

# Regional Plan Update 2012 – Round 1 Scenario Analysis

Presented to: Regional Plan 2012 Citizens Advisory Committee

By: Through David Wessel from the Scenario Development Working Group

Date: October 28, 2011

## Observations:

- General geographic patterns of development are very similar between the three scenarios due to the availability of land and, anecdotally, the reluctance of participants to recommend major redevelopment – thus preserving existing patterns.
- Scenario A most closely represents rural growth levels and patterns based on currently vacant lots.
- No scenario accurately represents expected employment and population growth *on* the NAU campus

## Findings:

### Kimley-Horn Community Viz Quantitative Analysis

- Scenarios B and C are very similar in their relative impacts across all measures
- Scenarios B and C have decided advantages over A in building footprint and acres utilized.
- Scenarios B and C have decided advantages over A in transportation and mobility regarding miles of travel and opportunities for improved mode shift
- Scenarios B and C have decided advantages over A in environment and air quality as well as water demand or usage.

### Guiding Principle Assessment

- Scenarios B and C are similar and clearly better than A
- Findings on economic development and community character in respect to buildings heights needs further evaluation.

### Assumptions Assessment

- Scenario C is clearly not as favored in that it is preferred in only one set of assumptions
- Scenario B is more favored than A in the number of assumptions. Though it may be suggested that B has more inertia (status quo) to overcome in the types of assumptions supporting A versus B.

### Professional Judgment

- Transportation (ADOT/FMPO) – full transportation model runs pending
  - Long-term plans to widen I-40 and I-17 should accommodate interstate travel on all three scenarios

## Regional Plan Update 2012 – Round 1 Scenario Analysis

- Scenario A may be excessive for W. Route 66, Milton and E. Route 66. The traffic impact analysis of Villaggio Montana (4,000 units, 300,000 sq. ft. of commercial) several years ago supports this assessment.
- Scenario C has least impact on W. Route 66, Milton and E. Route 66
- Work on Milton could include medians and consolidated driveways, “backage” roads, widening of the existing RR overpass, pedestrian improvements, may require additional RR overpass at Lone Tree.
  - Less aggressive for Scenario B and less for C
- Scenario C puts most pressure on Lone Tree and need for traffic interchange
- Employment densities may not be sufficient in any scenario to strongly influence transit
- Residential proximity to employment and level of mixed use development do not work in favor of shifts to other modes as well as they could.
- Utilities (City/Assumptions for County)
  - Scenario A has greatest costs with most transmission lines and distributed Waste Water Treatment Plants needed to avoid sewer interceptor replacement.
  - Scenario C has the least impact and need for new water and sewer infrastructure
  - County-based water companies have capacity to serve build-out at zoning/lots available levels.
  - County-based wastewater services and private septic systems have capacity to serve build-out at zoning/lots available levels.
- Parks and Recreations (City/County)
  - City – pending
  - County – analysis pending
- Wildlife
  - Scenario A – negative impacts near Baderville, Woody Ridge (Dry Lake), modest impacts to sections 20 and 30
  - Scenario B – negative impacts to Observatory Mesa (bypass), Picture Canyon, and moderate impact to Dry Lake, general impact along J.W. Powell alignment from Airport to sections 20 and 30.
  - Scenario C – some major spot impacts at Dry Lake, north and east of airport, east of Country Club

### Assumptions

- The vacant lots in the county will be developed. There is no desire to prevent this or tools – short of money – to permit it. This growth will reduce the relative advantages posed by scenarios B and C.
- NAU, per its stated goals, will grow to 25,000 students with a commensurate growth in faculty and staff. NAU and the market will respond by accommodating growth on or near the campus. This will have a slight positive effect on environmental and transportation measures.

