



# Planning and Development Services Report

---

May 5, 2016

**TO:** Planning and Zoning Commission  
**THROUGH:** Dan Folke, Planning Director  
Mark Sawyers, AICP, Current Planning Manager

**FROM:** Sara Dechter, AICP, Comprehensive Planning Manager

**RE:** Chapter 3 Plan Amendment Citizen Review Session

---

---

## Executive Summary

On Wednesday, May 11<sup>th</sup>, City staff will introduce a minor plan amendment to the Flagstaff Regional Plan 2030, *Chapter 3 How the Plan Works* for discussion. The amendment was available for a 30-day public review in March and April. The Planning and Zoning Commission will hold a public hearing on May 25<sup>th</sup> at City Hall. The Commission will vote whether or not to recommend adoption of the amendment to the City Council. The amendment is scheduled for review by the City Council in June 2016.

The proposed plan amendment is provided with and without track changes (Attachments A and B). In Attachment A, there are two colors of track changes. Red indicates a change made prior to the public review and blue indicates a change made as a result of the public review.

## Recommended Action: Commission Discussion and Direction

No decision is needed at the citizen review session. It is an opportunity for the Commission and community to discuss the amendment, seek clarification, and make comments.

## Purpose and Scope

The purpose of this minor amendment is to ensure good customer service to applicants and the community by providing a fair and transparent public process for all plan amendments and specific plans. The amendment would achieve this by creating a clear description of which development applications and City projects will require a major or minor plan amendment, clarifying the role of Specific Plans, filling in information missing from the current chapter, and reorganizing information in a more logical sequence. Staff has limited the scope of this minor amendment to the content of Chapter 3. There are potential amendments to Chapters 8, Growth and Land Use, and Chapter 9, Transportation, including changes language describing activity centers, neighborhoods, and Great Streets that are related to the content of Chapter 3, but these will be addressed in the future work program.

## **Context of Major and Minor Plan Amendments**

There are three legal mechanisms that work together to establish the process for major and minor plan amendments of the Flagstaff Regional Plan 2030 (General Plan). The first is A.R.S. §9-461.06. *Adoption and amendment of general plan; expiration and readoption.* This statute requires that the City “Adopt written procedures to provide effective, early and continuous public participation in the development and major amendment of general plans from all geographic, ethnic and economic areas of the municipality.” The statute only discusses procedures, and leaves the decision of what changes trigger the major amendment process to each municipality.

The minimum requirements for the major plan amendment process are:

- Major plan amendments must be completed prior to submittal of rezoning or annexation applications;
- A 60 day review of the proposed major plan amendments is required by specific agencies and anyone who requests such opportunities;
- Planning and Zoning Commission will hold two or more public hearings at different locations within the municipality to promote citizen participation; and
- The City Council will review all major plan amendments at a single public hearing during the calendar year the proposal is made.

Flagstaff City Code Title 11.01, *General Plan Amendment*, further refines the procedures by adding the requirement for a neighborhood meeting or Citizen Review Session, and by providing procedures for minor plan amendments and adoption of new elements. In Flagstaff, minor plan amendments do not require a review period and only require one public hearing with the Commission before presentation to the Council. Minor plan amendment applications can be processed concurrent with applications for rezoning and annexations.

In June 2014, approximately a year after adopting the General Plan, the Council adopted amendments to Title 11 to clarify procedures and to remove content that related to the previous version of the General Plan. Clarifications about submittal requirements were also needed, but these were put on hold pending completion of the Chapter 3 plan amendment and consideration of how to address impact analyses for major and minor plan amendments and specific plans.

The General Plan provides the last piece of the major plan amendment puzzle by establishing categories of amendments that will be subject to the major plan amendment procedures found in A.R.S §9-461.06 and Title 11 of the City Code. Chapter 3 of the document also describes the status of specific plans and how they relate to the General Plan, as well as how the plan will be used by City staff and the community.

