

**Summary Minutes
City Of Sedona
Citizens Steering Committee Meeting -
Sedona Community Plan Update
Vultee Conference Room, Sedona City Hall, Sedona, AZ
Tuesday, May 24, 2010 – 3:00 p.m.**

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

Chairman Eaton called the meeting to order at 3:03 p.m.

Committee Members Present: Chairman Jim Eaton, Vice Chairman Jon Thompson and Committee Members Mike Bower - arrived at 3:10 p.m., Angela LeFevre, Marty Losoff, Barbara Litrell - arrived at 3:07 p.m., Elemer Magaziner, Judy Reddington, and John Sather - called in at 3:14 p.m. Gerhard Mayer was excused.

Staff Present: Kathy Levin, John O'Brien, Donna Puckett and Mike Raber

2. Announcements from staff and committee.

Mike Raber announced that the business cards have an incorrect slash between "planning" and "update". It should be all one word without a slash, so you might want to block that out. Additionally, Kathy is going to explain where we are with the social media; there are a couple of things that weren't quite what the Committee wanted.

Kathy Levin referenced a meeting with the City Attorney, head of the IT Department, Assistant City Manager and the Communications Director that followed a memo received from the Assistant City Manager that pointed out her concerns about moving forward with a social media policy that wasn't all-inclusive and how it would be utilized and managed for records retention and Open Meeting Laws. Vice Chairman Thompson will address two sticking points, and we are waiting to see if this will be discussed a little more in the City Council's retreat, but it will come back to the Committee when there is more to report.

Vice Chairman Thompson explained that the good news was that they moved very quickly on this item, but there were two fairly significant points that he felt were different than what we needed. They are going forward with the plans they have, to try to get something going forward for us, and as soon as that is approved, we will add that to our agenda and discuss how we want to respond to that, because there could be different ways in which we do or don't want to participate in certain parts of it, but we'll save that discussion for when the time comes.

Note: Barbara Litrell joined the meeting at this time.

3. Public comment regarding the update of the Sedona Community Plan – limit of three minutes per person. (10 minutes for items 1-3)

Chairman Eaton opened the public comment period and having no requests to speak, closed the public comment period.

4. Approval of minutes for the following meeting: Tuesday, May 3, 2011.

The Chairman asked if there was a motion to approve the minutes of May 3rd.

MOTION: Barbara Litrell so moved. Elemer Magaziner seconded the motion. VOTE: Motion carried seven (7) for and zero (0) opposed. (Bower and Sather not present, Mayer excused)

Note: Mike Bower joined the meeting at this time.

5. Discussion regarding the May 19 and May 21, 2011 community meetings. (20 minutes 3:10 – 3:30 p.m.)

Mike Raber referenced an email from Tom O'Halleran that said some very good things about the program, and some others sent very positive comments as well. Gene Snyder, Anne Leap, Nancy Dunst and others were very complimentary about the program; they were excited about it and thought it was well done.

There weren't too many things we didn't do to get the word out, but we ended up not having a community room, and he doesn't believe we did any of the Public Service Announcements. We didn't do the big signs, posters and banners across the highway, but we did do a lot of other things and he thinks the word is out there, but he will leave it at that. We did actually get on NPR on Friday, but they didn't interview him. The newsletter seemed to be the big thing that drew everybody, and that was followed closely by the email, so that is growing and will probably surpass the newsletter at some point.

Chairman Eaton suggested another email blast before the June 30th program, and he hopes that everybody does send that to everybody they know, because that is more effective than any paid ad and probably more effective than a story in the media. The Chairman indicated he was kind of disappointed in the number of people that turned out; he doesn't think it was a shortcoming in our advanced notice, but people have a tendency to think it is another boring City meeting, etc., and he thinks we demonstrated to the people there that this Committee is going to do things a little differently. The way Masters Bower and Sather ran the important part of the program was outstanding. It showed people a lot of possibilities and things to stimulate their thinking, and if there were some things that people didn't like, that also stimulates the thinking. He hopes we can do as good of a job on the next one and he believes we can. He also believes we gained some credibility. The Chairman then asked for the Committee's impressions about things that could have been done better, etc.

