

Statement of Legal Action

**City of Sedona
Citizens Steering Committee for
Sedona Community Plan Update
Vultee Conference Room, Sedona City Hall, Sedona, AZ
Tuesday, January 18, 2011 - 3:00 p.m.**

1. Verification of Notice, Call to Order, and Roll Call.

Chairman Eaton called the meeting to order at 3:01 p.m.

Committee Members Present: Chairman James Eaton, Vice Chairman Jon Thompson and Committee Members Mike Bower, Angela LeFevre, Barbara Litrell, Elemer Magaziner, Gerhard Mayer, Michael Steinhart and Jon Thompson. Judith Reddington and John Sather participated telephonically and Alex Gillon was excused.

Staff Present: Mike Raber and Donna Puckett

2. Discussion/consensus on draft scope for the Citizens Steering Committee for the Sedona Community Plan Update. (15 minutes)

Mike Raber:

- Draft scope was revised based on previous discussions with the Planning & Zoning Commission and City Council in a joint meeting.
- A key issue is to better describe the relationship between the Citizens Steering Committee and the Planning & Zoning Commission, to make it clear that the two bodies will work together to oversee the process.
- Seven additional points were included to make it clear how we would try to work together to maintain a high level of collaboration.
- After the Committee's review, this document will be taken to the Planning Commission, but staff didn't think there were any additional major process issues that would affect this scope.

Committee Discussion:

- Elemer Magaziner asked why the Plan update process needs a Citizens Steering Committee and his answer was to help the Planning & Zoning Commission to draft a plan document that does two things. 1) It addresses the information from everyone that should have a say in the update, and 2) It is useful and compelling for all audiences.
- He almost saw the Committee as a subcommittee of the Planning & Zoning Commission; we're here to help ensure that everybody has input that should and to create a super document.
- Mike Raber noted that it might be good to have a purpose statement, which we don't have right now.
- Elemer Magaziner was asked what "compelling" means and he explained that it isn't just 10,000 words; people can see it holistically right away and get interested in it. "User-friendly" is part of "compelling" with a lot of graphics and pictures, and it is easy to read.
- Barbara Litrell and Mike Bower pointed out that the verbiage is included in different places in the existing draft scope and Elemer explained that he tried to pull some of the language together. Mike Bower pointed out that Elemer is suggesting moving a sentence from #6 and adding it to the first sentence.
- Elemer agreed that he didn't add anything and noted that asking a question is a powerful way to focus people.
- Vice Chairman Thompson suggested leaving it in both places.
- Mike Raber asked about working in that everyone who wants has a say and Barbara Litrell suggested saying, "Update the Community Plan by conducting public hearings on the draft plan, so that anyone who should have a say has a say, and then making a formal

recommendation to the City Council"; however, Elemer pointed out that says that the Planning & Zoning Commission is doing that.

- Mike indicated that a sentence could be added and he will look at those two ideas; it seems that we have agreed to put the one statement upfront, and he will look at the intro statement to see if there is a way to emphasize everyone having a say.
- Chairman Eaton noted that the one statement is to be left at the end also and asked if there is consensus today that we are in agreement and will leave it in Mike's hands to get the exact words and send it on to P&Z.
- Vice Chairman Thompson indicated that more important than everyone gets their say is that everyone be heard.
- Angela LeFevre noted the list of potential participant groups was removed and Chairman Eaton explained that the problem with a list is that someone is always going to be missing and Mike Raber explained that the Working Teams would look at that in more depth.
- John Sather was in agreement and preferred that Mike do the wordsmithing.
- Judith Reddington also agreed and indicated that it is understandable.
- Chairman Eaton indicated we shouldn't try to stuff more words into it, if the meaning is here and clear, and he thinks there is consensus that the Committee has approved this draft subject to Mike's fine-tuning and he can pass it on to P&Z.
- Mike Raber explained it will ultimately go to the City Council and they may have items to address.

No legal action was taken.

