

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, March 6, 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 3:09 p.m.

Committee Members Present: Chairman Jon Thompson, Vice Chairman Rio Robson and Committee Members Mike Bower, Jim Eaton, Barbara Litrell, Marty Losoff, Elemer Magaziner, Gerhard Mayer, and Judy Reddington - joined the meeting by video conferencing. Angela LeFevre and John Sather were excused.

Staff Present: Kathy Levin, Donna Puckett and Mike Raber

- 2. Announcements from staff and committee.**

Mike Raber indicated that the Planning Teams started meeting last week and they are divided into four groups. They are working on moment plans for several different areas in the community and they are currently meeting on Wednesday and Thursday afternoons. Two teams are pretty firm at 1:00 p.m. and 3:00 p.m. on Wednesdays and the others will probably be at 3:00 p.m. and 5:00 p.m. on Thursdays.

Additionally, Mike indicated that staff and a few of the Committee Members will probably start meeting here with property owners in a couple of weeks for at least introductory meetings to let them know what is going on, and then as the Planning Teams get things put together, we may get back with them to share ideas.

Mike also explained that for the community event we are trying to do in this room regarding the comments, the Outreach Team is working on distilling those comments. Jim Eaton spent quite a bit of time doing a great job and we are just polishing that up. Part of that was due to Gerhard Mayer's input too, so we are working on getting those more consolidated.

Regarding the Parks & Recreation Master Plan, Mike reported that there is a public meeting on April 2nd in the City Council Chambers at 5:30 p.m. They will go over the survey results, facility assessment and focus group, leadership interviews and student surveys. Following that, we will need to be closely coordinating as they move to a preliminary recommendation phase to ensure there is nothing out of sync with where we are. Currently, it doesn't sound like there is anything out of sync with the process, but it will be important to ensure we are not in conflict.

Mike announced that there is also an upcoming Webinar on Form-Based Codes in Small Towns on March 26th at 5:00 p.m. with Roger Eastman from Flagstaff, and Roger will talk about their experience in relationship to their General Plan. Kathy Levin added that they selected just a section of the full Webinar, and that portion is only one-half hour. It will fast-forward to a town that has a population of 12,000 and it will be here in the Community Room. According to the Form-Base Code Institute, they are putting a series together targeted to small towns based on our feedback from prior Webinars, so we will be out of here by 6:30 p.m.

Barbara Litrell noted that there is a regular Parks & Rec. meeting that night and Gerhard Mayer noted that he will also have to be there. The Chairman asked about a quorum being present and Mike Raber explained that it will be noticed.

Mike then indicated that there was some discussion about area tours for this group and we were going to put something on the next agenda, so you might be thinking about that. Elemer Magaziner added that Group 4 had a city tour to all of the places that were picked.

Marty Losoff indicated that he read several reports about the Mayor wanting a meeting with people at the Preserve and places like that to see about doing things. He then asked if the Mayor is aware of the Committee's planning activities and to what extent do we need to be involved or get an idea of what is going on, so we don't end up with another Parks & Rec. consultant coming in on top of what we are doing. Mike Raber explained that one thing would be to ensure that our current Community Plan is in sync with the discussion. Marty then clarified that the Committee is meeting with the owners and having some fairly serious discussions. Mike Raber explained that if we start having some fairly serious discussions with property owners, we should ensure the Mayor is clear on that. Barbara Litrell agreed that it is important and it should probably go through Tim [Ernster] on that to get to the Mayor on what is happening, because there are a couple of items, as you can see from the Mayor's advertising and around his agenda, so he is pushing on those.

Chairman Losoff then asked how we get back to the Mayor, and Barbara Litrell and Mike Raber agreed that it is a staff function to get to Tim and Tim to the Mayor. Chairman Thompson asked about the next update for the Council and Mike Raber indicated that it is next Wednesday.

Note: Angela LeFevre attempted to join the meeting by video conferencing at 3:19 p.m.

Barbara Litrell stated that part of the situation that Marty Losoff is referring to may be solved by what the Mayor and/or Councilors asked about, which was that we have had informal visioning meetings other groups like the former Mayors, but we haven't done that with the current Council and somewhere along the line, it would be a good idea to have that visioning session with the current Council, and then you will hear from the Mayor and the other Councilors.

Mike Raber explained that there has been some discussion about that and it is appropriate for the Council to weigh-in on the process and procedurally where we are going in the community outreach, etc., but the Council really has a different role and getting into their vision this early in the process would not be a good idea. He has talked to Mike Goimmarac about that and he brought that up once, but we probably need to have that discussion with the Council. Barbara pointed out that the updates are always an approval or questioning, but never like here are the five things I would like to see. Mike Raber agreed and stated there is a reason for that, because Council's role is different from even P&Z.

Chairman Thompson indicated that if the process takes two to three years to do a new Community Plan update, we simply can't ask the City Council to wait and do nothing until it is done. They still need to be able to do their . . . Barbara Litrell interjected their daily functioning and normal things that come before Council; however, the Chairman then noted that they are doing long-range planning all the time too. It would help to give them a general idea of where things are going and that is the purpose of the updates, so they can be as informed as possible. Mike Raber added, or if they have concerns about the nature of the process. Barbara Litrell then asked that they keep in mind that members of the community involved in development approach Councilors and say that the City should jump on the Biddle's property or the property near the Sedona Arts Center, because it will also give you a traffic solution, so there are members of the community that have an interest and are approaching Councilors as well.

Jim Eaton indicated that is appropriate and Chairman Losoff stated that we just should be able to connect all of the dots, and he wouldn't do it at a Council meeting. Mike Bower then commented that he doesn't understand why it wouldn't be appropriate, but he will accept that Mike Goimmarac says it isn't appropriate to have the Council share their visions with us; however, it might be wise to explain Goimmarac's thinking to the Council, because that would help us not feel that we are ignoring them.

Mike Raber explained that it isn't really clear cut, but the concern is how the statute frames the Council's role and because they are to act on what the Planning Commission gives them. They are supposed to be a body that really waits. If the visioning is not connected to the Community Plan, maybe there is a way for that to come out, but he doesn't know how you separate that. Barbara Litrell suggested bringing that up in the next update to Council, because they may be wondering why they haven't been included. Mike Raber explained that it didn't have anything to do with not getting together with the Council, but for that purpose, yes.

