

Summary Minutes
City Of Sedona
Citizens Steering Committee Meeting -
Sedona Community Plan Update
Community Plan Room, 1725 West S.R. 89A, Suite D, Sedona, AZ
Tuesday, April 3, 2012 – 3:00 p.m.

- 1. Verification of Notice, Call to Order, and Roll Call. Members of the Citizens Steering Committee will attend either in person or by telephone, video or internet conferencing.**
Chairman Thompson called the meeting to order at 3:10 p.m.

Committee Members Present: Chairman Jon Thompson, Vice Chairman Rio Robson and Committee Members Mike Bower, Jim Eaton, Barbara Litrell - arrived at 3:12 p.m., Marty Losoff, Judy Reddington and John Sather - arrived at 3:11 p.m. Angela LeFevre, Elemer Magaziner and Gerhard Mayer were excused.

Staff Present: Kathy Levin, Donna Puckett and Mike Raber

- 2. Announcements from staff and committee.**

Mike Raber announced that he attended the Sustainability Commission's meeting regarding their concerns about not being involved enough in the Plan update, and they wanted more of a say in how the sustainability components in the Plan come together. We suggested that they could be a first review filter for the plan alternatives before it is sent out for general comment, and they were fine with that, but they wanted to let the Committee know that they want the Community Plan to holistically address sustainability issues, rather than being a standalone element. We acknowledged that, but explained that it was premature to know how that would come together, but they were in agreement to be a reviewing body for those first alternatives, although they wanted it really clear that they were very much in favor of having a holistic look for sustainability issues. Additionally, one other thing the Commission brought up that we can discuss in agenda item #6 is that they also didn't think that we should refer to these as plan alternatives. He explained that we aren't voting on each one as standalone items; we are taking the best parts of each, and he thinks that is why they didn't think they should be called alternatives. They felt that they weren't going to be a holistic representation of each bucket, so we can discuss if that is the right term.

John Sather indicated that he fundamentally disagrees that these aren't alternatives. When he first pitched this, these were clearly alternatives and if we take pieces from each let's just go down to creating one alternative. Chairman Thompson explained that discussion will be part of agenda item #6.

Mike then explained that the Commission thought maybe they were themes or priority focuses, and Chairman Thompson repeated that it will definitely be part of the discussion in agenda item #6. Marty Losoff stated that he wanted clarification as to where the Committee stands in terms of other Commissions saying that they like this or don't like that . . . Chairman Thompson interjected that would be more discussion and explained that we haven't done a really good job of this in the past and he is trying to keep announcements as announcements. In this particular case, there is no problem, because it will definitely be covered in the agenda. If there is something that you feel you need to say that is not in the agenda, you will have to defer it to the last item on future agenda items.

Mike Raber then indicated that Angela LeFevre will be taking a Leave of Absence from the Committee for a while. She is going to be running for State Representative, so that will take her out of the Committee for awhile and we didn't think there was time to start looking for a replacement, so we suggested that she not resign right away and see how it goes, and then make that decision later if she needs to.

Mike also indicated that the meeting with the property owners on March 21st was a very good meeting and there were representatives from the Cultural Park, Biddle's, and Paul Lasia who has attended a lot of the meetings and owns property on S.R. 179, and we will be following up with more of these meetings on April 23rd and 24th and trying to get more folks.

Mike Bower added that he also attended the meeting and received a follow-up call yesterday from Bob Perkins, who is one of the developers for the Cultural Park, and it was a positive call. He basically asked if he (Mike Bower) would be willing to amplify our comments regarding uses, such as a corporate entity or business park being part of what they are doing, and they had lined up a huge laundry list of things they are going to do there. It is like everything we have ever heard for the Cultural Park, they are doing plus more, so he told Bob that is just one more thing to add to the huge list, but he then shared with Bob what the Committee had been hearing about some of the concepts that John Sather has helped the Committee see about the research centers, etc., and the need to look at these last large parcels with the bigger context of Sedona in mind. He got a pretty good warm and fuzzy from Bob's response to that, and he just left it at that and indicated that the Committee is hearing from the community and they obviously have their own needs and agenda, but if they are inclined to explore more . . . and Bob wanted to have more contact. He also commented that he thought we should have involved landowners a lot earlier, so he explained that it may not seem early, since Bob attended the one year's worth of meetings, but they were the tip of the iceberg, and this is pretty early, so there is nothing precluding him from hearing the voice of the people.

John Sather asked if there was anything in those meetings about the financial stability of those groups and Mike Raber indicated no. Mike Bower added that he did in the phone call. Bob indicated that once they get financing, it is very expensive to hold them up. Mike pointed out that that they aren't really excited about linen count, bed sheets, etc., because they are trying to sell it to somebody and he asked if they had any big hotel people committed. Bob indicated they have an architect who has done a lot of hotel work committed, but it didn't sound like they have a hotel lined up, although his response was very grey. John Sather suggested that there be a discussion before those additional meetings, because he is in discussion with some California communities where proving the financial stability is a requirement now. Those of us who have been here long enough know the debacle of Arroyo Roble that sat there as a concrete shell for 14 years in Uptown, and there are guys trying to do a hotel that are just trying to turn a deal.

Mike Raber then reported that the Arts & Culture Workshop was a very small group with four full tables, but it was a good discussion, although there weren't very many public there, but the attendees were engaged and it was a good discussion. Barbara Litrell added that there were art organization leaders there, like the head of the Artists in the Classroom Program, the Verde Valley Artists, the Arts Center, Chamber Music and the Heritage Museum.

Mike Raber indicated that the Parks & Rec. Master Plan meeting was yesterday and that was a small group of about 15 people, but it was a good overview of the survey results, pretty much what the Committee has already seen. Chairman Thompson was asked to attend with staff, because we met with the Olsson group before that to discuss how they are organizing what they have learned, so they can start developing strategies, but they are at a very big picture phase now, so it is nothing that is in conflict with what the Committee is doing and so far that is in sync. It will become more important to keep track of where they are going, when they start developing strategies and recommendations, because the Committee will be in a little different place by that time and it will be important for them to get what the Committee has and for the Committee to understand where they are going so everything remains in sync.

Mike then pointed out that their packet includes an updated timeline and it is significant to note that the public hearings start the first of next year, and that pretty much takes the year up, when you factor in the required 60-day review period and the 120-day period before the election, so a lot of waiting period is built into that timeline. The rest of this year will be to get to the draft Plan.