Judith Reddington indicated that she isn't sure about the notices we sent, but in the first meeting, she had mentioned what great focus groups the young people in her family were, because they are out in the professional community, and she found it very positive that there was feedback from that group saying that they didn't know it was going to be such a great meeting. They had heard it was a really great meeting, and they thought it was going to be just another City meeting where they would just sit and listen, so she guesses that is a positive and a negative, but it gives us some direction about how we might promote the opportunity in the future. She always judges a meeting by what we expect people to take away from it and whether or not we met those goals, and she thinks we did. People left energized and willing to come back again and participate, and we looked really good.

Note: John Sather telephonically joined the meeting at this time.

Marty Losoff indicated he thinks everyone was extremely impressed, so just a couple of minor constructive criticisms -- first everyone, to a person, was impressed, but he did hear both Thursday night and Saturday that it took too long to get to the good part, being John and Mike, and the interaction with the audience. People wanted more of that, but they enjoyed the presentation. The first part they were kind of okay, this is nice, but where are we going; they liked the second part a whole lot. The people he talked to didn't come because they felt it was just another meeting, and if you are going to talk about something substantial, they will come, but to sit and listen -- they were kind of apprehensive. Even after they heard how good it was, they still said they didn't want to be bothered by coming to just listen -- they want something specific, which will get into agenda item 6 later possibly. Overall, it was well done and better than he had anticipated. He would like to have seen more people there, but he doesn't think we could have done any more to attract people; he was surprised at how many people knew we were having the meeting. He would be concerned if the same people showed up to the following meetings. Thursday night's audience was a lot of us, our spouses, relatives, etc., but Saturday's audience was very diverse, and as they were walking

out, people were saying that they wished they could stay to hear what other people were saying, but they couldn't stay. He would just tighten it up a little bit, save more time for the interaction and think about more issue specifics.

Chairman Eaton pointed out that the objective of these two programs were to show them what the Community Plan is about and give them a taste of how the public participation is going to go, and we did that. If they liked that part, they are going to love June 30th, because it will be more of that, and we need to get that word out. We have demonstrated that it is not going to be a bunch of talking heads staying behind a dais.

Vice Chairman Thompson indicated that any criticism would be very minor; he agrees that the best part was when John Sather and Mike Bower started their presentation and the discussion afterward, but he doesn't know that he would change the first part, because that set a tone for receptiveness that may have contributed to those things going positively. The only thing we should be careful to do in the future is have at the very beginning something that says what is going to happen for the whole time. We went from one thing to the next, and Mike Raber wasn't introduced either time, so we just need to tell them what we are going to tell them, and then tell them what we told them. It would have been helpful, for people to pace what was going on. Other than that, he thought it went fine and he would do it the same way again.

John Sather indicated that he can't criticize anything; from the comments he has gotten, there have been a lot of nice compliments about what he and Mike did, but his wife said that we all performed like a very well oiled team, and everybody did a terrific job, so he felt it was fun to be with a group of people that all had very diverse parts and all played them well. What Vice Chairman Thompson said is really strong, with the whole idea of telling them, and he caught on to that on Saturday, but we didn't do that enough. One other thing is that we demonstrated that we gave a different kind of meeting than what normal City meetings are, and we probably need to just ramp up that part even more, because that is what people got excited about. It was a good beginning and we have a long way to go. He is not embarrassed at all about the number of people that came; we started a small tribe of people who are trying to promote the whole thing.

Mike Bower indicated that his son forwarded him something that somebody posted on his Facebook page, and it was about our meeting, and it came from his friend who is a water harvesting aficionado somewhere in Phoenix, but somebody sent the friend something about Sedona, who sent it to his son, who forwarded it to him, and it was from John Neville all about our meeting, so stuff is flying around out there that is completely unknown to us, and it was a very positive review of Thursday's meeting. Additionally for him, he went into a lot of self-evaluation about what he learned from the meeting and in the build-up to it, and in our dialogue together; he was able to coalesce several things. Why do we continue to revisit planning; he probably could have faked an answer to that previously, but now he knows four really strong reasons: changing demographics, changing world issues, soft buildings or buildings that are going to change, including whole uses, and there is always room for improvement. In addition to those, he kept rehashing a lot of the purposes, and personally, he felt he personally had made a lot of focused growth and he is hoping the rest of the Committee had a similar internal reaction.