Mike Bower asked about having a joint P&Z and Council meeting that is a brainstorming session, not an action session, to give both entities a chance to brainstorm with us, because he doesn't see that it could hurt us, and potentially, if we join them, it gets rid of the legal concern that it flows from P&Z to Council. Mike Raber explained that he didn't think that would diminish the concern, but they can talk through a couple of the different scenarios to see. It has to do with how the statutes are worded, not something that staff is coming up with.

Chairman Thompson suggested thinking about this topic for the next meeting, because this could go on and on and it is supposed to be only announcements. Jim Eaton stated that he wanted to add that it is not only the wording of the statute, but also the public's perception that you have to be careful of.

Jim Eaton then announced that yesterday he attended a roundtable that was co-produced by the City, namely the Mayor and Yavapai College, and the subject was how to make Sedona a center of arts & culture, what kind it would be and what would be involved. There were a lot of heavy hitters around the table, including the President of Yavapai College, the Dean of the Verde Valley Campus and about three others from the College, plus a person from Verde Valley School, Mei Wei Wong from SAC and Councilor DiNunzio, but there was nobody there from the School District and everyone acknowledged that they needed to be present, because they run the Performing Arts Center, which was a part of the discussion in addition to the future of the cultural park or if there should be one, plus the various aspects of culture, which weren't confined to painting and sculpture. For performing arts, Mary Guaraldi was there for a major part of the discussions, and Mark DiNunzio brought up that writing is an important part of arts & culture as well. Lisa Dahl represented the culinary arts, so except for the absence of the School District, it was a well-rounded group. There will be a report forthcoming and he will see that the Committee gets a copy of that. It was a roundtable with everybody getting two or three minutes and it was pretty well facilitated. There wasn't a vision as such, there were probably 20 visions, but everyone resolved that it was good to get together, so they should do it again. People weren't wasting their time there; it was a productive session.

Jim Eaton then noted that since he was there representing the Community Plan, he did give them an idea of what the Committee has been hearing from the public and told them that we are having the workshop on March 28th.

3. 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.

William Welter, Sedona, AZ: Indicated that he has enjoyed being the proverbial fly on the wall as this Committee has done its work and it has been good discipline for him to have to play that role. He wants to speak on behalf as Bill Welter, citizen of the City of Sedona. The process that he sees is that you ask him for input, which he has gladly given, and then in effect, you parked me on the sidelines and have me waiting until you digest all of that, write a plan and send me a copy to vote on, so he has been completely shut out of the process after giving the ideas. One of the things we know in public processes is that can be disastrous, even if he agrees with the plan, he doesn't like being closed out of everything since he was asked for ideas. What he suggests, and he

apologizes, because it will involve a lot of hard work and he is not willing to do it all, is to attempt to create a virtual Community Room under the City's website, and within that room create virtual conference rooms for each of the teams to do their work, post their pictures and their comments, and then have a way for the public to comment on their processes as they emerge. If you did that, what could happen is you would build support for the plan as you go, instead of introducing a finished product and creating the impression of "thanks for your ideas, we went ahead and wrote the plan anyway and here it is".

Chairman Thompson suggested chatting with Bill after the meeting, so he can be filled in on things that are happening. The Chairman thanked Bill for his comments and indicated that he thinks those concerns will be taken care of. Barbara Litrell suggested agendizing that for next time.

Sandy Moriarty, Sedona, AZ: Indicated that regarding the Council's participation, there have been Councilors at the open meetings and they have commented. It is not as if they haven't had any part in this and she doesn't think there is anything to prevent them from attending any of the work sessions, so keep that in mind as you talk to Mike Goimarac. She understands that they can't comment officially, but there is nothing to prevent them from coming. They have the right to comment as a citizen.

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

4. Discussion/possible action regarding future Arts and Culture Workshop. (20 minutes 3:10 – 3:30 p.m.)

Mike Raber reported that he, Jim Eaton and Elemer Magaziner were at the Arts & Culture Commission's meeting on the 27th and went over the program with them. The Commission will work on the questions and forward those to staff, so the Committee can have them for the next Committee meeting on the 20th, and they will have their next meeting on the 19th. We will also get table facilitators, recorders and come up with about five questions. They want to get their answers before moving to the next question, but he explained that depending on who is running the table, there are varying degrees of success with that approach. They also talked about not presenting the next question until you have dealt with the previous one, but in that case, the facilitator has to keep it moving.

Mike explained that the Commission will get a program outline for their meeting on the 19th, and we showed them Jim's DVD for that program, which is excellent. The Outreach Team will continue to work with Brenda on the set-up and Sandy Moriarty will run the sound system.

As far as the format, Mike explained that staff and the Chairman will do the background on the Community Plan and the introduction, introduce the Committee Members and show Jim's DVD. The Chairman of the Arts & Culture Commission will do an overview and introduce the Commissioners, like we did at the Sustainability workshop. Jim Eaton added that he forgot to mention that Ed (Uzumeckis) was there too. Mike continued to say that Chairman Thompson will open the table discussions and there will be about an hour for that plus 30 minutes to hear a report from each table. Then, Chairman Thompson will wrap it up in 5 to 10 minutes.

Mike explained that he wanted to get commitments on being there to facilitate or record and if there are any thoughts on having the tables answer one question at a time. He pointed out that sometimes that is a little messy, but he doesn't know.

Chairman Thompson asked the Committee Members how many of them would be there and Vice Chairman Robson asked when it is. Mike Raber indicated it is Wednesday, March 28th from 4:30 p.m. to 6:30 p.m. at the West Sedona School. Chairman Thompson, Jim Eaton, Elemer Magaziner, Barbara Litrell and Gerhard Mayer indicated that they would be present. Angela LeFevre could not be asked, since she was unable to link to the meeting.

Barbara Litrell, Jim Eaton and Gerhard Mayer volunteered to moderate and Chairman Thompson volunteered to record. Kathy Levin noted that she could also record. Judy Reddington indicated that she would be present and moderate.