Mike explained that the Planning Teams are mostly doing well and that can be discussed more in agenda item #6. We may want to have some overview on their status the middle of this month; there may be teams almost ready to run through what they have been doing. A final presentation may be on May 1st to include the students, because they probably won't be involved after that, then we can spend the rest of the time tweaking what we get, as we figure out how they are going to get attached to those alternatives.

Mike added that we are going to try to schedule tours of the Planning Team's sites to see what the teams come up with in the way of concepts, and then possibly take the first couple of weeks in May to have the Committee tour some of these sites to see what it looks like on the ground with what they are conceptualizing. We will probably need volunteers to spearhead that effort and that may be an agenda item for the next meeting, because we know that at least a few of the Committee Members want to look at some of these places. Chairman Thompson noted that staff is ready to take volunteers and Mike agreed they can get with staff, so staff and the Outreach Team can start figuring out how to put it together.

Chairman Thompson then added that it is good that we set a timeframe for doing this, so we can go out and see those plans as well as the neighborhoods, but it is going to take one or two people to put it together, in terms of transportation, length of time, etc., so let staff know if you are interested in helping.

3. Adoption of minutes. Tuesday, March 20, 2012

Chairman Thompson indicated that he would entertain a motion to approve the minutes for March 20th, 2012.

MOTION: Barbara Litrell so moved. Jim Eaton seconded the motion. VOTE: Motion carried eight (8) for and zero (0) opposed. (LeFevre, Magaziner and Mayer excused)

4. Public forum for items not listed on the agenda – limit of three minutes per person. (Note that the Citizens Steering Committee may not discuss or make decisions on any matter brought forward by a member of the public). (10 minutes for items 1-3)

Chairman Thompson opened the public forum.

Sandy Moriarty, Sedona, AZ: Suggested that the Committee look at SB1507 that was approved by the Senate and is now in the House. It has to do with sustainability issues and it is for any kind of legislation by any governmental entity in Arizona. It is going to make it impossible for any kind of sustainability legislation to be passed related to energy conservation, etc.; anything that the Sustainability Commission is looking at. It kind of snuck through as a strike all, so she would suggest that you contact your legislators and let them know how you feel.

Having no additional requests to speak, the Chairman closed the public forum.

5. Discussion/possible action on the “Open House” on April 20, 2012 in the Community Plan Room. (10 minutes 3:10 – 3:20 p.m.)

Chairman Thompson explained that this open house was a plan that the Outreach Subcommittee came up with and it was agendized before getting the invitation for a recognition luncheon to thank us for being volunteers on that same day, and that is something that we should plan to attend. The item was on the agenda to discuss whether or not we should do it, so first question is that we should not have it on the 20th and if there is no discussion of that, the question would be should we have it at all. His concern is that we are talking about having people come in to comment on our comments, and that is something he feels we should be moving away from. We should be trying to get the public geared up to comment on the alternatives. Their comments have helped us form the alternatives and the more time we spend on that, the more we are moving backwards. There was

also concern in the Outreach Subcommittee about whether or not people would come and should we do a really big splashy thing, and if we do it halfway, is that worse than doing nothing at all. He doesn't want to preempt what the Outreach Subcommittee is doing; he was attending as a listener, so this is his only chance to have a stake in that comment.

Barbara Litrell indicated that she thought that at the Subcommittee meeting, it was determined that there was going to be a larger public meeting when we have the alternatives, rather than trying to get people to come here, when we really don't think they will. Unless it is fun and exciting, you are going to get the same people who normally show up, so she thought we were considering not doing that.

Mike Raber explained that is why it was put on the agenda, because we weren't sure of what we were hearing from everybody. Chairman Thompson indicated that the Subcommittee left it as if there was going to be an event and it was going to be some kind of presentation and Jim Eaton was going to do a video at three different times, but there was still a lot of doubt and confusion among the Subcommittee about if it was the right thing to do.

Vice Chairman Robson stated that it is too soon; we don't have enough substance yet for people to absorb and comment on. Barbara Litrell recalled that it was going to be based on the idea of "Have we heard you correctly?", and it was going to be a checkpoint of sharing here is what we heard, so did we hear you right? Personally, she would rather see us go to two or three larger meetings to look at these ideas and alternatives, rather than 40 or 50 people coming in on one day; it just doesn't feel like it is enough.

Marty Losoff indicated that he would support the larger meetings. The feedback he is getting is asking what is happening; we built up some momentum with the community meetings, even though the attendance was suspect, and he thinks we should have a big community meeting at the school, etc., and if we don't have the alternatives, we shouldn't wait. We could put up the posters we had last week as summary sheets of the subjects and use the "Have we heard you?" approach, and explain this is what we have heard so far, then mingle and talk -- almost like a town hall thing and not expect any major voting, etc., to give the people some feedback and explain what will happen in the months ahead, just to get the momentum going, because right now it is dead.

Chairman Thompson asked Marty if he is casting a vote for going ahead with a meeting like this, but not on the 20th. Marty responded yes, assuming we aren't going to get those alternatives for a couple of months. Mike Raber indicated that the Committee is probably going to have to vote on this.

Mike Bower explained that there is something we are forgetting and that is if we give a deadline to these Working Teams at the end of this month, we are going to have at least five presentations done that would be more exciting, so it is possible to combine the idea of commenting on the comments with each of five different meetings, and see a future coming up in May where we meet five times and each one has something exciting -- a presentation by the Working Team. We might be able to deal with commenting on the comments as just an after or pre-party discussion or we could formalize it as a handout, so it seems that this hiatus is okay, but we are missing the opportunity to have a real active period. The only potential danger in the active period is that nobody really knows our process and what we are doing, so they might misconstrue the Working Teams' specific plans as the end of our exercise and the onus is upon us to explain our process, so we really have to internalize the process ourselves and understand how we get to the end; however, we do have some easy and exciting meetings coming up, because you can PowerPoint aerial photos and the little sketches and you can gear the presentation to the comments to show why the Team pursued the idea.

Judy Reddington asked if Mike thought separate presentations are preferable; she sees some danger there. She doubts that people will come to all of them and understand the relativity of the visions. People are more likely to come to one presentation. Mike Bower explained that if we are

clear that these are little case studies and we are really moving toward holistic alternatives, and the Sustainability Commission needs to see that they are alternatives, because they are going to be looked at holistically, not separately, but if we can explain the chart, he doesn't think that danger is that great. The key is keeping people motivated to get ready to participate even more and to understand what is needed from ourselves as citizens and where we are heading, and the hiatus leaves that question out there about if they know where we are going and that is why we are hearing frustration now. The individual Working Team projects will be in a form to be exciting presentations and it won't be that hard to make people understand it is a case study based on the comments.