Barbara Litrell indicated it was terrific and the meeting went really well; she liked a high level of idea discussion, when we got into the public part of it. There were definitely a lot of the usual people on both days that get active in Sedona, but there were also some new faces; people who aren't usually or haven't most recently been very active, so she thought that was very positive. She thought the mix was terrific and the reason that, by the time we got to Mike Bower and John Sather, and they were so terrific in that part, was because of what preceded it. It gave the history and inspiration to be ready for that kind of engagement, so she felt it really accomplished what it had to at that point. She also thinks that having Angela LeFevre and Elemer Magaziner speak and having people write their stuff was very engaging and people loved that, and it set a great tone, so we should consider a personal story each time. Ernie Strauch came out of the meeting on Thursday, and then walked his neighborhood telling people to come on Saturday. Additionally regarding Mike Bower and John

Sather, she was struck by their use of wonderful words; their choice of words was so peaceful. Words like coalescing, embracing; their words were just so positive and community-building that she learned a lot just from that and that is the tone we need to continue.

Angela LeFevre expressed agreement with what everybody had said and the "embracing", etc., is very important. The biggest thing that was said was the "us" part; it is not "you" and "them", it is "us", and that engaged everybody, and they felt we were sincerely opening up and wanting everybody to participate. She has been to a lot of meetings and she was amazed that how willing people were to share their stories and give their ideas. It was a little slow in the beginning, but not really, and then at the end, you couldn't stop them and that was great. She was also glad that you kept going a little longer, because it was worthwhile, and that was why it was so successful; they felt people were really being asked to participate and that word is getting out. The only negative was that while we felt we had a nice cross section, she did get a comment during an OLLIE meeting where they were talking about the Hispanic participation in the community, and she gave a little talk about the Community Plan, and one guy said there was nobody from the Hispanic community, so that was sad and we have to work on that. There might be a language issue, but it is something we need to encourage. Obviously, we're not expecting younger people a lot, but somebody also mentioned the older people, and she would like to see more, because they are a big part of our society, and that is going to be outreach and the ability to focus on different groups better. People have this view of Community Plans and Council activities, but the word is going to get around that this is something totally different, so she thought it was very well done and opened people's minds.

Chairman Eaton commented that we had nineteen Sedona Forums, and at every one of them, one of the shortcomings was, and we tried hard to get a cross section of the community and picked groups to invite to get that cross section, but we always had a tough time getting younger people and business people there, because they are young and busy. We need to see what we can do about that; we need to get younger people, because we are talking about their future and they need to be part of it.

Elemer Magaziner indicated it was an incredible community-building exercise, so he was like a kid in a candy store; it was like at the Mitzvah, he had the same thing. Whenever you get a bunch of people together working on a common purpose, you can't lose. His feeling was that we started something, and he isn't bothered by the fact we had 65 one day and 85 the next. The word is getting out and we set a precedent that is incredibly different, and the word is going to spread, because people hear about things that are new, fresh and different. The thing about the Hispanics or young people not being there is what he tries to stress with his community viewpoints. He talked with the Sedona Charter School and they want to make this project part of their curriculum next year, so we will at least have one group of people that will do it, and Natalia, at OLLIE, could spearhead that. Also, there were two people from the New Age community on Saturday who both spoke, but they were scared to death to speak, so it is an important thing for all of us to know, because they are afraid that they are going to be ridiculed. Actually, when one of the women was trying to speak, there were comments from a man, who was essentially saying that she was wrong, so there is a hitch there, but it is easy to incorporate them, and the Creative Life Center has offered their facilities for free to have a meeting with those people, so they wouldn't be afraid to speak their minds. He speaks their language, because he only told half of his personal story, because he felt other things that were much in line with the way they feel. We can create SIGs (Special Interest Groups) for young people, Hispanics, New Age community, seniors, etc. He is very excited and incredibly energized.

6. Discussion/possible action regarding community planning process and future public outreach events. (50 minutes 3:30 – 4:20 p.m.)

Mike Raber indicated there are several big picture items that we need to get closure on for the June 30th meeting. The Committee needs to agree to let staff and the Working Teams handle the marketing, logistics and presentation program details, and the Committee needs to focus on what we are trying to accomplish on the 30th and how that relates to the next steps in July, so he sees

the next meeting on June 7th really talking more about beyond the June 30th meeting and where that is leading.