Chairman Thompson then asked how the Committee Members felt about going through the questions trying to get answers to each one. Jim Eaton stated that if the questions are well framed and cover the ground, every effort should be made to cover all of them. It is always difficult, because people want to spend their time on the first question, and then run through the others. Gerhard Mayer noted that it is up to the moderator to cut them off. Chairman Thompson explained that is the question, do we want the moderator to do that?

Barbara Litrell stated that if we are setting aside one hour for five questions, that is about 12 minutes per question and we as moderators should stick to that -- it is very doable. What has happened previously is that we didn't have that requirement; we said pick one of the questions that you want to discuss. She likes the idea of going through them one at a time, so at the end you have everyone's opinion on five issues.

Mike Bower explained that he titles a sheet of paper with each question and as a moderator - recorder team, you can let the topic warp around a little. Even though you are on question one, a good recorder can hear a response to question three and just flip the sheet and write it down, so you aren't stifling it. If you stop the conversation and say that we aren't there yet, some quiet people are going to just shut up, and then there is the end of that table. It is a good goal, but it just requires better listening skills on the part of the recorder and a looser encouragement on the part of the moderator. There are points where you can stop an obvious dominator, but if someone just came up with their first comment and they are off of the topic, don't stop them; they might be on topic, so see where they go with it.

Marty Losoff pointed out that the Committee has had several workshops and this discussion is déjà vu, so he would recommend that staff just run with it and let's go on to the meat of today's meeting - the alternatives.

Jim Eaton indicated that the job of a moderator is not just to cover all of the questions; it is to control the ones who want to talk all the time and draw out the ones that are less anxious to talk. Some people want to sit there, but they came to the meeting for a reason and there should be some effort to draw them out. Chairman Thompson noted that can be done with what Mike is saying about jumping around. Jim Eaton then added that you want to ensure that you have all of the topics covered one way or another.

Elemer Magaziner pointed out that, if a participant wants to say something that is not covered by the questions, the questions limit the discussion to the frame of mind of those who made up the questions. When he has been a recorder, people were chewing at the bit, because they came prepared, and he would hate to shut somebody down that came to the meeting for that purpose.

Chairman Thompson suggested starting off by asking if anybody is dying to say something about anything that may not be in the questions -- if not, go 12 minutes, and if so, go 10 minutes per question. Gerhard Mayer indicated that he would have them look at all of the questions and refer to the ones that are important to them, have their thoughts and when it is their turn, explain what they want to say, rather than going one at a time. Not everybody has an answer for all questions.

Chairman Thompson indicated that it sounds like we are pretty comfortable with it. Mike Bower then added that a tip from the Sedona Forum was if the recorder is doing as he said, to help the moderator, the recorder can suggest going to the next question and saying that he will begin by telling what he already has on that question. It saves time and helps to move it along by having the recorder give a summary of what he has already gotten.

Jim Eaton noted that the difference is that those Forums lasted for two or three days and a writing committee boiled it all down and moved the parts around. Mike Bower agreed and added that they had to make tracks even though it was for multiple days, so that technique was a good one.

5. Discussion/possible action on the planning process; public comments, plan alternative concepts, public outreach and the Community Plan Room. (1 hour & 25 minutes 3:30 – 4:55 p.m.)

a. Neighborhood Outreach (35 minutes)

Chairman Thompson indicated that he had mentioned this item last week and there is a memo from him in the packet. Basically, his thought was from thinking of something that Mike Bower had said at an earlier meeting indicating that when a community gets to about 9,000 people, it no longer necessarily thinks as one. It thinks more in terms of neighborhoods, etc., plus this is going to go for a vote and what is going to make them vote. A lot of people might find something in the plan that they don't like and throw out the baby with the bath water. It could be different things for different people in the community, so a plan or candidate for election tends to talk in very general terms in order to not offend anyone and hope to get the votes by default. We don't want to do that, we want to be as specific as possible about the ideas that have come to the Committee. He thought one possibility was to do more of an emphasis on neighborhoods, so there is something in the plan that talks to different neighborhoods, and then people can see their group and they don't care as much about the other stuff, so they will go with it. The other possibility is when people come into this room, we have talked about having "Can you top this?", where each Committee Member would have a party or gathering here, and we might do that by neighborhoods. When we get the moment plans together and have them ready for review, we might think about having different parts of the City come in, so they can comment more as a group on the things in their neighborhoods and that might give us more focused information.

The Chairman then indicated that he is curious to know what the Committee Members think about that. Jim Eaton stated that it depends on how you define "neighborhood", if you define it very closely like the houses you can see from your front porch, it is going to be very difficult and it may not be as meaningful. We have larger neighborhoods like north Uptown, 179, the Chapel area, and two or three in West Sedona that can be defined. He landed on the number of eight to ten areas and we could hold open houses here. All it would take is two or three Committee Members and it wouldn't require a lot of staff time. We could have an aerial of their area and give them felt markers and stickies to get their ideas. The north Uptown people think in terms of all of Uptown, not a little part of it, because they drive through the other parts to get anywhere. They have a lot of things in common, but if you try to break it down into 20 or 30 little neighborhoods or homeowners' associations, he doesn't think you will get as clear a picture.

Chairman Thompson explained that the number of sectors picked is key, but he is not suggesting this from the standpoint of getting more input from the community. We need to be tough with ourselves at this point, because we are far enough along in the process and we have some deadlines coming up. We haven't written word one yet and if you work backwards, the City Council has to approve this by the middle of November in order for them to have four months before the election next March, and we need to go through P&Z first, so we have a lot of work to do and we have to be tough on ourselves about not having any more activities just for getting input; however, we can have neighborhoods or sectors of the community come in as groups to give feedback on the moment plans, etc.