## **Project Background**

The Flagstaff Regional Plan 2030 was ratified by voters in May 2014. In May-June 2015, The Comprehensive Planning staff presented the first annual report to the Commission and the Council. Throughout the first year of introducing the Regional Plan to staff, citizens and officials, numerous questions, concerns, and inconsistencies were brought to the staff’s attention. The 2014 Regional Plan Annual Report stated that staff had “identified over 85 changes to text and maps needed to address editing errors, legal issues, and to clarify assumptions and the

## **Memo – Planning and Zoning Commission**

May 11, 2016 – Citizen Review Session for Chapter 3 Minor Regional Plan Amendment

relationship between different sections.” Rather than bringing so many unrelated edits forward at once, staff proposed five “amendment tasks” that provided a meaningful way to organize related changes and to provide a chance for the Commission, Council, and the public to have input in how the ongoing work of maintaining the Regional Plan could proceed. The Council gave staff direction to proceed with these amendment tasks. The first amendment task was completed in December 2015 with a comprehensive update of Map 25 (Road Network Illustration) and Chapter 10, Transportation, to bring them into compliance with State law and to remove inconsistencies with the Engineering Standards that were missed in earlier reviews. During the review of the Map 25 plan amendment, the issues with the categories for major plan amendments became obvious to the Commission and they included in their recommendation to the Council to “prioritize updating the table of Major and Minor Plan Amendments on Page III-9 as the next highest priority for the Comprehensive Planning Program work plan.”

Records from the Citizens’ Advisory Committee showed that the groups did not review or discuss the major plan amendment categories and that the categories were first introduced at the public hearings for the final draft of the Regional Plan. The City Council did not bring forward any discussion items related to the major plan amendment process. However, in the two years since the plan was ratified the categories have been an area of intense scrutiny for Planning and Development Services staff. Given this lack of review, these proposed updates provide a second change for the public, staff, the Commission and Council to discuss the major plan amendment categories and what would be most appropriate for the Regional Plan.

## **Public Participation**

The goal for updating Chapter 3 was not to rewrite the entire plan or to reinvent policies that had been well vetted during the CAC process. The Public Participation Plan (Attachment D) was designed to begin working from the knowledge of those who developed the plan and then to provide opportunities for wider feedback from the public. Interviews with former CAC members and interest groups involved in developing the Plan was the first step in the public involvement process. These conversations confirmed that there was little discussion of these items prior to Plan ratification. The feedback received and questions asked during these interviews were important in informing the draft proposal.

Once the required proposal was complete, staff sent out the document for a 30-day public review. There is no review period for minor plan amendments, but staff believed it would be difficult to gather meaningful public involvement without one. During the public review, a public work session with the Planning and Zoning Commission and an Open House (Attachment E) was scheduled. The changes proposed were available to discuss interactively on the Flagstaff Community Forum. Staff received comments from nine individuals during the public review. These comments gave important insight into how to make the proposal better and how well it kept with the desires of the community for involvement in revisions to the Regional Plan. Staff carefully reviewed and considered all of these comments and has provided written responses to them (Attachment F).

## Memo – Planning and Zoning Commission

May 11, 2016 – Citizen Review Session for Chapter 3 Minor Regional Plan Amendment

Public participation on the plan amendment will continue through June 28, 2016 at the following meetings at City Hall:

### Planning and Zoning Commission

Citizens Review Session                      Wednesday, May 11, 2016  
Public Hearing                                      Wednesday, May 25, 2016

### City Council

Work Session                                      Tuesday, June 14, 2016  
Public Hearing and Resolution              Tuesday, June 28, 2016

## Changes Proposed to Major Plan Amendment Criteria

The Regional Land Use and Transportation Plan (RLUTP) was the General Plan that preceded the Flagstaff Regional Plan 2030 (Regional Plan). The RLUTP had 18 parcel-specific land use categories that were used to determine compliance with the General Plan. The document took a simpler approach to major plan amendment categories and adopted the following:

- Category 1: Any increase of intensity of residential land use category of 80 acres or more;
- Category 2: A change from a residential land use classification to a non-residential land use category of 40 acres or more; and
- Category 3: Any change of non-residential land use category of 20 acres or more.

The Regional Plan has a more flexible land use classification system, but more detailed criteria for major plan amendment categories. The current table describing criteria for major plan amendments in the Regional Plan includes a list of minor plan amendments that are not exhaustive and have been confusing in several cases. Under A.R.S. 9-461.06, any change to the Regional Plan after ratification must be processed as a minor amendment if it is not identified as a major amendment category. Appendices are therefore the only part of the document that can be updated without following the plan amendment procedures and approval from the City Council.