Judy Reddington indicated that she understands, but it might accomplish more if people understand you need units that need to be pulled from to create a better whole and if we present them all at one time. She is thinking more along the lines of a status report -- here are three alternatives and here is what we heard from you.

John Sather agreed that we should have a meeting, but it should be before June. He also thinks five is too many, so maybe two to build a "what is going on" kind of thing in some way; it is not really to solicit comments. He sees it as kind of a panel report in which we explain what we did with all of these comments and somebody could go through the team reports without lots of depth, and maybe both meetings are the same, because if we don't do it in May, we are going to say that we can't do it in the summer, because people are away. We should do something soon and turn up the heat that we are doing something.

Jim Eaton indicated that we should get more press coverage both before and after the event, and get the press here during the event. Mike Raber indicated that he thinks the reason we got turnouts in the early workshops was because we sent out a citywide mailing and that gets people out. Part of the reason it fell off toward the end was that we rescheduled those things and didn't do that through the same means, so we are going to have to make an effort like that, maybe through another newspaper thing or a postcard, etc.

Chairman Thompson indicated that he is perfectly happy to let the Outreach Subcommittee determine the logistics for marketing it, etc., all we want to do is try to give the Subcommittee guidance as to what the Committee feels, and it sounds like we do like the idea of doing something for the public before the alternatives and plans are done. It sounds like a status report of some kind to talk about what we have been doing and it is one or two meetings and something that doesn't just tell what we did in the past based on the comments, but what is going on right now. Mike Bower added, and what the process is. The Chairman then stated if that is the case, we can take it back to the Subcommittee to figure out how to do that.

Mike Raber expressed the need for it to be clear that is what we want to do, and then we will go do it. Barbara Litrell indicated that for the Subcommittee, she is indicating that there will be a large meeting for the public and the same meeting might be held twice, just at different times, and it will be a status report kind of meeting and it will consist of presentations saying what we heard, what the teams have been doing on these specific areas, and here are some of the big ideas that are emerging as alternatives. It is not total detail, but it is definitely directional and enough for people to react to, so if they hear Community, Environment and Tourism, they can either feel very comfortable or begin to panic. It is enough for them to sink their teeth in and say that it sounds like they are moving in the right direction or here is what we want.

Mike Bower indicated that is still missing the part that tells people what we are doing and how we are moving forward; what the process is and what we heard. With the Working Team stuff, it needs to be really clear that they are just case studies to show how you can take some of the broad issues and put them on the ground in a specific location, and then people will see they have to gear up more and understand that we aren't done, so include where we are going from here -- the process.

Chairman Thompson asked if there is consensus on that and Mike Raber asked Marty Losoff if he is good with that approach. Marty indicated that he may attend the Outreach meeting to add some thoughts on that related to the Working Teams. Mike Raber indicated that can be discussed in the next agenda item and Marty added that we assigned various things, but we haven't accepted the fact that Biddle's should be a major component. Chairman Thompson suggested segueing to agenda item #6, and Marty Losoff indicated that it could be interesting to present pictures, not to say that we have adopted it. Chairman Thompson agreed; it is a status report.

Jim Eaton indicated that to be clear, we have decided that we are not going to have a meeting on April 20th and the response was yes. Jim noted that he has to remove that from the column.

Judy Reddington asked if some serious thought should be given to creating some response mechanism or a card they can take home and mail back. We are kind of inviting them to indicate a preference, and they may go away with a feeling that they have a preference. Chairman Thompson noted that it sounds like an item for the Subcommittee.

6. Discussion/possible action on the planning process and plan alternative concepts. (2 hours 3:20 – 5:20 p.m.)

Chairman Thompson suggested starting with a discussion about the name "alternative". John Sather explained that one day he wrote a paper that said let's talk about alternatives, and here are five of them. When that thought was presented, he clearly said there could be more, but these three could be more purpose-driven communities. For example, Tourism would be the equivalent of Branson; it is a town that lives and breathes for tourism and their whole economy and philosophy is driven by it, but real people do live in Branson and they send their kids to school and play soccer, etc. It is a purpose-driven community. For Environment, go to Big Sur; it is an environmentally purpose-driven community. Everything in Big Sur is immensely limited and all decisions are formed by environment. Community might be any little small town in Nebraska; he is making that up, but where there is a little village where everybody knows each other. One of his alternatives was to stay the course, which is Sedona as is and just keep moving forward. We have separated the community into tourism and non-tourism, and tourism is slowly creeping into S.R. 89A. He also proposed the one that was retreat, which was basically in response to like the legislators who are retreating from the notion of sustainability.

John Sather then explained that he was clear at one point in saying we might bypass all of this and just say we have a sense that we want to be a balanced community, a little of all of these, and he thinks Mike Bower is saying that is probably where we will end up, and we could just go to that. He thinks there is a bit of danger in doing that, because there may be validity in these. If we had alternatives 6 - 8, we could be an educational purpose-driven community, like North Carolina where Duke is with all of the educational intensity going on there. For technology-driven, people don't live in Palo Alto for tourism; they live there for technology and all of its spin-offs. That is where he saw these clearly as alternatives; otherwise, he can't really think of these. If we don't look at them as alternatives and perfect our version of tourism as Branson, in a different way, then he wants to jump to the balanced, because that is what that is.

John Sather then stated that his preference is the alternatives, but if we aren't seriously looking at them as purpose-driven alternatives, then he would skip that process and go right to the end game. Chairman Thompson asked if John felt that from the comments of the Sustainability Commission that the objection to the word "alternative" was undermining that and John Sather stated yes.

Marty Losoff stated that we are the Steering Committee and we were appointed to look at the overall big picture and come up with a vision, and this is what is driving our vision so far. We had the discussion early on about where do all of the Commissions stand; they all wanted to do something early on and we said that we will have workshops, etc., but we are still the Steering Committee and we are the over-body of all of these things, so he is hearing now that a particular Commission has given us an opinion on something, and that is fine if we as the Steering Committee

agree with it, okay we move on, but they are suggestions, and if we don't agree -- and he doesn't, then we as a Committee should maybe just spend two minutes talking about it, and if we don't agree, there is nothing to discuss other than we hear you, but we don't agree. We have to get to this, and he heard from people that didn't go to the Arts & Culture workshop, because they are boycotting Arts & Culture, and they represent other arts and culture committees. They aren't a Commission appointed by the City; they self-formed and they don't think Arts & Culture represents them and they want a workshop. At this stage, we have to move on as a Steering Committee; we have heard from others and yes, we need to get feedback and each Commission is entitled to what they have already told us, but let's get on with this stuff, and when we are done, if they still don't agree and it is significant and we have consensus among ourselves, great, but we don't need to stop and change our focus because a Commission or group said something. He is in favor of this approach, whether we have two or ten, the approach is fine and he is ready to move on.