3. Discussion/consensus on the Sedona Community planning process. (85 minutes)

Mike Raber:

- Explained this was revised based on the last meeting and we heard the need to emphasize community values early in the process, so staff attempted to do that, and Elemer Magaziner provided a good illustration that says a lot. Chairman Eaton described the illustration as looking at community values as a keystone that keeps citizens on one side and government on the other side from collapsing.
- Regarding the spreadsheet, Mike explained there were problems lining up some of the items in trying to create a matrix. The far left is the formation of the working teams and everything behind that, so it has nothing to do with the matrix, but is included on the sheet.
- Essentially, we have Outcomes, Information Products, Outreach Purpose, Potential Outreach Methods & Tools and Completion Criteria on the left side of the matrix. The top of the matrix are the different phases, possibly calling them what we have described before.
- If we can agree on the Outcomes and Outreach Purpose, and then work on the remaining things in the Working Teams that would be a big accomplishment.
- The Outcomes are the numbered items, and under "Where are we now?", it is a little out of order, and he drew a red line to divide the Outcomes from the Information Products, but it didn't line up.
- On the Information Products are the details needed to reach those Outcomes and that will require some work with the Working Teams, and then on the Outreach Purpose, it is the numbered items that are the purposes behind each of those outreach efforts in the different phases.
- As we evolve through the process, we will get a better handle on Completion Criteria through our Working Teams discussions, what says we are done with that section and moving to the next.
- In "Where are we now?" and "How do we like it?", the Outcomes are education and awareness, and the other Outcome are what are the Community Values, the perceptions, ideas, issues and solutions, and that is staff's interpretation of what the Committee has been saying. In addition to putting some education out to the community, we are trying to get some feedback on Community Values and that is the addition of the other question.
- We added a lot of things in Information, but we can focus on that through the Working Teams.

- The Outreach Purpose would be education and informal discussion; what is the community like, what does the community dislike? That is why we are trying to get at through the outreach, and the methods & tools will be another detail that our Working Teams can look at
- That gives a sense of the first phase, and then under "What Could We Be?" What is Possible? The Outcomes are understanding Community Values and determining the values and needs that aren't met. Develop the preliminary goals and principles, and then develop alternative futures and looking at those alternatives from the standpoint of what we know about the community's values.
- The Outreach Purpose would be to have the community involved in creating scenarios and those alternatives, and an ongoing outreach on the values, goals, needs and guiding principles.
- On "What do we want to be?", the Outcomes would be reviewing the preferences and getting feedback on the alternatives, refining those alternatives into a common vision, and getting consensus on that. The community outreach is centered on getting input on a common vision and the outreach on that common vision, and then consensus.
- The last columns on "This is where we are going?" and "How we get there?" is compiling the draft plan, evaluating its usability and creating an implementation strategy, and then testing that to ensure it is practical and realistic, and the Outreach Purpose is education on common vision, the public hearing schedule and conveying the reality of the implementation process.
- "Do we all agree?" is the public hearing phase and "Do we all approve?" is the election phase.
- Mike explained that staff didn't have time to incorporate Mike Bower's idea of a flowchart, but staff will try to do that for the next meeting.
- Mike indicated he didn't think there would be feedback loops between the different phases; there will be loops within each of the phases for who we are getting the information to, where it is going, how many times we are going to go through the process, how many times we need to retest goals, etc., but he didn't get the sense that it was actually between the phases as much as the need to describe what is going on within each one with a flowchart.
- Mike indicated he would feel good if we get consensus on the key areas that the Outcomes and Outreach Purposes, and then leave the details to the Working Teams, and they can bring it back to the Steering Committee.

Committee Discussion:

- Chairman Eaton asked if approved, would the document be revised so everybody gets a clean copy and Mike indicated yes; it would be helpful if we understand where we have agreement and we might want to produce a simpler chart with the key points of agreement.
- Vice Chairman Thompson indicated that under "What could we be", understanding community values and needs, it seems like part of that should be in the phase before that. He can see reasons for having it in both places.
- Mike Raber explained it is actually in the earlier phase; it is out of order.
- Vice Chairman Thompson indicated if Phase 1 is providing information to the community about whatever is going on and it is more of a listening thing for the community, then it belongs where it is, but if we want Phase 2 to be a robust brainstorming session on what is possible, he is concerned that spending time on our common values, etc., will detract from that and set a tone of needing to get agreement, as opposed to opening up and giving us all you have got.
- Mike Raber explained that in the next phase we may test what we have heard. As we go through the process, we need to retest what we think the community's values are all the time.
- Mike Bower agreed that to have a robust process of creating visions with the community's scenarios is the meat of the matter and the work could be broken into subcategories, once we get there. What you just said goes back to there not being loops that go back and forth between these, because you just said that maybe there are, in that we need to test that. The whole reason for creating this process is that there are interconnected loops and that is why he thought the other format would help visualize that, but he is curious about how the rest of the Committee feels about the format of the planning process. We will have to communicate that process to each other and to the Commissions and Council, and ideally to the citizens. He personally sees the need to modify it a lot. Outcomes, as the first thing we do, and Outreach Purpose are good to know, but he is not sure they are the overarching organizational

categories. It is worth spending time on, but from reading things on the Internet, most people don't try to shortcut this, although we need to get something going, and it is possible to modify it as we go.

- Elemer Magaziner indicated that after studying it, he sent Mike Raber a concept diagram. The handicap of the matrix is that it is trying to play a lot of roles at the same time. It is trying to be a Gantt chart, pert chart, etc., but maybe we can express it in different ways. Once he did the concept chart, he was able to understand Mike's flowchart easily. Different presentations and ways of looking at it would help, because the matrix can't handle all of the different ways of looking at this thing. He also doesn't think these phases are going to go in order; the first phase will get started, then we will get into a little of the second one, but the first one will keep sputtering along for a while, and that is where all of the verification comes in, so it isn't like we are done with it and move on to the next.
- Chairman Eaton noted that we can't answer item 4 in the first column until March 1st; however, Mike Raber explained that we may have enough to get a bottom-line, and he senses the need to get this right.
- Gerhard Mayer indicated he would do Phase 3 first -- "where he wants to be", and then look at what he has got and how he is going to get there; that is a different approach and doesn't fit this matrix. We all have dreams and those shouldn't be suppressed.
- Chairman Eaton indicated that he looks at this as a guideline; not a law, and it is going to develop as it goes along. Elemer Magaziner added that Mike's flowchart has ideas and dreams at the beginning too.
- Barbara Litrell indicated that her initial reaction was that we needed to do "where we are" first, but that could be an exciting thing to do first, because it isn't in reference to anything, but you are pulling out ideas, concepts, etc., and it is uninhibited when you do it that way.
- Chairman Eaton added that he would bet more than half of the people don't know where we are, and some people like where we are and don't want us to mess with it.
- Gerhard Mayer indicated small communities in Australia and Europe, plus a university in North Carolina did studies, and the first thing is just some bullet points; on his second page he has some outreach ideas.
- Vice Chairman Thompson indicated that what Gerhard Mayer described sounds more like the second phase, because the third phase has already gotten our individual dreams and ideas from a brainstorming thing, and the next one is how we pull all of it together, so we are only one out of sequence.
- Mike Raber indicated that part of "what is possible" is actually going on a little in the first phase, because it is an education phase about things that are possible, but even ahead of that, he was hearing the need to ensure people understood what we look like and how we got here and what the plan is all about. Maybe we collapse those into part of the same phase and not make that such a separate piece. The education about who we are and where we have come from is coupled with what we could be.
- Gerhard Mayer indicated those are given facts and we can't change them; however Mike Raber pointed out that a lot of people don't understand what that is. We may be expressing the same thing differently, and the key is to get to where we are expressing them the same way.
- Chairman Eaton indicated that we might need an element of "how did we get here" the first time we go to the public.
- Vice Chairman Thompson indicated we need to think of the first phase much quicker; we will provide some information, now we want to hear from you and hear what your ideas are about what we could be. Providing that information can be stimulating too. There was a link to a presentation made by Sony and it was a multi-media kick-off that said if you are one in a million in China there are 133,000 people just like you. It was an interesting way of describing the world the way it is today, and if we presented something in an exciting way that gets people thinking more broadly about where we are, we have accomplished fairly quickly what is in Phase 1. We have to welcome them for coming and explain that we're doing a Community Plan and this is what it is, and there is a chart or two for that, but then something like the Sony presentation would get their juices going, and then we would go into what their dreams are.