The table below compares the current criteria in the Regional Plan and the criteria proposed under this plan amendment. Each subheading that follows explains the rationale for the proposed changes and their origin.

*Table 1: Comparison of Current and Proposed Criteria for Major Plan Amendments*

Category	Current Criteria	Proposed Criteria
<b>Urban Growth Boundary</b>	Any expansion of the urban growth boundary that requires an expansion of utility infrastructure as determined in an utility analysis	Expansion of the urban growth boundary that requires an expansion of public utility infrastructure, except where services are already provided, or for the purpose of designating Parks/Open Space area type.
<b>Employment Area Type</b>	Any change to the boundaries of employment areas to urban, suburban, or rural area types	Reduction of the employment area type, unless offset by an exchange of acres within the same master planned area.

**Memo – Planning and Zoning Commission**

May 11, 2016 – Citizen Review Session for Chapter 3 Minor Regional Plan Amendment

Category	Current Criteria	Proposed Criteria
<b>Urban to Rural Area Type</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Urban to rural of any size</li> <li>• Rural to urban of any size</li> </ul>	Changes from urban to rural or rural to urban area types.
<b>Parks/Open Space Area Type</b>	Any reduction to the boundary of land purchased for conservation. (Only applied to Open Space)	Reduction of the land designated for conservation and active or passive recreation.
<b>Urban/ Suburban/Rural</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Urban to suburban greater than 10 acres</li> <li>• Suburban to urban greater than 10 acres</li> <li>• Rural to suburban greater than 20 acres</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In activity centers, changes to area types that reduce the range of intensity, density and mix of uses, except where done to protect natural or cultural resources.</li> <li>• In neighborhoods and along commercial corridors, more than ¼ mile from an activity center, changes from suburban to urban area types.</li> </ul>
<b>Activity Centers</b>	Addition of a new activity center; Specific Plan needed	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Addition or deletion of an activity center</li> <li>• Moving the center of an activity center more than ½ mile from its original location.</li> <li>• Reduction in the category of an activity center (urban to suburban, suburban to rural, or regional to neighborhood) without creating a proportional increase in the scale of an activity center elsewhere in the Flagstaff region.</li> </ul>
<b>Corridors</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Any commercial activities proposed outside of the activity center and along a corridor that is not contiguous to the activity center.</li> <li>• Addition of a corridor or great street; Specific Plan needed.</li> <li>• Extension of a corridor or great street more than a 1/4 mile in length.</li> </ul>	No categories

**Memo – Planning and Zoning Commission**

May 11, 2016 – Citizen Review Session for Chapter 3 Minor Regional Plan Amendment

<b>Category</b>	<b>Current Criteria</b>	<b>Proposed Criteria</b>
<b>Special Districts</b>	No category	Creation of a new special district, or reduction in the size of a special district.
<b>Goals and Policies</b>	No category	Add or delete a goal or policy in any chapter of the Plan.

**Urban Growth Boundary**

Under the RLUTP, expanding the urban growth boundary was not a major plan amendment. The current Regional Plan was designed to accommodate a 100 year water supply through the land uses proposed. All of the areas within the urban growth boundary have a utilities analysis, such as the West Route 66 Corridor Study, or were included in the 100 year water supply assumptions. Providing utility services beyond this boundary requires a reexamination of assumptions in the Regional Plan and the Utilities Master Plan. The changes are proposed to clarify the meaning of a “utility analysis,” and to make an exception when providing minor utilities for open spaces and parks.

**Employment Area Type**

Under the RLUTP, changes to employment or industrial land uses were minor unless the change exceeded 20 acres. With the current Regional Plan, the supply of suitable vacant and redevelopable lands for research and development, business parks and industrial uses was carefully analyzed to create adequate supply and site selection for business attraction and the long term economic security of the community. The scarcity of the land and its relative value to meeting the community’s long range projections supported protection of this area type with a major plan amendment category. Several of these areas are already master planned business parks or places where a master plan would be advisable for future development. For this reason, staff proposes that minor flexibility to allow for employment area types to be relocated in the interest of achieving master plan goals would be allowable. Staff also recommends that changes from Employment to Special Districts and Parks/Open Space be elevated to major plan amendments, since these requests could have the same impact on the available supply as Urban, Suburban and Rural. This would not restrict the ability to have park space within business parks, so long as the uses is compatible with and in support of the areas purpose.