## Regional Plan Update 2012 – Round 1 Scenario Analysis

### Conclusions and Recommendations for next round of scenarios

- The ability to locate additional population of 70,000 with the commensurate jobs to support them in a way that materially or significantly affects important community indicators is limited.
- Therefore, changes to a more compact urban form will largely be motivated by the following:
  - Community Character – moving away from suburban strip commercial to a more urban form
  - Social Concerns – mixing of economic classes and generations toward better cross cultural and generational understanding and education; supporting walk, bicycle and transit through investment and land use to the greatest extent possible to lower transportation costs for the lower income and create mobility options for the youth and elderly.
  - Environmental Ethos – creating better opportunities for those who wish to lower their personal carbon footprint through smaller living spaces and more environmentally friendly transportation
  - Workforce housing/Equity concerns – creating lower transportation costs and housing costs to permit a high quality of life for a broader range of the work force
  - Many of the preceding points are set against the choice of current residents for the status quo of lower densities and the implicit choice for future residents to live in higher density homes and use other modes of transportation.
- Scenario Adaptations, general principles
  - Reflect the assumptions about county and NAU growth
  - Move growth away from or reduce growth in areas with problematic infrastructure capacity
  - Move growth away from or reduce growth in areas with known wildlife, historic or cultural sensitivity
- 2<sup>nd</sup> Round Scenarios to Evaluate
  - Scenario A – Baseline with minor modifications to reflect county and NAU growth
  - Scenario B – modifications to reflect county and NAU growth, lowering quantity of suburban on the periphery as it shifts to out to county and in to NAU
  - Scenario D – Urban Villages, higher density nodes at several locations. Lower suburban densities on the periphery. Introduce a new, higher-density, place type. See the survey guidance from the Regional Transportation Plan on-line survey that may be used to recommend the types of densities to be considered in different places. Not all locations will be subjected to higher densities:

## Regional Plan Update 2012 – Round 1 Scenario Analysis

In the first survey, many people supported maintaining Flagstaff's small-town atmosphere by encouraging urban development only in concentrated locations. Please identify those areas -- and the level of development in building stories -- where you believe we can expand or develop new urban activity centers without violating our small-town character.

	None	2 Stories	3 Stories	4 Stories	5 Stories	Response Count
1) W. Route 66	31	89	49	8	20	197
2) Woodlands Village	29	72	58	24	24	207
3) Milton Road	35	62	54	18	28	169
4) Southside	31	83	42	14	22	192
5) Downtown	27	33	46	28	61	195
6) McMillan Mesa	35	62	32	3	13	145
7) N. Fourth Street	16	65	72	23	35	211
8) Canyon del Rio	37	68	45	8	21	179
9) Flagstaff Mall	11	40	63	35	59	208

	None	2 Stories	3 Stories	4 Stories	5 Stories	Response Count
1) W. Route 66	15.7%	45.2%	24.9%	4.1%	10.2%	1
2) Woodlands Village	14.0%	34.8%	28.0%	11.6%	11.6%	1
3) Milton Road	20.7%	36.7%	32.0%	10.7%	16.6%	1
4) Southside	16.1%	43.2%	21.9%	7.3%	11.5%	1
5) Downtown	13.8%	16.9%	23.6%	14.4%	31.3%	1
6) McMillan Mesa	24.1%	42.8%	22.1%	2.1%	9.0%	1
7) N. Fourth Street	7.6%	30.8%	34.1%	10.9%	16.6%	1
8) Canyon del Rio	20.7%	38.0%	25.1%	4.5%	11.7%	1
9) Flagstaff Mall	5.3%	19.2%	30.3%	16.8%	28.4%	1

### 2<sup>nd</sup> Round Metrics to Add and/or Refine

- Transportation modeling
  - VMT, VHT, Mode Share
- Utilities modeling
- Fiscal Impact
  - Rough costs versus expenses
- Proximity measures
  - Residents within ¼ mile of protected open space
  - Residents within ½ mile and within 1 miles of employment
  - Residents within ¼ mile and ½ mile of transit service
  - Industrial properties
    - Acres within ¼ mile of interstate, principal arterial, rail spur
- Conservation Measures
  - Acres of quality wildlife habitat developed

## Regional Plan Update 2012 – Round 1 Scenario Analysis

- Population in proximity to sensitive lands
- Economic Development / Market Sensitivity Measures
  - T.B.D. ?
- Narrative / Qualitative Assessments (such as...)
  - Development of urban parks in close proximity and frequency to high density areas
  - Finer grain transportation issues associated with quality high density
- An analysis of each scenario against the current regional plan and current zoning is recommended to address regulatory challenges