Marty Losoff stated that it would be great to get people in here to feel the energy that is on these walls, so anything that would get them in would be nice, but he doesn't think it should be by neighborhoods -- they are too small. He lives in the Uptown area and they get together as a group and they don't talk about Lazy Bear, they talk about all of Sedona and he imagines a lot of neighborhoods do that. He would be concerned if we did what we are talking about in that

we're isolating too much on neighborhoods, and maybe hopefully not isolate too much on the moment plans. We as a group haven't come up with our vision or whatever the five or six alternatives are going to be, and until we do that as a Committee, the moment plans and neighborhood discussions, etc., are almost incidental, because we still have to get that overall blueprint, and the moment plans may or may not fit into the vision. We should get with the timeline, because November isn't that far away and we need to get moving on our vision -- the five or six alternative plans. He is afraid that if we do what we are talking about, it will take some of our time away. If we can do it informally with one of us hosting a group that is fine, but not to have neighborhoods come in and decide how they want their neighborhood set up. He is also concerned that our moment plans may be too narrow and we aren't looking at the overall vision.

Chairman Thompson summarized that Marty Losoff wants to emphasize the alternatives more and Marty indicated yes. Mike Bower explained that it is critical to realize that we're not doing the moment plans in lieu of focusing on the bigger visions, and that keeps coming up as a criticism of them and the process, and he thinks it is because we don't see the process and steps we need to take. One of the moment plans' efforts is to look at two or three neighborhoods and try to identify their centers, and as an outflow of that comes the concept of neighborhood centers. In a general plan like we are working on, it could be that we determine that it is a goal to identify neighborhood centers in Sedona and define the qualities of those centers. The General Plan doesn't have to do that, but it has to state that and it could become an implementation strategy or a future area Specific Plan to do that work, but we don't have to get to that detail.

Mike Bower added that what he thinks Chairman Thompson is talking about is something we have heard and it harbors to the community side of our comments. We have discussed Harmony and that they saw their possible center in a neighborhood garden, etc., so one of the moment planning efforts will shed some light on the neighborhood issue. He is suggesting that we shouldn't get too worried about going heavily into that, but we should keep our feelers out as we present these bigger alternatives, to see how our neighbors and fellow citizens react, and if it is strong then in our final writing, we should strengthen Sedona's neighborhood identities as a goal of the Community Plan and that can be amplified with one of the moment plan's graphics and description of neighborhood centers -- walkability within a radius. It is important to not get sidetracked into thinking we are doing the wrong thing; we are trying to do a couple of things in parallel and we are at the point of needing to add more things in parallel, so it is going to get even more confusing.

Gerhard Mayer stated that should be on the Outreach Team's agenda for Thursday, so it can be discussed in more detail to maybe come up with more ideas on how to approach that whole thing. We could set four dates and if they show up, we will know they are interested; we can't accommodate everyone. Chairman Thompson agreed and indicated that the Outreach Committee could probably take this and decide how to use that in terms of looking at moment plans or whatever, but he wanted the Outreach Committee to have the benefit of the whole Committee's feelings about whether or not neighborhoods should be more emphasized. With a map, he, Mike and Kathy found a way to divide it into four different groups or sectors, but those might not be the right ones and that is something the Outreach Team can do.

The Chairman then asked if the Committee as a whole feels this is a smart thing to do as opposed to continuing to look at it as a whole City thing, in terms of the Plan and how we bring people in to comment on the work.

Gerhard Mayer stated that it is a whole City; we all live in Sedona and all of the issues pertain to everyday life; we shouldn't be split up. He would rather see a whole picture, because when you separate them there are different demographics, income, etc., from Foothills to Harmony Hills. Chairman Thompson commented that we don't want that, but we have always been a little bi-polar about Uptown and West Sedona, but do we divide it even more, are the far west

people different from people on the retail strip and are they going to have different interests? If the people in the different areas have different values and look at the Community Plan in a different way, then we need to acknowledge that and that is why big cities like Santa Fe, which is similar to us but with a big population, has different districts. Their Councilors are even voted for in four different districts, because there is so much difference, so that is why he is raising the question. The Chairman noted that Gerhard sounded like we should keep it holistic, but he isn't sure that we shouldn't be looking at it as more of a divide and conquer kind of town. Gerhard Mayer stated that it is the industry; we live off of that industry and the industry basically feeds from us as workers or store owners, etc. -- it is all a mix and it is such a small community; we're not a huge city with different districts.

Marty Losoff indicated that he is willing to try anything; he is just concerned about the calendar. This would have been a great exercise a year ago, but as Bill Welter said, if we do something like that again, we are going to have to have feedback for people and it is going to be another step and take up some more time, and we are going to have to deal with the website some other way. For some reason when we become the host for our neighborhood, keeping in mind in Uptown, we have merchants on Main Street and people who live in Uptown, and their neighbor gatherings include from 30 to 60 people at a time, they don't want to talk about Uptown, they want to talk about the City. Sure they want to talk about the traffic in Uptown or the Sales Tax, but in going through some of these exercises with them, they want to talk about the big picture.

Chairman Thompson clarified that he is not talking about a separate activity and you seem to be coming back to it adding more time, but there are two things in particular that we have to do, and we can do them in different ways. One is to get feedback on our alternatives and moment plans. The Outreach Committee will help us figure out the best way to get that feedback; he is just suggesting that one way to do that is to try to get different sectors of the City at a time, because that may help us get better feedback on those things. It is not a different thing, just the same thing a different way. Marty Losoff stated that he is fine with that. Chairman Thompson then continued to say that the other thing is when we get to writing the Community Plan, we can talk about one vision for the whole City, and then anyone in the City can find one little thing they don't like and vote no; whereas, if we find a way to talk about the different neighborhoods or sectors, then maybe they will see what their neighborhood wants and support it, although they may not know much about what else it talks about. Marty Losoff stated again that he has no problem with that.

Elemer Magaziner indicated that neighborhoods or sectors are one way to slice it, but viewpoints are another way. We need to bounce it off of the elderly, the business people, etc. We have their ideas, but we aren't talking about getting more ideas; we're talking about the feedback, which is independent of neighborhoods. It is the demographic element and we need their feedback, so there are at least two different ways. Chairman Thompson noted that we may need to address them specifically in the Plan as well. Elemer Magaziner agreed and indicated that even if you go within one neighborhood, like with Working Team 4 identifying possible paths so people could get around without using cars, the answer he gets in his neighborhood depends on whether they are teenagers or 80-years-old. Some say it is ridiculous; it is uphill, so there are many ways to slice it and we have to decide who we want feedback from.