We want to try to package the video/audio program from the May meetings to create something on the website or something people can check out later, because it would be helpful in engaging people outside of meetings. Today, we want to get closure on the framework for June 30th and a possible guest speaker. We also have to finalize the general components for the next newsletter in about a week, and before we leave, he also wanted to talk about a potential couple of changes in our Working Teams that we have observed based on need.

Chairman Eaton asked the Committee members to tell what the one most important thing is that we want the June 30th meeting to achieve.

- Elemer Magaziner - collecting ideas for the Plan; most of it should be coming our way.
- Angela LeFevre - getting input, better ways of reaching out, how to put it all together.
- Barbara Litrell - try to go toward the values and goals of the people in our community; ideas can be part of it, but values and goals would be important to identify.
- Mike Bower - agreed with Barbara Litrell with the added complexity of the potential problem of trying to interrelate what we hear to what we've got, because the Plan is chocked full of goals and values. There is no sense in beating a dead horse or reinventing the wheel, but somehow if we can categorize or lump things in a way that gets people to understand more that they're in line with the existing values and goals or that they are launching into new territory would be the most informative thing we could do.
- John Sather - we need to basically build on what Barbara Litrell said, and then Mike Bower and define where the real work is. We shouldn't waste a lot of time restating or reaffirming goals and objectives that we know are just part of all of us. He would like to isolate the big areas that we all believe we ought to spend the most amount of time on, so that is really defining those goals and values, but also pushing aside the ones that would just be restating and reworking things that have been done through the years.
- Chairman Eaton - clarified that we are trying to identify what the most important things are that we want to go away from the June 30th meeting with, not how to conduct it.
- Vice Chairman Thompson - there are two things that would be good for us to discuss if we want to cover them or not. One is that we learned that there are a lot of people interested in the stuff on the cutting room floor, and it might be good to have some way to present them, if not on June 30th, in another meeting, that says here are some of the ideas from before, so tell us if you think they are good and rate them. Should we let them sit or should we bring them back? He also thinks it would be helpful to ask them to help us with the process, specifically, how would they like to participate in meetings going forward. We can describe the idea of the topic-based meetings and that we have gotten input about underserved communities that may need special outreach, and should we try to do both or meet by communities, HOAs, etc., or by topics. He would like to hear what the citizens say about that.
- Marty Losoff - issue-specific topics; we should come out of the meeting with specifics, whether it is values, big picture items, whatever -- some specific related issues.
- Judith Reddington - agreed with Marty Losoff, Barbara Litrell and Mike Bower, but it would be good to figure out a way for the next participants, and reflecting back to the list, etc., to start finding a clear path to how they can participate.

Chairman Eaton then asked what the second and third most important things are that we should go away with, and he clarified that the question was what we should gain from the meeting -- what is our goal for holding this meeting, not how we are going to do it or what we are going to put into it, but what is our objective that we want to gain from this meeting.

- Elemer Magaziner - agreed with Vice Chairman Thompson that we need to figure out how people want to participate. We should know how they would like to play a part.
- Angela LeFevre - we should make a big effort to hit people who didn't come before, especially Special Interest Groups, so we can see a wider picture. We have some insight from the comment cards, but we need to broaden that.

- Barbara Litrell - her second round would be specific issues, as far as what we want to identify at the next meeting. She then asked if we are going to discuss how to reach those people and the Chairman indicated yes.
- Mike Bower - it would be what we all like best about our town.
- John Sather - we have to find out what the biggest issues are that are on everybody's mind, and no one told us to do a meeting like we did, so he doesn't know that we are going to learn a lot. We kind of know what to do, so he wants to get into the big things we need to focus on that are on the citizens' mind.
- Vice Chairman Thompson - questioned if it was still a little too early to try to get issues out. It would be good to come away from June 30th knowing how to proceed with the rest of the input gathering, so we need to spend some time getting how they want to participate, giving them some ideas on how that might happen, and having them come up with their own ideas. He worries that we are going to miss key access somehow, if we don't spend some time on that.
- Marty Losoff - His second one would be specific issues by specific groups. We are trying to avoid the use of the word "constituents", but given the discussions in the meetings, we have to, and that would be the best way to get participation, as well as specific issues by various groups -- that is the most effective way we are going to get a good turnout and participation.
- Chairman Eaton noted that we were trying to avoid the word "stakeholders".
- Judith Reddington - liked Mike Bower's concept of what they like best, but it may be too early to have people start to sign-up for participating, to identify what committees, etc., they might like to volunteer for.
- Chairman Eaton - we need to hear more from the people, as we did in the second part of the previous programs, and have them identify what is on their minds, but in a way that gives us some positive forward direction. His regret was that the meeting kind of collapsed, because somebody said if you have to leave, we'll understand, so half of them left, and the other half wanted to talk forever, and then the last two or three were kind of negative, but we do need to make them more public issue-oriented and learn what issues the various parts of the public have on their minds.