Chairman Thompson asked if that is including the word "alternative" as opposed to something else and Marty Losoff stated that at this stage in the game, he would like to see "alternatives" become "visions". Chairman Thompson pointed out that each alternative is going to have its vision.

Jim Eaton stated that if all of the people who say they are being left out would come to the public meetings, we would have a packed house, but he has never understood the objective of dividing things into alternatives. "Alternative" means choice; you have to choose one and he has never understood the objective, and he is sure that there is nobody in the public that is anything but confused by us presenting alternatives. Visions are fine; choices and alternatives are the same thing. If they were called visions . . . John Sather interjected that it is semantics with the word and not so much the categorization. Jim Eaton explained that having to choose between tourism and community and sustainability is just wrong. John Sather pointed out that Jim Eaton wants to jump to balance then, and Jim Eaton said absolutely, that is exactly what he is saying.

Chairman Thompson indicated that there may be another way to do that without jumping to that, so we are going to go ahead and work on this. Marty Losoff indicated that he and Jim Eaton are opposite; he is here and Jim is there. Mike Bower indicated that it is critical that we aren't choosing between these alternatives. We need to be able to communicate clearly that these are different focuses that a community can take, and we know that it is going to be taking the best of each of these concepts, and the best are the ones that work synergistically together -- a community thing that really supports the environment and enhances tourism, and that is going to make it into the final vision. We need to clearly articulate that the reason for doing these is that this is how we see citizens falling into camps. There is a camp of business people who are rah, rah tourism and a camp of community members who don't like the business people and the tourists. It is the "Sedonons versus the Tourons". There is a camp of residents and visitors that think this should be a National Park -- all environment stuff. He personally has gotten good feedback from friends that this seems really intelligent, because that will bring us together and help the friend running a hotel see that all of these community gardens may come together around the concept of eating locally and a culinary school, etc., that help fill the hotel rooms.

Mike Bower then indicated that the reason for the discussion is that the Sustainability Commission comment kind of flies in the face of their earlier comment that they want to see sustainability handled holistically and not as an isolated element. You go for alternatives in a planning vision, because your option is to go for elements, and then everything is an isolated element, but at the end you somehow create a whole holistic plan. The idea of doing this is that you are going to create as good a holistic environmental, residential community and tourism focus as you can, and then with the blue dot type process, we are going to learn as citizens which of the synergistic ideas survive in the sustainable balanced vision.

Jim Eaton indicated that maybe we should have six or seven, because tourism is not the only economy in Sedona; there are a lot of other aspects to Sedona's economy. This presupposes that when you talk about the economy, you have to be talking about tourism. John Sather indicated that Jim Eaton is stuck in the present; however, Jim Eaton stated no, this is present. John Sather

explained that it is future in a much more refined way and he doesn't see this fully as only an economic name piece. It is developed in a far more focused purpose-driven way. Right now, we don't do that here; we just struggle along with tourism and there is the Tourons and the Sedonons and not everybody has come together. When you go to Big Sur, everyone knows the number one issue and if you go to Branson, there isn't anybody there that doesn't know that tourism is what it is all about. Currently, people are confused in Sedona, and you go through this filter, maybe we bring these people together and this new Community Plan repackages all of that, and it may be balanced in a variety of ways or maybe it is heavy in environmental and it is a little less in terms of how tourism is creeping over S.R. 89A.

Chairman Thompson remembered that, when John Sather first came up with these ideas, he thought they were great and he still does. He is a supporter of doing this, but from an historical perspective, we initially didn't have the word "alternative" and we actually were thinking of the word "caricature" at one point, because the ideas was to give some extreme version of a Sedona that would be touristy, one that would be an extreme version of environmental and one that would be an extreme version of community, to get the mouths foaming if nothing else, so people would say what they liked better. Over time, it has softened for him, but he still thinks it is valuable to divide and conquer and give people these different groupings, to see what an emphasis on community would be like, rather than going for just one vision that has it all muddled together. It also makes it easier to put up the different moment plans that we've got that are more community-oriented and those that are more environmentally-oriented, etc. We have all of these things and some of the things apply more to one than the other and some apply to all three. In the end, he is looking forward to how we are going to get the public to respond and if they think they are being asked to vote, because if we use a word like "alternative" or make them look like "which one do you want?", he thinks it is a problem and that is where he agrees with Jim Eaton. He hopes we can come up with a word that says we keep the plan exactly as it is, but we don't use the word "alternative".

Jim Eaton indicated that in the first gleam of this concept, they were called buckets. Chairman Thompson added that there may be the option of calling it the "Branson Plan". Judy Reddington indicated that she liked the word "caricature".

John Sather suggested not deciding now, just do it. Chairman Thompson explained that we went to this discussion first, because some members were chomping at the bit to get it out, and it may affect how we do the exercise if some members are thinking of these in terms of giving the public choices and others are thinking of giving the public buckets. It is important, and if we don't get to this exercise today and we just determine how we are going to present this to the public, it would be time well spent.

Barbara Litrell agreed that words are important and when she finds words that can really capture a concept, that is really important, because that is what we are going to have to do for the public and the words "a purpose-driven community" is significant. If you had to define what Sedona's purpose is now, she is not sure we have a clear purpose. Some might say tourism and some might say resident quality of life, etc., but when you look at the four or five other purpose-driven communities as examples, it is a very clear concept that she could buy into to segue into this kind of conversation. When you talk about a purpose-driven community of tourism, environment, education, technology, etc., people can identify with those and that is a good segue to looking at Sedona as a purpose-driven community. We do need to be conscious of those kinds of things when we explain it to the public.

Chairman Thompson indicated that if Barbara Litrell had put herself on the bucket side or the choice side, he thinks she is more on the bucket side. Barbara Litrell then stated that at the moment, she would still go with "alternatives" just to get through this. Alternatives are clear to us, but when it is done, "purposes" might be the right thing, but she would just go for it.