Vice Chairman Robson stated that he still wants to take a tour of the neighborhoods; he wants to see what some of the issues are that may be addressed for the future. Maybe one neighborhood has a horrible drainage issue that needs to be addressed, but another neighborhood has fine drainage and he needs to know that, and he thinks it would be beneficial for all of us, so when we write this, there are provisions to address those issues. We need to try to move forward with figuring that out, as far as going out there and looking at them; we can't see them from here.

Jim Eaton indicated that he doesn't have a problem with continuing the idea of neighborhood tours, but just driving around a neighborhood isn't going to identify their issues. To address Elemer's concern, we have already got a pretty good idea of what the various demographics want. The elderly want to ensure that there are some elderly services and people who can hike and ride bicycles have told us they want bike paths and bicycle paths. Representing the elderly, he doesn't care, except they want it so let's give it to them. We already have a pretty good idea and if you look at the comments we've got, you find a definite pattern, and to do another layer with separate demographics, he doesn't know what the product of it would be. Elemer Magaziner stated just feedback, not ideas; however, Jim Eaton stated that we have got feedback.

Mike Bower indicated he wanted to tie in the idea of the neighborhood stuff, but not so much on feedback, and he is fine with the idea of trying some specific neighborhood groupings to get feedback on the overall alternatives, but in the overall alternatives, there is one that really would probably lead us to create identifiable neighborhoods, and it is not tourism. It is probably the Resident Community First alternative, and in trying to communicate what that looks like, it looks like a Sedona that is divided into readily identifiable neighborhoods, each one strong socially with a center, lots of helping one another and community interactions, so we might be able to explore the map division you have done or pursue the definition of what a center is within that alternative itself. It is not an either/or, we need to embrace the reality that we are going to be doing some work and that will come out in that particular alternative. Granted we could argue that it could be in the other alternatives, but the point of the five is that they all should and could blend, but we are going to have to make some calls and say that we are going to put that idea in this alternative for now, recognizing that the good ideas from all of those five will bubble up into a consensus alternative, so it is not an either/or; we will do it all to some extent, and whether or not we elect to get feedback based on some division, he doesn't think we are going to get the correct neighborhood division in this group's tenure, but we can make a cut at it and say we are going into the Chapel area with a special presentation. It might spark more attendance, so it is a good thought.

Mike Raber asked if Mike Bower thinks it is better to see what comes out of the alternatives before deciding on an area that we might want to do outreach to and Mike Bower stated definitely, but we could start thinking about it concurrently. When we start defining alternatives, if we want to explore the idea of strong neighborhoods that will fit into that one alternative, and if we want to define all of the strong neighborhoods, then he is suggesting that we are going beyond our scope of work. Our scope of work would say that is a goal for Sedona to work on in the future; we have a big enough scope of work that if we tried to get meetings and make everyone decide where the little neighborhood boundary would be, that would be another year's effort. We really are going to decide if we have enough of a consensus that the idea of identifiable neighborhoods is part of our final recommendation, but where they are and who is in each one is not part of our scope of work. To worry about it too much for feedback sessions is probably wrong; we could take a quickie at it and not try to say that this is one of the identifiable neighborhoods . . . just say an Uptown meeting or Chapel meeting, etc., and we can make some arbitrary chunks of the City for feedback sessions.

Barbara Litrell indicated that part of it has to be how the City views itself and whether or not there are any neighborhoods that view themselves as strong neighborhoods, because the Council had a program for Listening Sessions in four parts of the City. When we did it in the Chapel area, it was great and the people in the Chapel area felt they were being heard and they showed up in droves. When they did it in Uptown and West Sedona they also worked well. People like the idea of two to four areas, but when you look at West Sedona, most of the people seem to think of themselves as West Sedona, except for the folks in Harmony. In Harmony, you have almost 10% of the population with about 1,000 people, and they see themselves as something specific. She has been working with Harmony as the liaison from the Housing Commission, and they are working on a whole project related to wellness in their community and building community, as a subset of what we are doing. We did a meeting for

Harmony and they had specific things they wanted the Committee to know, so it is not like dividing it into all of the HOAs, but we should have a meeting in the Chapel area, in Uptown, in West Sedona and in Harmony Hills, because they have an identity, so even if it is those four, it is productive for us to know if people consider themselves of a certain neighborhood or not. She thinks of herself as West Sedona, not Kachina, but Harmony is different and we have to be cognizant of that. Gerhard Mayer added that Harmony is a lot more engaged than any of the other neighborhoods, and Barbara Litrell added that it is fairly recent and it is because of a group of people there that are doing that, so we need to acknowledge that.

Jim Eaton pointed out that we have different kinds of neighborhoods; Harmony is a very tight neighborhood. They had their own community center, when it was called the Adult Community Center; it was really the Harmony neighborhood center and they still feel that way. His neighborhood has their own park and once a year they get together for a picnic, but between times nobody cares -- he lives in the most selfish neighborhood in town, because they are the ones that closed the Forest Service, built a locked gate and made us the laughing stock of the community.

Chairman Thompson indicated that this discussion has accomplished everything he intended, which was a good sharing of different ways to approach it and he is very comfortable with this being input to the Outreach Committee, in terms of determining if this is another way to handle what we are doing from now on.

Judy Reddington stated that as the Plan develops, we will see who is most likely to want and need the feedback, it may be viewpoint groups or it may be neighborhood groups, but it will be clearer as the Plan develops.

b. Development of Plan Alternatives. (50 minutes)

Mike Raber indicated that he sees three points of discussion and one thing from our last meeting was that the Committee needs to keep working on these plan alternatives and as the Planning Teams work, we need to be in parallel with that. Looking at these potential options and maybe additional ones, there are some different ideas that we have about how the alternatives are characterized. Mike Bower presented an idea that is a little more standalone and John Sather's tends to be more holistic as alternatives, so there are some differences of opinion. We included those two different descriptions in the packet. One is what we landed on the end of January and the other one is the original concept that John Sather put together.