- Angela LeFevre indicated that we also have to explain why we are doing this, and it actually does both, "why" alludes to what a Community Plan is. We have to do it because we are supposed to do it, but obviously the community wants more than that and unto that links what is a Community Plan, where we are going and what we want in the future.
- John Sather indicated he believes in the phases or questions in the order they are in. We cannot start this in a boring way and Phase 1 could be perceived as boring if we are dragging out maps, etc. When we did the first plan, we did this powerful slide show of a lot of exciting images around the world and said very little. It was the beginning of dreaming; it was a little like a movie trailer where they show the whole movie in a minute. Then, we took a rather quick and concise time to tell them that there are lots of dreams out there and we aren't trying to guide their mind. A lot may like everything the way it is, but we are going to do this exercise and here are the ground rules, i.e., our zoning, our boundaries, our existing and things that aren't built yet, and we go over that quickly. Everyone wants to get into the second one of what can we be, the fun stuff, before people start telling you it will cost too much or we can't do it. You get through the basics quick and then go to the fun stuff. Secondly, in looking at Mike's chart and understanding what Mike Bower put out, there has to be two versions; one is a very simplified version of this that may have two, three or four bullet points below each. Then, we may have six pages after that, that are only for the Committee, Council and P&Z, where each of these are detailed even more than Mike has, and we work on that as we refine each phase. Lastly, for the simplified public version there has to be a version of the schedule that shows these are the seven times they can interface and make their contribution, so it is real clear as opposed to just saying five months.
- Mike Bower agreed with the idea of several versions and that having some bullet points under the basic questions is enough of a view of the process for most people to feel comfortable that they are going to this meeting in the "what could we be" phase. We won't have to worry too much about the process once we get something. A lot of the energy is going toward how to best get the community involvement and where do the various ideas like the war room and newsletter plug-in, so he is looking at it as a tool to help us get busy with our community engagement charge, but there is also just the tool of leading a process that doesn't turn into a big train wreck, and the reason for doing a good process is that we flow through things in a way that keeps people coming back.

Note: The following minutes are taken from the Recording Secretary's notes of the meeting, because of a recording malfunction.

- Mike Bower then read a letter issued in 1990 as an example, and indicated that the same type of kick-off is needed to keep the energy going.
- Gerhard Mayer indicated he wrote of a similar use of technical tools to make it interesting, such as incorporating a competition and winning a prize and creating a uni-community and customizing it for the audience.
- Mike Bower indicated that Outcomes and Outreach Purpose tend to be the same thing and the actual planning process is missing. It's a good start, but he sketched a grid with a flow process and another matrix of items below. It needs to be clear, too many things are the same and Outcomes and Outreach Purpose may not be major items.
- Mike Raber agreed that staff would simplify it and bring it back, so the Committee can figure out the key points in the next meeting.
- John Sather suggested writing an introduction on each phase as a handout for the public. P&Z, the City Council and the Citizens Steering Committee would have the paragraphs and bullets. It could be a simple design saying what is needed from each phase and when people can give input.
- Judith Reddington added that if it can be simple, show people what can be achieved, what is possible, the building blocks and when they can participate. Planning the kick-off is very important.
- Barbara Litrell noted what we want to accomplish in the first phase -- educate and awareness and communicate community values, etc., and have a wow factor in each phase.