Vice Chairman Thompson asked if the Committee is in agreement that the next meeting shouldn't be discussion-debate oriented. Chairman Eaton explained that we aren't there yet. Mike Raber added that he has an outline of the June 30th program; it isn't necessarily all tools, but more detailed about what the program might look like based on all of your comments. We also have some things about what could happen in July, in terms of planning and topically-based workshops, and there is a timeline interspersed on the other side of this.

Mike Raber then explained that we have heard in the past that the June meeting needs to be a way to introduce Elemer's point-of-view/comment system and that is going to be important for how we try to organize the feedback from the community, so it needs to be an integral part of the June 30th meeting. He doesn't know how that should be presented, maybe Elemer should facilitate that. One suggestion was that part of this meeting be a break-out exercise after explaining that process, and actually use it as an exercise to try to get to those different viewpoints, so those are a couple of things that might be very useful. We certainly can't do everything on the list, so we will have to decide what the program looks like. We also might want to have Barbara Litrell discuss how a guest speaker might fit into that.

Elemer Magaziner indicated that we shouldn't solicit ideas and issues before we solicit values, because issues have to be expressed in terms of values that are being ignored or violated, so he is pushing for June 30th to be for collecting values, and the matrix works for values as well as ideas. He would hate for us to start opening it up to specific ideas and issues, before we collect the values.

Marty Losoff indicated he would take a different point-of-view. Again, there is a lot of talking to the people and not getting feedback until the end. Mike Raber indicated that isn't necessarily true. Marty pointed out there is a guest speaker, a brief review, recap of May and comments, and

presentation. Mike Raber added that he also said that we weren't going to do all of those things. Marty referenced Lee Iacocca's book on management and gave the example of Iacocca wanting to put out a convertible and rather than taking six to ten months, he told his staff to go out and get a car and cut the top off, then for marketing, drive it around the block, copy oohs and ahs. Sometimes, we get caught up in process too much, and it is great to ask people how they want to participate, but he is not sure they are ready for that, because we don't have avenues for them yet, such as committees formed or focus groups set up. Ten people have already said they want to participate, so he thinks the meeting should really get to the issues. He doesn't know if people know values from issues; he has asked about their values and they say they want bike trails. If we talk specifics, we will get the values and he would rather go that way than the other way. People don't think of values; they think of what is important to them and it could be dog parks, and if you ask why dog parks, they say well I value family, etc.

Judith Reddington indicated it is not too early to start, even though they may not have specific names for the workshops, etc. We can still be planning that these things will exist and let the people know that they will be able to participate. She also doesn't think it is bad to start with a keynote speaker to get that meeting going, and these read like audience participation things to her.

Mike Raber indicated that he isn't sure that we are completely disparate on this value issues thing; it is still a way we can get that information. What Elemer is talking about is not trying to take all of that information and skip organizing values, as we do that internally, before getting to more detail.

Vice Chairman Thompson agreed that we need to address values and that we need to have a good sense of what the values are, but that doesn't mean that we have to ask, what are your values? We might say that we've had this first meeting and have a bunch of comments; we can pull out what we think the values are and put them up there and say we think these are the values we heard in May, but is there anything we are missing? That could take 15 minutes and we are done.

Barbara Litrell indicated that some of getting at the values is going to come from the kinds of questions we ask, and asking what are your values isn't necessarily going to get the answers we are looking for. Asking what you love about our town will help get to the values, so at the next meeting, we need to come up with the questions, but we also need to talk about Pat Beaty being invited. She was asked if she would be available, so she can share the details.