**Urban to Rural Area Type**

In the Regional Plan, Urban Neighborhoods are generally laid out on a grid, two stories and taller and eight units per acres or more (Page IX-35), while Rural Neighborhoods are typically 0.2 to 1 unit per acres and may be clustered to protect open space. These two area types are so fundamentally different that a major plan amendment is assumed to be warranted if a proposal to change from one to the other were proposed. The proposed amendment would not make any substantive changes to this category.

**Parks/Open Space Area Type**

Under the RLUTP, parks and open space land use changes did not require a major plan amendment. Under the current Regional Plan, open space is elevated to a major plan amendment but parks, which may or may not be designated for open space, are not. The proposed amendment would expand the land use category from only those “purchased for conservation” to any “designated for conservation and active or passive recreation.” Expanding the definition requires some flexibility because some areas within open space and parks are also used for

## **Memo – Planning and Zoning Commission**

May 11, 2016 – Citizen Review Session for Chapter 3 Minor Regional Plan Amendment

utilities or other public facilities. Therefore the footnote for this category states, “Within the Parks/Open Space area type, public facilities, such as tanks, utilities, roads, and staging areas may be located. If these facilities have substantially altered the natural environment or created a brownfield site, removing them from the Parks/Open Space designation may be processed as a minor amendment. Expansion of such facilities does not require a plan amendment.” This would allow for expansion of utilities and roads in and around parks.

### **Urban/Suburban/Rural**

In the RLUTP, the land use map was parcel-specific and major plan amendments were only required for land use changes that exceeded 20, 40 or 80 acres depending on the proposal. In the current Regional Plan, the equivalent map is generalized and requires amendments for area type changes that exceed 10 or 20 acres. This is counterintuitive and has been a subject of much discussion since the plan was adopted. There have been cases of parcels with more than one area type and proposals that fell just under the threshold, which have been discussed in pre-application meetings. Staff proposes that the intent of these criteria can be maintained without a specific acre threshold. This would be achieved by requiring a major amendment for projects that reduce the range of intensity, density, and mix of uses for an activity center, except where it is done to protect cultural or natural resources, and outside of activity centers, where the change is from suburban to urban. This change would have the effect of concentrating growth in activity centers and preventing haphazard urban development.

### **Activity Centers**

Activity centers were a concept in the RLUTP but their locations were not mapped. The current Regional Plan identified their locations and calibrated the transportation, infrastructure, sustainability and open space goals and maps to the activity centers through scenario-based charrettes and modeling. Moving or altering activity centers could have systematic impacts on the ability of the Plan to meet its goals and to sustainably support the City’s projected growth and job demand. However, there were very limited categories for major plan amendments. Without a major plan amendment process, it would be difficult for staff to evaluate what other calibrations the plan might need in order to relocate an activity center or decrease their intensity. One of the biggest impacts that would go without analysis would be how transportation choices would be altered or how many jobs or housing units would be deficit. Therefore, staff has proposed more robust categories for changes to activity centers that would still allow for specific plans to clarify the parcel-level refinement and compatibility issue, and would allow limited flexibility in moving the commercial core (within ½ mile) without additional procedural requirements.

### **Corridors**

The RLUTP did not consider transportation corridors as a land use category. The current Regional Plan recognizes that commercial corridors support neighborhoods and activity centers and designates them a place type. The original content of the Regional Plan was unclear about which map should be used to identify corridors but this was corrected by the major plan amendment processed last year. The amendment also added many corridors throughout the City to comply with Arizona State law about the content of the General Plan. This both clarified and expanded the breadth of the major plan amendment categories in the current Regional Plan beyond their original intent.

## **Memo – Planning and Zoning Commission**

May 11, 2016 – Citizen Review Session for Chapter 3 Minor Regional Plan Amendment

The categories pertaining to corridors and Great Streets are themselves problematic because they place limitations on expansion of the transportation that may be necessary to fully support the Future Growth Illustration. State law requires that the General Plan have a map that shows all collectors and arterials, but the road network shown on Map 25 (Road Network Illustration) is not complete enough to meet the City's Engineering Standards in the areas that may see future development. Subdivision plats do not require a Regional Plan analysis except for dedications to the City, which makes this requirement difficult to implement. The category for commercial activities outside of activity centers and along corridors is also problematic because it is an amendment that does not actually amend any map in the Regional Plan. It is more appropriate when a map or text does not need to be amended that the proposal address concerns such as this in the analysis of plan compliance.