Judy Reddington wanted to affirm that three is a good number; this concept is a very good one and its main advantage is that by concentrating your focus on each of these, it helps you clarify your

own value that you assign to each element, and by doing that, people can get a clearer vision of what is important to them. It is good and she doesn't care what we call them.

Vice Chairman Robson indicated he has been calling them ideas instead of alternatives, because if somebody looks at them, they go, "Oh, I like that idea", so buckets or ideas instead of alternatives, because then people feel that they have to conform to one and that is it.

Chairman Thompson asked if we were to change this at some point to focus or whatever, does that . . . John Sather interjected that he is fine, because this is good stuff. One would ask if there are other communities that aren't purpose-driven and he would say that 95% of the communities in the United States are not purpose-driven. If you said six, seven and eight, we would be kidding ourselves a little bit, because we aren't going to be a technology-driven community and we aren't going to be a manufacturing-driven community. If you want to mentally think about this, he looks at it as developing like a business plan of what you are going to do with the community. Sam Walton's business plan was all about delivery and supply, and that is the magic of Walmart. We are tourism-based and yes we have a great environment, etc., but could we deliver tourism in a way that ultimately respects the environment and develop that as a scenario. He would be really hard pressed to believe anybody would just say let's accept all of that, so it is inevitable that we are going to end up in a balance, but this is a way to think about these as opposed to the endless lists of things that aren't categorized.

Judy Reddington indicated that it is a bottom-up way to do it, like from the opinions of the community as opposed to a top-down approach, which would be asking them to respond to our own balanced view. Barbara Litrell added that there is a matrix, because like education and technology cuts across all of them, so all of that can enter into them, but these are three really important things to the people who live here. Judy Reddington suggested just accepting them, and then developing a word list and vote on the list.

Chairman Thompson indicated that he is fine with deferring it, but when you mentioned Branson and Big Sur, he thinks there is an option for calling it like a mythical city -- like Pleasantville. Mike Bower explained that he doesn't think that is a good idea, because everybody riles whenever you relate Sedona to anywhere, be it Aspen or Santa Fe, etc., and an easy cheap shot is that we don't want to be like Scottsdale or whatever. As soon as we stick any other known place in it, we would just alienate people, and if we used mythical places, it would be more confusing than using "alternatives". There are six different sub-words up there now and surely they are all bucket words, but the word "bucket" is so overused, he is sick of that word. "First" still works for him; future, focus, vision, ideas, emphasis, themes or models, he doesn't really care. The key is to explain why we are doing this and it is because these are the kind of named thrusts and goals we already feel in our town. We don't really have enough education happening to say that is a main goal, but John Sather's point is that it is a very viable goal and technology also is viable. We don't have the arts in there, but that is certainly one of the big goals. We have gotten past thinking we are an arts colony; we're way too big.

Mike Raber indicated that whatever we call these doesn't have to be decided today, but if we do our community meetings, we better be clear on what that is all about, so at some point, we need to land on why we're calling them what we are calling them and where that is going, because the community must be clear on that, and that is why he brought this up. The Sustainability Commission isn't the only ones that have expressed that confusion. Chairman Thompson indicated that he thinks we can all agree that we can manage the Commissions -- a lot of that stuff is coming from the Commissions because they haven't heard anything and they get worried. Mike Raber pointed out that it was just a comment.

Marty Losoff suggested saying Concept 1 focuses on Community, Concept 2 focuses on Environment and Concept 3 focuses on Tourism. John Sather then suggested beginning the exercise and in the end we can see where we are.

Chairman Thompson explained that for the exercise the Committee Members have the lists from the exercise done two weeks ago, when all of the distilled comments were put into the categories of Community, Environment and/or Tourism, and now they are nicely organized. There is definitely overlap again, but that is because we said some of the bulleted items belonged in more than one category. Under Tourism, we have all of the bullet items that we said belonged in that category, and we have kept the headings that Jim Eaton gave to that bullet item. For Environment, you see the same sub-headings, because that is where the bullet originally was, but you can ignore those if you want. Now, the task is to get some things that will allow us to write vision statements for each of the three and we need to sort the bullets down, so we thought we could look for some big concepts that many of the bullets relate to, and the headings might be a good starting point, but we want to get to maybe six to ten major concepts that include virtually all of the bullets, so we can write our vision statement.

John Sather stated, or none of the bullets, because we are also brainstorming what is not on here. Chairman Thompson agreed that there are things that aren't on here and we agreed that we would have part of this session to bring up those things that are missing. Let's look at these things and come up with some big concepts, and start putting them on the wall. We also have a fourth category for something like "a walkable community" that is good for all three, and it doesn't make a lot of sense to put it in three places, so we have one for "Common to All", so when you write your vision statement for Tourism, it would include anything under "Tourism" and "Common to All".

Barbara Litrell asked if it is helpful to do some kind of statement about tourism off of which we would then generate these ideas. If we are thinking of Tourism First, then what goes through your brain if you are thinking of Sedona or what is the experience for a tourist coming to Sedona and what is tourism to Sedona? Chairman Thompson stated that if you can boil down what you are thinking into a statement of six to eight words, then that would be something to put up here. We have talked about a world-class tourism experience or getting a higher class tourist, so if that gets pulled into a statement of a big concept, rather than something that reports to another bigger concept, then we can put it up here, but we want to ask if it is part of a bigger idea that we should put up instead.

Mike Raber asked if we want to get the big thoughts up here, and then go to the smaller sheets to fill those in. Chairman Thompson indicated however we want to do it and Mike Raber explained that staff was thinking that if we put the bigger ideas up, then we could put more ideas on the small sheets under those big themes. For example, one bigger theme might be making West S. R. 89A a pedestrian-friendly environment, and then you might place components under that. Chairman Thompson indicated that he doesn't think that is necessary, because the details are here and we can always refer to them. The main point is to get the big concepts and anything we have missed, and then our vision statement has to contain these.

The Chairman indicated that as an example, under Pedestrian Circulation, the second bullet says that people can walk to a public square or plaza and to him that is not a big enough concept. The first bullet is a bigger one, "Make west 89A corridor more pedestrian-friendly with safety islands", but for him to make it as big as it needs to be, he would cut off the safety islands. Marty Losoff stated that when you are brainstorming, there are no rules; you just put up all of the thoughts. John Sather agreed that if we sit here and qualify what we can put up . . . no one has ever talked about a Tourism Development Commission.

Chairman Thompson explained that he tried to put up what he thought was the goal of the exercise, which was to get something that we can write vision statements from, but if we want to do a different plan, just say it. We talked about it last time that we were going to do individual Committee Member vision writing, and then come back and discuss them in two weeks. We can change that plan, but this was all geared towards that goal.