Angela LeFevre indicated that some people have expressed concern about how we pay for this, and she told them that we aren't going there yet, but that is something we may need to address. Chairman Eaton indicated that is a negative and for the purposes of the Community Plan that isn't something we should have to be concerned about. We also shouldn't be concerned about the Arizona State Legislature, Prop 207, etc., that comes after we produce a document that says what we want Sedona to be. Two or three of the last comments on Saturday were on the negative side and we don't want to hear that during this process.

Elemer Magaziner indicated that we do, but it doesn't have to be negative. When you have a long list of things to do and you want to figure out what to do first, second, etc., there are seven things that you need to consider and one of them is cost. The Chairman commented that is not our purview; the Council can worry about that. Elemer agreed that it can come after, but he doesn't think it has to be expressed negatively. If somebody really feels that an idea is extravagant, we can't just say, let's worry about that after, so when we have time, he would like to show you the seven things. One of them is cost and one is feasibility from a nuts and bolts point-of-view, one is the value of that thing to the community. There is a list of seven things that help us figure out what goes on top of the list, etc., so we can entertain those comments, but turn them around, so they aren't negative. Cost doesn't always have to come from the legislature; Mike Bower and John Sather talked about privately-owned land. Chairman Eaton pointed out that they talked about ways of doing it, not about what it is going to cost.

Mike Bower added that it is fine to talk about cost if you can swing it into implementation strategies, but for this next meeting, the issue is if people value personal money and not community money, then it is going to come up. If everybody wanted to be isolated and gated in and live unto their own and save their money and not share it, that would be some kind of a bizarre value and you would have to entertain that. He is interested in a guest speaker for sure, but he was thinking that we were heading toward a meeting that would be based on this chart and process that we have yet to fully learn. It would seem if Elemer could take us through 10 - 15 minutes and see how good he can bring out our values, we might feel a lot more relaxed or a little more freaked out. It probably isn't appropriate for this meeting, but it is a suggestion and it could have been a way of tackling this.

Chairman Eaton asked if the Committee wants a guest speaker. We will have a meeting that takes about 1½ hours, so do we want to spend one-third of it on a guest speaker and would a guest speaker be a draw?

Barbara Litrell mentioned Pat Beaty and Lattie Coor, who was the President of ASU, and explained that Lattie is now retired, but started the Center for the Arizona We Want, and they have tried to identify what is going on in the State, in terms of values and civic engagement and what people want, etc. They have done studies on what is going on in Arizona where the civic engagement is down near zero and people don't feel connected to their neighbors. They feel connected to Arizona; for example, if they felt attached to Sedona, but not to each other. Pat Beaty spoke at the Conference on Regionalism. She is a fabulous speaker with great energy and a good PowerPoint, and she would normally set a larger framework for this by talking about the values and thoughts of people throughout Arizona and how Arizona compares to the rest of the country. Where we are #49 in most things, it would only take 7% of a change in something to make us in the top ten, and that is the goal of the Center for the Arizona We Want. They are very involved in making these things happen, so they have been entertaining grant requests from communities and we had eight grant requests from the Verde Valley, for things to make the community better and address their goals, so she thought it might be helpful to see a bigger picture of Arizona from that Gallup Poll-type study about attitudes and how people feel about their community, their legislators, etc., and if we talk about the Arizona we want, the question is what is the Sedona we want, so they build on each other. Lattie Coor is a smart, knowledgeable person, but not quite as dynamic as Pat.

Chairman Eaton asked what the least amount of time is that she would need and Barbara Litrell indicated that 30 minutes would be a good time. The Chairman noted that is a long time, and when he looked through that PowerPoint, a person like that might draw more people to the meeting, but it would also be easy to tailor that story to Sedona, and we could do that rather than spend 30 minutes on an outsider.

Vice Chairman Thompson agreed; we should take from that what we can and do it ourselves. We talked about guest speakers that would be there to inspire or inform and we decided to go without a guest speaker last week, and we inspired and informed. We also made a point of saying that we are all citizens here and we didn't bring any outsiders to do this part of the work, so to have somebody come from the outside somehow undercuts that message. Barbara Litrell pointed out that we were talking about consultants; however, the Vice Chairman explained that he is talking about the image. He would also worry about confusion with the Sedona We Want program and what we are trying to do, because we want people to focus on what we are trying to do, and if you go to most of the cities in this state and ask what they want, they would be happy to take Sedona. We don't need someone saying what the rest of Arizona is trying to do to come up to our level.