An analysis of the City's commercial corridors (Access, Circulation, and Freeway) shows that 95% of the parcels within a half block are already not zoned Highway Commercial or Community Commercial, which both allow mixed-use buildings in the City of Flagstaff. A few exceptions are the northeast corner of Downtown, S. Beaver St. and San Francisco St. (Southside), Mt. Elden Hills and Ft. Valley Rd. All of these locations, except for Ft. Valley Road, did not originally require major plan amendments but were added to Map 25 as part of the Major Plan amendment last year. Both Downtown and the Southside neighborhood, are in the Urban Area Type that allow commercial uses along corridors. Mt Elden Hills is managed by restrictive covenants and a Homeowner's Association. Ft. Valley Road has congestion issues that make it an unlikely place to increase density and it has widely separated activity centers that are intended to be the areas of concentrated growth. Therefore, removing categories related to corridors would be unlikely to result in a different pattern or intensity of commercial and mixed use development.

### **Special Districts**

All changes to Special Districts are considered minor in the current Regional Plan and the land use category is not comparable to any RLUTP category. Special Districts are mixed use employment centers that have a campus-like setting, primarily NAU, Lowell Observatory and Flagstaff Medical Center. This category was created to capture locations that did not quite fit the Employment area type, and it was not intended that this category would be widely used. Staff believed that new districts could be proposed as a way of avoiding compliance with Regional Plan goals and policies since there are no goals for Special Districts. Likewise, reducing the size of a Special District could hurt the ability of a major employer to be retained and to grow.

### **Goals and Policies**

Under RLUTP and the Regional Plan, all text amendments were minor. However, reviewing the potential categories with former members of the CAC brought forward the concern about how much time had been spent crafting the content of these policies and their importance to the Regional Plan. The category would not prevent modifications to the goals and policies but would prevent them from being deleted or added without substantial public process.

This category also clarifies that only the City (staff, Council, Commissions) can recommend changes to goals and policies. This is actually already the case because of who would be able to get standing to recommend a change but the footnote makes this clearer. A resident did approach the front counter this year with a request to change language in the plan that they

## **Memo – Planning and Zoning Commission**

May 11, 2016 – Citizen Review Session for Chapter 3 Minor Regional Plan Amendment

individually did not like, which would undermine the community's voice in shaping the content of the Regional Plan through ratification in 2014.

### **Changes proposed in Specific Plans**

The Urban Growth Boundary, Urban/Suburban/Rural, Activity Centers and Goals and Policies categories are all proposed to have footnotes that allow for amendments that are accompanied by a specific plan to be excluded from the timeline criteria of hearing all major plan amendments in a single annual hearing. The rationale for allowing this exception is that specific plans, typically take a year or more to develop and they must follow all the same procedural steps as a major plan amendment per Title 11. This ensures that the same level of public notification and involvement are required but allows more time to negotiate complicated, multi-property-owner issues or development master plans for large areas.

### **Clarifications regarding Minor Plan Amendments**

In the current Regional Plan, the table describing amendment criteria includes an incomplete list of possible amendments to the plan. This list has been confusing when an applicant has been proposing something that was not included in the table on current Page III-9. Since the State law requires that all changes that are not major are minor amendments, the proposed Chapter 3 has removed this column of the table and replaced it with a bulleted list providing some examples.

The proposal also clarifies the timing of amendments. Changes to background information and public infrastructure may occur without an action that can trigger a plan amendment. For instance, new Historic District could be designated by the State, or the Arizona Game and Fish Department could update their wildlife corridor data. Likewise, the City could realign a road or upgrade sewer lines in a neighborhood without any action that would require a plan amendment. The only changes that cannot be brought forward without plan compliance are rezoning and annexations applications.

Under the proposal, rezoning and annexation applicants would be required to pay the fee and submit an application for a plan amendment (major or minor, if part or all of their proposal requires an amendment to Maps 21 and 22 (Future Growth Illustration), or 24 (Activity Centers). With their application, they would update any other related maps in the Regional Plan, including Map 25 (Road Network Illustration). If the application complies with Maps 21, 22 and 24, but would result in changes to other maps, such as moving a historic resource, then they would not amend the Plan with their application. In this case, the analysis for Regional Plan compliance would disclose the action, and the minor plan amendment would be part of the annual update that the City will propose along with the Regional Plan Annual Report, starting in 2017.