Mike Raber then explained that one point of discussion is that John Sather was pretty adamant about keeping that original description and most of that boiled down to a difference of opinion over the idea of creating a sustainability-focused alternative, which was much more holistic by itself, as opposed to something that stood out as an environmental alternative, in that sustainability permeated a lot of these things. We have really got two different opinions about those two alternatives and maybe in some of the others too. The second point is how much information should be in each alternative for the citizens to be able to easily grasp them and give us usable feedback, so we need to discuss more examples of what needs to be included, and that is in Kathy Levin's handout. It is an idea that John Sather had originally about a bucket list of things to be included in each alternative. One way to possibly move forward would be if we agree on some of the alternatives and pick a couple to start working up an outline for those, while we hash out the ones we don't agree with.

For the third point, Mike Raber indicated it is mainly what Mike Bower is focused on, which is the process for developing the alternatives, and that is why we have his suggested process in the packet with the flowchart that shows where it is inserted into the planning process. Basically, the Committee would be involved in drafting vision statements and creating a template for final visions, and then writing final visions based on that template. He knows that not all of that will be resolved today, but it is pretty much about the alternatives themselves, the

information in the alternatives, and then the process for developing them that he saw as important things to talk about.

Chairman Thompson asked if Mike Bower had any general comments about the process and Mike Bower asked that everybody look at the process and flowchart. He thinks it behooves us to work as a group in a brainstorming way initially to try to understand all five alternatives. Just as we tried to write our own visions, each of us should individually try to write a vision for each of the five alternatives. It is hard; he started on Resident Community and he was going too deep. What John Sather has here is sort of an armature to draft a vision on and it starts with sort of an overview of the vision and you fill it out by talking about goals and initiatives, land use and urban form and what might be revitalized or changed, and urban revitalization, transportation and circulation, etc.

Mike Bower added that he hates the words "bucket list"; it is a reminder list of the kinds of ingredients your vision might want to hit upon, so he doesn't think the approach John Sather is talking about and his own approach are at odds. John has just laid out an outline of how to define any of the five visions, while he has laid out a process to define any of the five visions, so the process that he is advocating is that we all brainstorm together. He put first, second and third by that to get a handle on it, but we would brainstorm the key qualities of each alternative as a group, including

- What is the sense of place of the environmental vision?
- What is the sense of place of the Tourism First vision, etc.?
- What are the social interactions that take place there?
- What is the pace of life?

Mike Bower then indicated that there are other things; the "soft" square is us as a Committee and there are three things that he thinks we all will do; the "hard" squares are subcommittees or staff or whatever. It would be nice to map all of the key development and redevelopment areas and that is the first "hard" square. We would map vacant lands; soft structures, which are buildings that are likely to be bulldozed; prior failed proposals, because those are bodies of land, like Biddles, that people are churning new ideas on and they will come through with something. Then, we would move into that second step and try to list some key ideas or land uses that would relate to each of the five alternatives, so in Resident Community First, maybe there is a community rec. center as a key idea or land use, and if we had the map of where things are, we could say that it could go anywhere or it is better in this location. After we have done that with the ingredients, social interactions and feeling of each of the five alternatives, we then take our notes and individually write. He believes we will be drawn to one of the alternatives to write well, and then draft outlines for the others. If we do that, we would share those together again and he is referencing the third "soft" bubble. We write it, and then share it together as a group, and then we are done in a way with our whole Committee activity. Then, some "hard" square subcommittee analyzes all of our visions and tries to decide the template for writing the final vision statements.

Mike Bower then explained that John Sather's is a first cut at a template laying out the way you would address each of these, and he may or may not be right. It is a good place-keeping device to remind us that we need to do something like that, but after we read what people are writing about, we might decide that these descriptions are taking a different form than this outline and that is what the fourth step would be, to decide the appropriate template.

Mike Bower added that the fifth and sixth steps are taking it to conclusion and you are actually writing a vision statement for each of the five and that is probably done by a writing subcommittee. They can come back for feedback or assign us aspects of that, and the sixth part in the little square will likely be John Sather and himself. They will get some City maps and try to take the written visions and the discussions we've had to figure out how to best put those ideas on the map. Some will fit on a map and some won't, but they will get the ones that fit, to get us to the point that we can start getting community feedback on the five visions. We would

have written documentation of what we understood them to mean and a graphic to help people focus the discussion on those, but he thinks it was good to engage all of us, hence the "soft" squares, in a process to do that. Otherwise, it will be done by a fewer number of people.

Mike Bower also explained that the options are to engage the public and create more Working Teams, but nobody is as up-to-speed as we are and we are the public, so he thinks this is when we all go to work on improving our own understanding of these things and trying to winnow it down. What he and John Sather have presented go hand-in-hand; they are not different. Mike Raber agreed that they are in sync.

Mike Bower indicated that what John Sather has presented would be what he is calling the fourth step, but he did it without the process in front of it and we might say skip the process and adopt this, give it to a subcommittee and kick back, but he is advocating that we don't do that and we set forth either some special meetings or set the agenda differently for the next meetings and take a couple of meetings to do the first and second steps, and then give ourselves the two intervening weeks to get three alternatives written, and the next two intervening weeks to get the next two alternatives written, and then see how we do.

Jim Eaton requested that every piece of paper from now on bear a date and the name of the author for reference, so we know what we are talking about. There have been references to this thing that has been handed out, but it doesn't say it is John Sather's. If this paper had a date, he would know that it came after the one he got in January.

Chairman Thompson indicated that for clarity if we were to do this plan that you are talking about, there is a lot of time invested in this. Mike Bower stated three Committee meetings or 1½ months; however, the Chairman noted that isn't including the outside time when everybody is writing multiple versions of this, and then coordinating it. If we did that and came up with the deliverable of one or two-page statements about each of five alternatives, the point of having those would be that they are what we give the public to comment on, in addition to the moment plans as illustrations of those visions. Mike Bower stated yes, potentially.

Chairman Thompson explained that he is asking to be sure that we are aiming for something that we really want and it seems that we want to have the public tell us what we need to do to write the Community Plan draft that they will approve. We are spending all of this time on these alternate visions, which we agreed early on were to be more stimulation to get people thinking about almost extreme versions of things, as opposed to the Plan itself. He understood that we are doing that so we can pull them together into one, and isn't it the one that we want to get the public's comments on after they have looked at our preliminary planning, etc.? In other words, why not have them look at the moment plans, because they are illustrations of what would be behind these one or two-page statements anyway.