Judith Reddington indicated that if our goal is to advance our understanding of the values; we have our own research with all of the discussion that took place in two meetings and the research of the project that Elemer started, so her question is if that would advance us in our own understanding of our values and goals better than a good study of our own research.

Barbara Litrell explained that she always looks at things as there is a lot more going on around the world than just in Sedona, and when you get a sense of what people are identifying as their values,

like the whole thing about attachment -- she doesn't know that we would have identified that concept the way they did, because of all of the research of the Center for the Arizona We Want. The Sedona we want is not to be used, that was just her reference to it. We have Sedona -- 2020 and Beyond, but she does see that it would. Judith Reddington asked if this is the right timing for it, because it seems a better time might be once we all have a better grip on our own research.

Barbara Litrell indicated she saw it as inspiration to help people think about their values. Judith Reddington noted that it could persuade people that those were the values, because everybody else is thinking that. Judith then indicated her second question is if we have enough to start pulling some specific values out. Elemer explained that he went to the Regionalization Forum and heard her speak, so he knows what message she brings across, but it reminds him of the same thing that Mike said a month or two ago about us doing a visioning exercise individually at all scales. Listening to her would be an exercise in not just looking at Sedona, but looking at Sedona in a larger context. All of her talk is about values, so it could have two advantages; it would be about values and context and those are valuable, however we can fold them in. He also agrees with Vice Chairman Thompson in should we have her speak to us and help us construct the message.

Marty Losoff indicated that he doesn't think the majority wants a speaker. Angela LeFevre indicated that Sedona is a unique place and most people have an idea of what they want, and they don't particularly need motivating. She would like to hear her, but she likes that kind of thing and a lot of people don't, so maybe we would be forcing something on people who have a different conception of why they are coming to the meeting. We don't want to alienate rather than motivate, but not having heard her, it is hard to say. She has the fear that people here tend to have very strong opinions as to what they want out of Sedona.

Mike Bower indicated he is interested in having a guest speaker. When he thinks about doing a value generation meeting, you need something to spark it up and spark people's thinking and short of doing another slide show, a guest speaker could be a great thing to do that. It is possible that if she could shrink her presentation down to 20 minutes, it could be valuable, because it gives us a great segue into what we are doing, so he is not opposed to it. The PowerPoint was meaningful to him. Ernie Strauch introduced him to it by asking, "What do you think about Arizona, if you had to rate it on a conservative to liberal scale, where do you think we would sit? Of all of the states, would we be first as the most conservative or last?" Mike indicated that he guessed between ten and seven as the most conservative state, and Ernie laughed and said we are right in the middle at 28, so the information can be really engaging. The point could be made that you have to be tolerant and listen to each other and you can't have preconceptions. If you think we'll never do it, because Arizona is too conservative, we might be on the brink of making some great strides in our state, but the goal should be to see if she is willing to come for a 15 or 20 minute show.

John Sather indicated that he understands Vice Chairman Thompson's comment, but just in how we insert that, like we want to embrace key people who come and speak. He knows about this program and he has the enthusiasm that Barbara Litrell does, and you don't want Lattie to be the speaker, so yes we should have the speaker and yes we should introduce her properly, as it relates to our show, and the other thing we should look for is speakers within our community who are of the stature; they could have some interesting things to say.

Note: John Sather telephonically left the meeting at 4:15 p.m.

Marty Losoff indicated that a half hour for a speaker is ridiculous. A half hour of Mike Bower and John Sather talking about great ideas and seven questions would be just as inspiring. He and others looked at the slide show and they said it is great, but so what, what is it going to do for us on June 30th. We talk a lot about values, but we are getting carried away with all of that. The Community wants to talk about issues, whether it relates to values or not. If we get too highfaluting about it, we are going to turn people off. We have a great momentum started and to continue that with the fourth bullet from the bottom, break into groups, ten great ideas, seven questions, etc., is substantial information we will get from the community.