The rationale for this is that all other maps in the Regional Plan were created to inform Map 21 and 22 (Future Growth Illustration), based on related sustainability, transportation, historic resources, utilities and natural resource preservation indicators. The basis for the location of activity centers and urban areas included these parameters and were calibrated to balance the trade-offs underlying the goals and policies in the plan. Therefore, a project which meets the criteria for its area-place type is a refinement of other maps in the Regional Plan, but falls within the expected range of variability for the document overall.

## **Changes related to Specific Plans**

Specific Plans are discussed on Pages III-8 and III-13 of the proposed Chapter 3. The current Regional Plan states:

*Over the past decade, the City of Flagstaff's RLUTP proposed the development of special study area plans to deal with unique community and neighborhood issues, including, for example, the Southside 2005 Plan and the La Plaza Vieja Neighborhood Plan (2011). These study area plans were developed in close coordination with local residents.*

***This new Flagstaff Regional Plan does not supersede these plans. They will remain in effect except for any provisions that may conflict with this new Plan, until such times as the plans are amended or repealed by the City Council.***

This statement is factually inaccurate, and has led to confusion on numerous occasions. The statement is false because:

- A study cannot supersede a Regional Plan ratified by voters.
- Neither the Southside Plan nor the La Plaza Vieja Plan were adopted specific plans at the time, and therefore, these plans could not be used as part of the rationale for denying requests for rezoning.
- Specific Plans adopted by different mechanisms have different legal standing in relation to the Zoning Code and the Regional Plan.

Comments received about the draft replacement text made it clear that the first attempt to clarify these distinctions was too detailed and confusing. Staff proposes a short and more concise version of the distinctions surrounding specific plan adoption in the final draft. Some commenters preferred the existing language but leaving in a false statement would not make the status of plans different than they currently are treated. It would only lend itself to more confusion.

Another new concept in the proposed amendment is to exempt amendments that meet major plan amendment criteria proposed as part of a specific plan from calendar year and timing of hearing requirements, if they relate to Urban Growth Boundary, Area Types, Activity Centers, and Goals and Policies categories and follow the same notification and meeting procedures. Specific Plans typically take more than a year to develop and adopt and carefully look how the plan is implemented in a certain area. They are meant to resolve the trade-offs between plan goals and policies and prioritize them. In the process of doing this, an adjustment to land use or plan direction may be proposed that would apply to a specific area or City-wide. Staff believes that given this level of public involvement, a major plan amendment would be a duplication of effort in these cases.

## **Role of City Council**

On Page III-5, staff proposed edits to paragraph describing how the Council will use the Plan and generated numerous comments. The main purpose was to clarify that the Council does not review all development applications and that administrative applications do not have to consider the Regional Plan direction, only the standards and guidelines of the City Codes (Zoning,

## **Memo – Planning and Zoning Commission**

May 11, 2016 – Citizen Review Session for Chapter 3 Minor Regional Plan Amendment

Engineering, Wastewater, etc.). The changes proposed between draft and final are intended to address public concerns while correcting the factual errors in the original paragraph.

### **Conclusions**

Pursuing the strategy endorsed by the City Council in June 2015 and the Planning and Zoning Commission’s recommendation on October 2015, staff presents this amendment to Chapter 3 of the Flagstaff Regional Plan for the May 11<sup>th</sup> Citizen’s Review Session. Staff believes that these changes will reduce confusion and improve the service we provide to applicants, other City staff and the public.

If you have questions, or require clarification on the contents of this memorandum, please contact Sara Dechter, AICP, Comprehensive Planning Manager at [sdechter@flagstaffaz.gov](mailto:sdechter@flagstaffaz.gov) or (928) 213-2631.

**Attachment A.** Proposed Changes to Chapter 3 of the Regional Plan – Track Changes

**Attachment B.** Proposed Changes to Chapter 3 of the Regional Plan – Final

**Attachment C.** Flow chart of decision logic behind current and proposed major plan amendment categories

**Attachment D.** Public Participation Plan

**Attachment E.** Record of Proceeding for Open House

**Attachment F.** Response to Comments Received During 30 Day Review