Mike Bower indicated that he thinks John Sather's point is that we should just be a little more free-wheeling and start putting things up there, and then see where it goes. John Sather indicated that we didn't do the agenda item of the last meeting about brainstorming. We didn't do anything but

sort and file, so let's brainstorm. He wants to write his vision around things that he heard beyond what he just pontificated, so if we throw these things on the wall, we can then all individually write papers that encompass parts of things someone else might say, in how we believe they are woven together. Then, those would be merged into this vision group statement. Chairman Thompson then said, let's brainstorm and put some things up here then. Jim Eaton then wanted to define brainstorming and explained that you throw up every idea and there is no critique or discussion.

Barbara Litrell indicated that Tourism First means that we want Sedona to be a world-class destination that drives a lot of things, but if we want Sedona to be just a campground that is another whole kind of tourism direction, so is this group going to say that we want Sedona to be a world-class tourist destination . . . is that what we have heard from the people? She then asked Vice Chairman Robson if he wanted Sedona to be a world-class tourist destination and the Vice Chairman stated yes. Barbara Litrell then stated if that is the case, she would like to see that there. The Committee Members then started writing the following concepts/ideas to be placed under Community, Environment or Tourism:

TOURISM

- World-class tourist destination at all levels - 5 or 6-star hotels to campsites
- Diversity of Tourist Base
- Facilities for Festivals
- Life beyond shopping
- Housing for workers
- Fun Festivals
- More forest lands opportunities
- Exhibit hall and event space
- Alliances with National Park Service and others
- Explore new tourist opportunities - Medical, Eco-tourism, Bikers, Sports Training folks
- Red Rock Discovery Center
- Making Sedona "Experience" - easy, exciting and longer stays
- Longer stays are attractive due to opportunities to volunteer, learn, experience (and shop & dine too)
- Provision of high-level tourist amenities
- Tourism-friendly signage
- Other subsets of tourism - Equestrian, Food, Agriculture, Architecture, New Age, International Appeal, etc.
- Vision Quest -- experience things that enlarge our understanding, journey home with a fresh perspective
- Develop tourist events unique to us (Sedona) - (a film festivals is not unique to us, etc.; look for the one and only)
- Encourage cross-cultural interactions focused on unique sense of place
- Vision to be ranked in top 5 destination cities for tourism in the U.S.
- Develop Tourism around themes - ranch & western, New Age, Medicine, Healing, Living; promote creativity and inspiration/workshops learning
- Sedona as a center of creativity
- Transportation without cars - great airport shuttle, in-town public transportation, mixed-use walkable environments
- Cultural Park and the water treatment facility land as a tourism-related land use
- Look at physical design of City from a tourist point-of-view and see what tourist destination areas are, so it is not quite so haphazard
- Focus on tourism arrival sequence (first impressions) - gateways, airport terminal, Tlaquepaque bridge, etc.

- Feel a sense of "authenticity" - activities shared with residents, no discounts for locals and no "tourist only" zones
- Focus on gateways, Cultural Park, Preserves, Hillside and Tlaquepaque
- Open up the creek
- Improve information resources, pay attention to signage
- Encourage "eccentrics", performers, artists, speakers, buskers
- Tourism taught in schools as a vocation - training for creating business
- Quality of the visitor experience is primary concern
- Tourism to be ranked in top five destination points in U.S. - Attractions: Preserve, Cultural Park, Tlaquepaque, Hillside, Oak Creek, Pedestrian-Friendly
- Create a Tourism Development Council
- Large airport out of town; remove old one
- Low Sales Tax
- Eco-tourism - learning about geology, history, environmental issues, etc.
- Evolve retail to match top tourist destination
- Viticulture awareness and activities - "Road" scholars, tours, local products
- All residents serve as gracious hosts - training to do so . . . if needed
- Pilgrimage Walk - three to four day route, similar to Spain
- Hut System - overnight or three-night route for hiker or biker adventure
- Close the Canyon - one day per season for walking, skating, strolling and silence
- Artist Culture in the DNA of Sedona
- International

John Sather referenced the Japanese man who is behind the walk at the Grand Canyon and indicated that it is stunning to understand what he knows about tourism and the money he is making in packaging tourism in Asia to come to the Grand Canyon and part of it is understanding that pipeline internationally.

John Sather also shared that he met with five people who basically run the Economics Department at Harvard University and they had driven through Uptown Sedona and they could do nothing but speak poorly of it and say that it is an ultimate example of tacky tourism.

Mike Raber asked about the next step and John Sather indicated that when the Committee Members get this information, we can get back on Chairman Thompson's agenda of writing the vision statements that would contain not only all of this information, but also all of the citizens' comments. Then, the goal will be to try to pull it all together. Marty Losoff asked about modifying it to do it together as opposed to having 33 vision statements. Perhaps have two or three members take one category and two or three other members take a different category, etc.

Judy Reddington pointed out that we need to start counting time backwards from the meeting we are going to have and Mike Raber recalled that it had previously been discussed that we would hand some of this off to the Format Team to pull that together. Marty Losoff then indicated that the Committee needs to come up with a collective vision before the Format Team sees it.

Chairman Thompson pointed out that when we talked through this process the one thing that kept coming up is that you can't write something by committee. As a result of that, we decided to try to get the main ideas, so each one of us that wants to do this, times however many you want to do, and they would be done within a week and all of them would be in the packet for the next meeting two weeks from today. Then, we can discuss them and say that we like the way this one reads or this point, etc., and then the Format Team will take that information and get it sounding like there are three similar visions, and that was all based on the fact that we felt we needed good, concise vision statements to go with our boards with moment plans, etc., on them. He can't include all of these things in a vision statement, so today, we have tried to identify things that may not have been in the comments, and we will add those, and then on our own do what he thought the exercise . . .

Barbara Litrell pointed out that a vision statement is broad and a lot of these are strategies and tactics.

The Chairman then asked the Committee Members to put some things on Environment and Community, and noted that these can be sent to us in the next few days, so we can get back on our plan.