Chairman Eaton agreed and indicated that we can't afford the time the guest speaker would take; she is not the Governor, so it wouldn't be that big a draw for the general community, probably for the people at our previous programs yes, but he doesn't think we can afford the time or that it is worth what this would accomplish for us in leading up to the public input part of the program, so he doesn't think it is worthwhile. He would much rather spend more time breaking into groups, probing some of these things and coming back and reporting to the full session on what the groups found and that is where he would spend most of the time.

Mike Raber asked Elemer Magaziner to say a few words, because he thinks it has to do with what he sees as a segue between this chart, that whole process and having the speaker. Elemer Magaziner explained that if she did speak shorter, the whole thing is about values, and he could use that as a perfect segue into us collecting values further. He could take the values she expressed and get a start, and then turn it over to the audience to go further, so he could take advantage of it. We don't want to just ask, "What are your values?", but if she has some specific things about the values in Arizona, that could be a perfect segue. As things come in, he could also show how we can organize them.

Mike Raber explained that a newsletter has to go out before we can meet again, so he needs direction on whether or not anything about a speaker could be stated in that newsletter without a potential conflict. Angela LeFevre pointed out that if we know it, we should try to highlight it, but we are very divided; she is right in the middle, but we should make a decision. Barbara Litrell added that she has to know if it is on her calendar, because she asked her if she would come up and she is holding it, so she has to get back with her.

Angela LeFevre indicated that Elemer is going to be very important in this meeting and if he feels that this works in well, and we have Mike Bower and John Sather gung ho about it, she respects these views, although she agrees with the others too.

Mike Raber noted that he is concerned about 30 minutes. Barbara Litrell indicated she would get with Mike tomorrow; however, the Chairman expressed concern that it might skew the results of the public input, because they might tend to go along in the same vein. Vice Chairman Thompson indicated that it might be a perfect segue, but we can do what she is doing as well as she can and we will get more out of the community if it is us doing it. We can learn from her presentation, set that up and lead into what Elemer is doing. Judith Reddington asked if there would be any value in using their material and Barbara Litrell indicated possibly. Chairman Eaton indicated that was his first thought. The Vice Chairman expressed that we are on a roll and should keep rolling.

Marty Losoff stated that if we are going to bring in an outside speaker, let's bring somebody that is going to be a wow!

In the interest of time, the Chairman suggested taking a vote.

VOTE: Chairman Eaton asked for all of those in favor of bringing in an outside speaker to raise their right hand. The Chairman announced the vote was split with three (3) for, three (3) opposed and two (2) abstentions. (Bower, Litrell and Magaziner for, Eaton, Losoff and Thompson opposed, LeFevre and Reddington abstained, John Sather was not present and Gerhard Mayer was excused)

Vice Chairman Thompson asked if there is a Working Team that is going to meet before we have to decide, and Mike Raber indicated yes. The Vice Chairman suggested that the Working Group decide and other Committee members agreed. The Chairman stated so let it be written, so let it be done.

Mike Raber indicated that the Information Working Team meeting is at 7:00 a.m. tomorrow morning and there is a Public Outreach Working Team meeting at 9:00 a.m.; the Coordination Working Team doesn't meet until June 2nd. An open discussion ensued about which Working Team should

make the decision and Vice Chairman Thompson suggested that the Information Team make the decision, because Elemer is on that team and he is critical, since it is going to have to segue into what he is doing. Angela LeFevre offered to change her vote; however, the Chairman noted that we are out of time.

Mike recapped that he is hearing that the majority wants us to pursue it, but we need to talk about it to see if there is some logistical things that might cause us to rethink that, and we will let Barbara Litrell know tomorrow, but if she comes, the presentation should be shortened to 20 minutes.

7. Discussion regarding future meeting dates and future agenda items. (5 minutes 4:20 – 4:25 p.m.) Tuesday, June 7, 2011 – 3:00 p.m.

The Chairman indicated the next meeting is on June 7th at 3:00 p.m.

8. Adjournment.

Chairman Eaton called for adjournment at 4:25 p.m., without objection.

I certify that the above is a true and correct summary of the meeting of the Citizens Steering Committee held on May 24, 2011.

Donna A. S. Puckett, *Recording Secretary*

Date