implement net-zero-ready energy standards."  | Same as original comment  | Mary Norton                         | Withdrawn by commenter.          |           | 09/24/25 | "Net-zero-ready" is not already required in the Building Code.   |
| 47  | 10  |   | Revise the plan to move away from abandonment of natural gas and instead strive to maintain two energy sources to maintain resiliency, redundancy, and affordability.   | Same as original comment  | Ian Sharp                           | Yes                              | 6-1       | 09/24/25 | Making this change would make the proposed out of policy alignment with the Carbon Neutrality Plan page 97.  |
| 51  | 10  |   | Add: Create a funding mechanism (e.g., tourism impact fees, lodging/car rental taxes) that ensures the cost of EV infrastructure and carbon offsets is equitably shared between residents and visitors. Dedicate a portion of these revenues to affordable housing and transit improvements for local workers, reducing displacement pressures caused by the tourism economy.   | Same as original comment  | Ian Sharp                           | No                               | Unanimous | 09/24/25 | Staff needs more information on the intent of this comment. Is the commenter referring to carbon offsets that the City can purchase, or is he referring to carbon dioxide removal processes/ mechanisms/ infrastructure that actually remove carbon from the atmosphere?   |
| 43  | 11  | 4 | Page 11-4 cites a dam failure on Lower Lake Mary. The word "Dam" should be replaced or have a footnote that clarifies it was earthen berm, or a levee that failed at Lake Mary.   | Same as original comment  | Ian Sharp                           | Yes                              | Unanimous | 09/24/25 | Support - Confirmed with Ed Schenk in Stormwater and Daniel Kelly in Emergency Management. The term levee was preferred  |
| 44  | All |   | Replace "100-year floodplain" with "1-percent Annual Chance Exceedance flood"   | Discussed with related comments, see #45  | Ian Sharp                           | Discussed, but voted on #45 only |           | 09/24/25 | See Comment 45   |
| 45  | G   | 1 | Add to glossary - "1-percent Annual Chance Exceedance flood" or "100-year floodplain" and clarify whether the definition includes only FEMA floodplains or other regulatory floodplains adopted by the City.  | Staff recommendation: Keep the language as is and add a subcategorized definition to the Glossary, such as:<br>Floodplain: an area that floods seasonally, sometimes associated with a riparian area<br>1. Special Flood Hazard Area -....<br>2. 1% annual change of flooding or 100-year floodplain.....<br>3. 0.2% annual chance of flooding or 500-year floodplain.... | Ian Sharp with staff recommendation | Yes                              | Unanimous | 09/24/25 | Floodplain is a term used throughout the plan in a number of different contexts. It does not always refer to the 100 year floodplain. Staff recommends keeping the language as is and adding a subcategorized definition to the Glossary, such as:<br>Floodplain: an area that floods seasonally, sometimes associated with a riparian area<br>1. Special Flood Hazard Area -....<br>2. 1% annual change of flooding or 100-year floodplain.....<br>3. 0.2% annual chance of flooding or 500-year floodplain.... |
| 67  | G   | 7 | Revise the Paratransit definition to add "for people with disabilities who may be unable to use standard bus services."   | Same as original comment  | Russell Randall                     | Yes                              | Unanimous | 09/24/25 | Add by staff - Good addition staff recommends this edit.   |
| 92  | G   | 7 | Revise the Paratransit definition to add "for people with disabilities who may be unable to use standard bus services."   | Same as original comment  | Russell Randall                     | Yes                              | Unanimous | 09/29/25 | Good addition staff recommends this edit.  |
| 93  | G   | 9 | Add to glossary - Universal Design: The practice of creating buildings, environments, products, and services to be usable by all people to the greatest extent possible, without the need for adaptation or specialized design.   | Same as original comment  | Russell Randall                     | No                               | Unanimous | 09/29/25 | The rule of thumb for the glossary was not to define words that could be easily looked up online and that did not have unique meaning within the document.   |