Mike Bower explained that he doesn't think they are going to be; he thinks that is where we still have a disconnect and maybe it is him, but what he saw happen in the Working Team moment plan assignment of tasks won't address these five alternative visions. The various things that come out might fit as a small part of it, but he thinks it is the graphic that ultimately needs to go to the public and have the blue dot process or something put on each of the five alternatives, so he thinks it is worthwhile spending time on the five alternatives, because ultimately the ideas and concepts generated in the five alternatives are the only ideas and concepts that are really on the table to end up in the final consensus vision. If we shortcut these and make a cursory look at the five and aim for the end, we are really shortcutting the public's involvement process, because you are going to have one thing that is whole and real for them to respond to. These little key components are aspects of the written vision that get pulled out and keyed to a location in town or a use in town. If there is a great community center and a lot of sharing and social interaction there, there can be a descriptive that points to that spot in the alternative. He kind of disagrees with the concern, because spending time on the five will help everybody take all of this feedback, some of which are issues and some of which are ideas, and distill it into

visions and specifics that all try to work holistically within one of the defined ideas -- Refresh the Current Plan, Essential Services, Significantly Embrace Tourism, Community First, and he just can't say Sustainable Balance, because that is too much of the given holistic vision.

Mike Bower indicated that he doesn't understand why John Sather fights it so much; he thought Chairman Thompson's example was great, just Environment First, because in Environment First, it could be fairly extreme. The cultural park reverts to nature and we actually reduce tourism to protect the trails and we encourage long-term eco-tourism only. We don't encourage new residents, because we aren't going to expand -- you could take a rather extreme look at Sedona as a total environment. If you say Sustainable Balance, you are going to have to have a great community with super enviro-tourism and it is all going to be the final vision.

Mike Raber referenced Chairman Thompson's comment about the moment plans and indicated that you may use some of those to illustrate aspects of that and it may be that people can relate to that better than text, so that may be where a lot of their emphasis goes. Chairman Thompson agreed that is at the root of what he is thinking, because he imagines people coming in here to give their feedback, and if they are like him, they can respond to a plan for the cultural park, a plan for the creek, etc., but to look at five different alternatives, how do they relate to five different statements of visions? The more text, the more overwhelmed they are going to be and they not only won't give us good feedback, but they will go away thinking that they didn't say what they wanted to say, and that is what has him more afraid than anything. He wants something that people can relate to immediately and say they like that. We can be good enough listeners to move that into an overall plan.

Jim Eaton indicated that he thinks he has been assigned to write a draft of a vision for each of the five alternative futures and to distill some ideas and comments into visions.

Gerhard Mayer agreed with the Chairman that they have to see something visually, and then they will like it or not like it. There has to be something for them to see and feel; otherwise, we are going to be too holistic and too far out, and they won't make any decisions at all. They might get confused too.

Judy Reddington stated that she is not sure that she understands it. She understands that the Committee Members are getting an assignment, but she is not exactly sure what it is.

Marty Losoff indicated that coming up with our alternative future is the most important thing for us to do right now and whatever process we use, it shouldn't be a two-hour meeting. We should have one or two meetings at the most for three to five hours and knock out our vision, whether it is five visions or one vision. He also would suggest that instead of having five alternatives, we should have three. Five is too many for the community, and his alternatives would be Embrace Tourism, Embrace Community or come up with a combination, but five is too many. He also thinks in terms of the process, he would like to start at step 3, because after all of the efforts, we may be past steps 1 and 2, and he would like to see the Committee devote a good portion to brainstorming, followed by a one or two-page vision statement for each of the alternatives.

Marty Losoff then added that we don't need to devote just a two-hour meeting either; this is important enough that it is time to sit down and really knock it out with no other agenda items. We need to just devote our time to brainstorming what we have and where we are today and what we think the three alternatives should be. He likes the use of John Sather's elements, whether we modify them or come up with a list like that, but certainly a vision and some goals, and we could tie that into what we have already heard. He would venture to say that we would find a lot of the goals in many of the visions, so he would like to see us get to that and not spend a lot of time on other issues right now. We have to keep current with other things, but he would like to see time devoted to Mike Bower's process and John Sather's alternative and set a deadline -- one month or a month and a half. We talk about the moment plans and it is neat to

get the people involved, but he wouldn't put the same emphasis on them in terms of giving people something to see yet. He would rather they see our alternative plans related to those. We want Sedona to be X and Y, and then bring in the picture. That wall shows a wonderful idea and that could be a moment plan, as part of our vision.

Judy Reddington indicated that she is wondering if five alternatives are relevant for every element of the Plan. There are certainly elements in the Plan where five alternatives would help people focus and make choices, but for every element in the Plan, they would need a fully fleshed out community in quadruplicate.

Chairman Thompson indicated that he would think there would be overlap in addition to having some areas where it wouldn't apply as much. We have to cover certain things when we write the ultimate plan, and reducing the number of alternatives is one way of reducing the potential confusion and possible overwhelm for people coming in, so that does allow us to possibly use more text and that may be a good compromise.

Elemer Magaziner noted that we are throwing the words "vision" and "vision statement" around on all of these sheets of paper, and he has no clue as to what they mean anymore. On one sheet "vision" is one of A-J for each of the alternatives and in Mike Bower's flowchart, there is "vision statement", and then we also say "vision" like overall, so he has no clue, and if he was asked to write a vision for anything, he wouldn't know what you are talking about, but he could write a vision with his own interpretation of what that word means and highly distinguish that from "vision statement", which he thinks the Plan is only supposed to have one of and it is just a few words and doesn't have futures in it; it is what the Council reads. Additionally, he doesn't understand how all of the stuff on this wall fits into either the five alternatives or the flowchart -- how mechanically or conceptually it actually feeds in. He has lost track of how public comments are feeding all of these designs, which is what they need to do. Everything needs to be triggered by that and that is why we are called the Citizens Steering Committee. He isn't saying there is anything wrong, he is just starting to lose track of how all of it fits together.