ENVIRONMENT

- Buy back land for open space
- Create Open Space Sales Tax
- Create Open Space Transfer Tax based on percentage of home sale
- Remove visual pollution (signs, buildings, above-ground utilities)
- Create ethic of environmental protection
- Be a center for alternate energy
- Regional renewable energy or bio-energy power plant
- Focus on silence, minimize energy footprint
- Grow food locally
- All public buildings to be LEED Platinum
- The City as a natural, living system (e.g., wastewater turns into potable water; everything is a closed loop, one business's waste is another business's input, zero waste, sustainable community)
- Zero waste
- Environmental contribution with all rezonings (payoff for the benefit of a rezoning, impact fee)
- Significant down-zoning (commercial to residential)
- "Stewardship" priority mentality
- Prevent urban sprawl
- Eco-hotels' tax breaks
- Create Land Trust
- Plant more trees
- One-stop parking
- Reduce number of residents and visitors
- Protect air and water quality

Note: Mike Bower left the meeting at 4:56 p.m.

COMMUNITY

- Eliminate Main Street, create easier access to the Canyon
- Limit "dead-end" communities and "dead-end" roads
- Support alternatives in communication media -- mass media alternative
- Strengthen neighborhoods
- Family-friendly
- More jobs that are not in tourism
- More education opportunities
- Balanced community land zoning uses
- State of art healthcare
- Moratorium on commercial retail zoning; we have too much commercial now
- More neighborhood parks
- Community-shared uses - including shared automobiles, etc.
- Neighborhood district system of representation
- Develop a bypass for 89A

- Inter-connective circulation, underpasses and/or overpasses
- Sedona for Sedonans
- Nobody under 45
- Visitors are invited, but not the focus of the community
- More parades
- An ethic of creating community
- Cradle to grave lifestyle
- Intergenerational mindset
- Senior Tax
- Encourage Philanthropy
- To be considered among the best retirement communities in U.S.
- Buy creek land back

John Sather pointed out that the Day of the Dead Festival is where you go to the actual gravesite and the families come to a party at the gravesite, and they have music and bring the deceased's food and decorate the grave, etc.

Barbara Litrell asked if there is an ideal number of residents in the City of Sedona and Mike Raber explained that based on the zoning and the density limit, there is a number or capacity level. It is about 15,000 without the part-time residents; it may be 14,000 full-time and 16,000+ total, and that is a conscious plan decision that was made in the past.

Chairman Thompson asked if the Committee wanted to close the brainstorming session and start to sort, etc. Jim Eaton pointed out that it is easy to eliminate the duplicates of what we already have and Barbara Litrell questioned why sorting was necessary; just type these, send them to the Committee, and then we are supposed to write a vision.

John Sather indicated that even with all of these things, this thing could be dialed this way or that way and still be in this umbrella, so in scribing this, it incorporates everything, but some of these are not philosophical thoughts for a vision statement, but they shouldn't be lost. They are subsets to it to help explain it and back it up. It kind of packages the idea that tourism is our main priority; we are embracing it and refining it, teaching it, living it and we are supporting it in many different ways. Jim Eaton added, because we haven't explored the alternatives; we just labeled it tourism and took off. Jim then pointed out that John Sather isn't in the tourist business; however, John clarified that his wife sells things to tourism. It doesn't mean that everyone in town lines up under this.

John then indicated that as the Devil's advocate, where this could breakdown is that we don't get the right people to show up for meetings, but he has the belief that when people come to Sedona and think it is a tacky tourist town, then there is something amiss if we think that is our main driver. There isn't anyone saying that is not where our economy is based. There are other subsets to it, but we aren't making our money by selling tires. This is all about accepting that and refining it and taking it to a new level.

John added that environmental is taking a complete U-turn and saying we have overridden this place and destroyed what we were given. We should be embarrassed by ourselves and we should start repairing the Earth. We should start buying back that which we gave, which went afoul -- the Cultural Park, the Wastewater Plant that we were coaxed into it having way out there and now it is getting more and more eaten away. Our whole ethic is about protectionism; it is in the architecture, the food, etc. That is a severely different model than this bucket.

John then explained community doesn't like any of this, other than people being invited here, so there are hotel rooms, and it begins to push away this and say we are first; we live here. It is our place and others come here, and if he wrote on all three, that is how he would write them.

John then stated that he is not certain that we really should have a pabulum of all of this into a balance. Maybe there is a contingency in town that wants to say that we really have overridden this place. He isn't sure about this yet, but it would be easy to say take three from each of these, and that is the balanced plan.

Barbara Litrell indicated that keeping in mind the community is going to be voting on the Plan, as we look at the vision of Tourism, are we going to look at it as a separate vision or at creating some balance. She then asked if, for the assignment, we are looking at three distinct areas and purifying them. Barbara then pointed out that the tourism aspect could need to be sold to the community. She remembers a lady saying that she had lived here 25 years and Sedona has been screwed up by the tourists and she doesn't want any more tourists in this town; everything the City does, they do for tourism. While that may not be the case, we have to figure out a way that the community's lifestyle is fed by the tourist dollar and by tourists that are here . . . Jim Eaton interjected if that is what they want.

John Sather indicated that what was just said is what our Community Plan is now. It addresses tourism and the "Sedonons", but he still believes there are at least five, rather than three, that we are still talking about. The current Plan updated, but not significantly shifted, and that addresses what you are talking about, and in the update, it is a little of all of these. The other one is the severe turnaround that let's all cut back and have less. If we say the community has to vote, unless one of these really hit traction, then we are in a balanced one, whether it is a completely different balance than our current Plan or it is our current Plan balanced.

Barbara Litrell then stated that what is done in the tourism world needs to be attractive to the residents and vice versa, and she guesses that is where all of these things come together. When she thinks about pedestrian bridges or arts education, people have to see value in it for themselves or they will think all of the money from the City is going towards the tourism side. John Sather pointed out that in one, you are playing down the tourism piece immensely; it is like almost no more money goes to the tourists.

Chairman Thompson then asked John Sather if he is making a pitch to add those other two again and John Sather indicated that he is churning the pot and he never took the two off of the table. Chairman Thompson pointed out that the Committee did collectively and John indicated he wasn't here. Chairman Thompson noted for the record that the Committee was very nervous about that. John Sather then indicated that the point is that with the version of the Community Plan as is updated or the stay the course version . . . Jim Eaton stated that doesn't require a new vision statement, and John Sather indicated that he had said, "Concept: Acknowledging the current Plan is basically sound and has served us well for the last 10 years. This concept would maintain the core components of it and not add any new major concepts. Data would be updated as necessary and we would add emphasis to areas that have received significant community support."