- Mike Raber indicated we seem to have consensus on the one key point and doing one big visioning-type meeting, and those are things that can be bullets on the list.
- Judith Reddington asked who did the slide show last time and John Sather indicated they did it and it was criticized as being overreaching.
- Elemer Magaziner noted the need to sort it out so it is clear. Simplify, present that purpose paragraph and get agreement on the direction. Then, Mike Bower's idea on how they relate together and flesh it out through the Working Teams on how they relate and who they relate to.
- Barbara Litrell asked about empowering Mike Raber to synthesize these and Mike Raber agreed that Outreach and Outcome Purpose could be the same and may be a bullet.
- Mike Bower noted that to go through public conversation and questions speaks to engagement.
- Elemer Magaziner indicated questions are critical, do we agree and approve? Examples were then given of things being approved without agreement.
- Mike Raber pointed out the goal is to understand the feel of the community for the community's vote.
- Mike Bower indicated that where we are now and what we could be could be one phase with goals, data, etc. The four questions seemed good, but might be revisited while sticking with the concept.
- Angela LeFevre indicated that why we are here should be in the first phase and be more than just "legally required"; Chairman Eaton asked the members to say why.
- The Committee members provided the following reasons for "why":
 - It is the framework for the future and we want input from the community to put it together.
 - As the neophyte, what is the Community Plan when the community is at buildout, not sure of the goal.
 - To open communication and have agreement by consensus on the community we are and to clarify goals.
 - It is a guide for the future land uses, open spaces, transportation, etc., and the basis is dynamic, because there are new people, ideas, technology and opportunities, and it looks at how to guide itself. To say that we're "almost builtout" is naïve, because there are places that could be brought to full use, torn down, etc., and opportunities for redevelopment like Harkins and Basha's, so it is a guide.
 - What we want the community to feel like isn't here today and we should look at the community as a dynamic entity, and the Community Plan helps set the goals and standards against which to measure actions.
 - An example was given of the residents in Harmony Hills and their neighborhood pride efforts to maintain their neighborhood.
 - To maintain our quality of life and guarantee it for future generations so they can enjoy Sedona's natural assets, etc.
 - It is really what and why; the Community Plan is not a thing, planning is an ongoing action, and it is used to argue for amendments. Now, not too many can get excited with the Community Plan. Developers want to be part of your visioning. The "why" is to develop better in the future.
 - Likes all of the comments, but there is a legal obligation and that is not a reason to apologize for, and that legal document extends beyond one or two elections. An example is Kennedy's 1961 address about landing a man on the moon within the decade, which was accomplished.
 - The key is dynamic, not static. Situations change and the Plan helps deal with that. If we are at builtout, it is then how to plan redevelopment
 - The Plan is a future guide, but the process of getting there and including the community is as important.
- Mike Raber indicated staff can simplify the matrix and bring it back for the Committee to discuss and fill out to take it to the next level, and he will include the question about "Why".

No legal action was taken.

4. Discussion regarding staff working teams comprised of committee members and Public Participation (and engagement) procedures. (15 minutes)

Mike Raber:

- Indicated that the Working Teams were put together last week with a brief description, and we have the following teams:
 - Information and Organization - for public outreach and feedback addressing "What are we saying and what are they saying?"
 - Coordination and Roles - to cover, "Who are we saying it to?", and the products needed from each phase.
 - Public Outreach - addressing "How do we get it?" and the methods for providing information and receiving feedback for each phase.
 - Budget Needs - having a flexible budget, which depends on the City Council, but we know the past costs. The separation by fiscal year is important for staff; for example, there is money budgeted to July, so we are mainly looking at the budget for the next fiscal year.
- The short-term would involve the Coordination and Roles and the Public Outreach Working Teams, for example, addressing the relationships between groups and some method for public outreach.
- Other Commissions want to go to the community to update their elements, but this Committee needs to lead the public process.
- Mike asked if any Committee members had concerns about their assigned Working Team and there were no concerns expressed.

No legal action was taken.

5. Discussion regarding future meeting dates and agenda items (5 minutes):

Tuesday, February 1, 2011 – 3:00 p.m.

Tuesday, February 15, 2011 – 3:00 p.m.

Mike Raber referenced prior discussions about Committee members sharing their Sedona visions and thought perhaps a couple of members could start presenting those at each meeting.

Mike also mentioned Public Outreach details and procedures, and the Chairman referenced work done by a P&Z Working Team. Mike Raber indicated he would see what they have.

Gerhard Mayer indicated that he may be gone February 1st, and asked if the Working Teams should set their own times to meet. Mike Raber explained that staff would organize their meeting times.

Chairman Eaton noted that the March meeting dates are the same as the February meeting dates; March 1st and 15th.

The meeting ended at 4:55 p.m.

I certify that the above is a true and correct summary of the meeting of the Citizens Steering Committee held on January 18, 2011.

Donna A. S. Puckett, *Recording Secretary*

Date