Chairman Thompson asked if the point of the three or the five is to gather good input, so we can come up with one, how is that one going to be different from what you just read. John Sather stated that in doing this exercise, this may be the one. When Mike Bower created that, John indicated that he stated that the assumption was being made . . . Chairman Thompson asked then about the statement someone said that the whole point of this is to make it possible to get good ideas, because of the emphases, and we are really aiming to get the right combination of the three. John Sather stated that is an assumption that he is not willing to make. He is assuming that we have no polling data or indication that if we refined and took it to the public that the majority wouldn't believe in this. Chairman Thompson indicated that it is still a combination of the three; he is not talking about them being equal. The point of it is that we wanted the three main themes that we heard from the public put into a caricature pattern and expanded, go for broke first kind of format, to let people think about what if it was all that way, so people could say that they wouldn't have said that tourism was their first thing, but those two tourism ideas are outstanding, so we get the best of all three.

John Sather indicated that the Chairman was making what seems to be (to the Chairman) the obvious next step and John explained that personally he believes that tourism has taken over the City and has virtually destroyed it, and he is a strong believer that we have mishandled this as citizens and we should go back and repair the damage we have done. If he voted on this, he wouldn't take any of the Tourism; he would go right to Environment; however, he is also smart enough to work in the collective "we" of Community, to know that is his and he doesn't quite know how many others are out there like him. We may get to where you are, which is to take this and this and this, and come to another one, but as we go out there, we can call them whatever, but a place like Big Sur didn't happen because people decided it should be a little bit of everything. It is because the people said they aren't allowing anything to be built here.

Chairman Thompson clarified that saying it should be a little bit of everything is the 30-30-30 rule and he is not saying that. Marty Losoff indicated that we are talking about vision and as we look at these sheets, we still have to come up with our vision. The vision should be maybe two or three paragraphs without a lot of details, and when we are all done, we are going to find that the sheet that is vacant now will have a lot of stuff on it. Whether we are Community First, Tourism First or Environment First, circulation, pedestrian-friendly, no cars, parks and recreation, etc., are important and they are common themes, but our vision is the emphasis; it is not all of the stuff that goes under it, it is the big picture, and he thinks that is starting to formulate.

Jim Eaton stated that the Committee is charged with the responsibility of writing the community's vision, not our own. We have to write our own, and then get over it, but in the final analysis, we are going to write the community's vision, which will be evolved from all of these ideas, with the most feasible of each, and that will probably come after we have gotten into a lot of detail.

Chairman Thompson asked if they want to decide how they are going to write the vision statements, because he feels we are ready to do some homework, but do we all want to take a crack at all of them or get groups of two together. Jim Eaton stated he can do it; he would like to see all of these things transcribed. Chairman Thompson indicated that they will be transcribed and sent to us before the end of the week.

Judy Reddington suggested just writing the ones that move us and Chairman Thompson stated that is fine, but the downside of that is that we may not get any on certain ones. Judy Reddington added that relative to the remaining groups that aren't up here, her understanding is that these were kind of purifying, clarifying, and then we would ask the community to respond to them, because it will be easier to see what is there and the values between them, then maybe we could bring those other two back in and say this is the balance achieved by looking at the three things, but what if we do nothing.

John Sather indicated that now that we've done this and decided we kind of know the other two without doing a lot of this, maybe we jump to the end either now or in another session, and try to achieve the balanced, and when we have our community update, we say here is the work of the group. We created five, fill in the blanks, buckets or whatever, and from that, we took a crack at balancing this. You may not agree with this, which is why we are back out before you, so help us calibrate that, and then test that. The purism of each of these is helpful to envision components, if there was a constituency that strong and we kind of developed it as a "Branson Model", but he doesn't think anybody here believes that. Everybody believes there is a balanced piece, so why don't we just go to that at our next meeting. He thinks we could do it and say that, the trouble is that everybody is going to try to take all of this and put it in there.

Chairman Thompson asked if John is saying don't go with the three, just go for a combined and John Sather stated no, we are doing exactly what the chart does, he is just saying go to the end also. It is just a suggestion and what he worries about is as we go out there, none of us will have the conviction that says I could muster up for this one, because nobody really believes them. He isn't saying there is anything wrong with that; he thinks everyone believes what he had written as number four -- the sustainable balance.

Chairman Thompson indicated that the best description of a Tourist First focus he ever heard was one that John Sather said when he wrote the summary, and we can all do that. It was a compelling vision for some imaginary person who thinks that is the way to do it, so he doesn't know how it can be said that we can't write these, unless we believe them ourselves. That is our job as a Committee. John Sather explained that he thinks what this Committee believes is that we would never end up with that as the Plan -- it would never get through all of the filters. The Chairman indicated that is jumping to a conclusion. We are going to get to one single vision by presenting these three extreme visions, and if the public says they like that one the best and they don't like the pieces of the others, then that becomes it.

John Sather indicated he was trying to shore that up, because he didn't feel that was too strong here. Judy Reddington stated that she bought into what John said right after the 89A vote, which was something like I know how I feel, but I didn't know those other guys were out there. Where did that 70% of the people come from, I don't understand those people, and she thought this was an effort to help those other people understand. John Sather stated that she is shoring up this and maybe there is more strength in this room to this idea than he was feeling today. Judy Reddington agreed she is shoring up, because she thought it was a clever device.

John Sather then stated that we should hold off on the amalgamation piece until after we roll these out. Jim Eaton suggested that each of us go home and after we get this transcribed, write our own vision for Tourism, Environment and Community and send it to Kathy and ask her to distribute it, with our without our names, before the next meeting.

Chairman Thompson then summarized that the plan is that these will be transcribed so the Committee will have copies of them in the next few days, and by next Wednesday, those of you who choose to do so will write one or more vision statements, and then they will be in the packet for the next meeting and we will have a discussion on those. Jim Eaton asked if they could have them before the meeting, and Chairman Thompson restated that if they are done by next Wednesday, they will be in the packet.

Barbara Litrell stated that the Committee also should have another discussion on whether or not we are going to take it out to the public in three separate segments or one.

- 7. Discussion regarding future meeting dates and future agenda items. (5 minutes 5:20 – 5:25 p.m.)**
Tuesday, April 17, 2012 – 3:00 p.m.
Tuesday, May 1, 2012
At the “Community Plan Room”

Chairman Thompson asked if the Committee Members had any future agenda items and Vice Chairman Robson asked about visiting the neighborhoods. Chairman Thompson referenced the announcement and stated that we have a plan for May.

8. Adjournment.

The Chairman adjourned the meeting at 5:28 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 April 3, 2012.

Donna A. S. Puckett, *Recording Secretary*

Date