Barbara Litrell indicated that she must be seeing it in black and white, because it doesn't look so complicated. She likes Marty Losoff's idea of reducing the number, because it occurred to her that Refresh the Current Plan is an easy fallback for anyone to say just refresh the current Plan, which is kind of what we are doing. We are taking the current Plan and looking at it as a basis for going forward, so she would eliminate Refresh the Current Plan and eliminate Essential Services and Infrastructure, because they have to be a part of any of the rest. Part of the plan has to excite the public -- the idea of an alternative, and she likes the idea of Tourism First, Community First and Environment First. Those are three very clear concepts for people and it is important that it be very clear that they aren't exclusive, but they have a certain accent on those syllables and that this is the direction we are looking at, and then build what Tourism First, Environment First and Community First look like, and they should incorporate all of these items on the wall. They will all incorporate Essential Services and Infrastructure, because you can't have any of it without the infrastructure and land use, etc. She also agrees that we need to do a full-day workshop based on this and reduce the number.

Mike Bower agreed with the names that Barbara Litrell came up with and the reduction to those three. The reason that John Sather threw out the other two is that they are going to be the only reasons why people would vote down whatever we do. Another reason could be that we didn't hit it when we got to our consensus vision, but he thinks we have to address that in some other manner, because the Chairman is right that five are just going to make us work too hard and make people mentally flounder. We heard reaction that the word "first" was grating some people the wrong way, and we reacted to that reaction and tried other words, but it is clearer and that way you can have Tourism, Environment and Community as the main things and "first" just amplifies the fact that alternative future X on the wall is calling this thing first and it has focused its ideas on that. In answer to Elemer's confusion, the A. vision in John Sather's handout should probably say "summary description", because A-J creates the vision and that

could be confusing. It is just a summary description of what Tourism First really is doing. You would write something that allowed people to read the first paragraph and get what the rest of the writing was going to focus on.

Mike Bower then explained that regarding the moment plans and the Working Teams and how they interact with the three things, that graphic helps you see that. A, B and C on the left side are some of those little drawings or little plans, and they are keyed on the big overall Sedona map, so it is not confusing, and if we reduce them to three, the vision statement itself is something for our internal churning to get to the key component paragraphs. The whole vision statement doesn't have to end up on the wall, but we would pull the key components out of it and point to places on the map, so people understand that a community center is part of the first vision or age-in-place housing is part of the Community First vision, etc. He doesn't feel that it is going to detract from our process and it is the only way to take the information and use it to move forward. If we tried to get to a consensus vision and make the majority of the presentation about that, we would struggle. He tried to figure out the process that would just give us the great ideas, great social interactions, etc., and just move them through some criteria goals and objectives to a vision, and if we could do that in the chat room format or in some open public process, it should work, but you really just have these three strong directions that Sedona could take, and we could just keep going strongly into tourism and ignore age-in-place housing or keeping our youth here with good jobs, etc., and become the greatest visitor destination or we could revert to total environmental preservation and not allow many new residents or minimize or change the way tourism works. Granted we are going to do an amalgamation of all three in the consensus, but it will be clear to people and we don't have to confuse them by saying that we aren't voting on these. It should make it clear if we can show where it is all going and they can come up and read a key component and stick their blue dot on it, and then like another key component and put a blue dot there, and there is nothing wrong with those two ideas making it into the future vision.

Mike Bower then explained that his diagrams help him take what is complex and insert time into the equation to see how it is going to move.

Vice Chairman Robson indicated he would make a motion to get rid of the first two questions right now and get this thing simplified. Chairman Thompson indicated that he wasn't ready to open it for a motion at this time and Mike Raber explained that without John Sather here to really talk about his point-of-view, it might be a little hasty to throw them out, but we can go forward and still take on this task, and hold off making a decision on the number of alternatives we are going to end up with until we've had a chance to hash that out more. Making that decision may just be premature, but certainly moving forward with the rest of it makes sense, and it may turn out that three alternatives are fine, because we are looking at multiple components and they should cover almost everything we need to cover, and maybe there is another way to characterize those other two -- stay the course and scale back, so he would prefer that we stay open on that until we have John Sather here.

Jim Eaton stated that it isn't going to take a lot of time to write a vision for doing nothing, and he intends to write visions on all five. He proposes to keep all five and take a stab at it, but he will focus on the three that we've been talking about. Chairman Thompson agreed that we can start with the three and hold off on deciding what to do with the other two.

Gerhard Mayer stated tourism - economy, sustainable environment, and community - social are the three main ingredients of a community and everything else is a sub-subject of those three main components. Chairman Thompson pointed out that the titles of them can almost be the last thing we decide. When we met with the former Mayors, Councilors and P&Z Commissioners, the first thing really threw them and that surprised us. We could see why it was throwing them, because people saw the word "first" and heard the word "only". Mike explained that we aren't going to vote on these and Mike Bower added that they didn't hear it. The Chairman indicated that they were people experienced with the process and they knew

how this stuff works and had been through it before. They are not the average citizens, so he is trying to imagine what the average citizens are going to respond to and he wants to be really careful with that. If he writes one of these, he would approach it by starting at the bottom, like arts & culture and ask what things are for this particular emphasis that are arts & culture-related, and he would do the same thing with all of the others. Then, he would develop some goals out of it and write a vision that accompanied that, instead of starting with the vision. When that is done, he would decide whether or not the title is right, so he thinks we can do this.

The Chairman then summarized that what he is hearing is that the next meeting or two, we will do some brainstorming on these three -- Community, Environment and Tourism. Mike Raber pointed out that there were two items that he thought would be on the next agenda, and asked if they should be kicked off. One was the Arts & Culture meeting, unless you want the Outreach Team to deal with that. The Chairman indicated that the Outreach Team could do that. Mike Raber then indicated that the other item has to do with the discussion about the Council's visioning and Barbara Litrell stated that isn't an urgent item. The Chairman noted that started with Bill Welter's comment; however, Mike Raber stated that was how we are going to ensure that this has momentum and that it is continuous, and no one is getting feedback from the Committee, so it is understanding how we are going to go forward with our outreach. Chairman Thompson suggested having a few minutes with Bill to let him know what we are working on, so we can keep that off of the agenda; we can deal with that without having to take time in the meeting and find a way to follow-up with him. Marty Losoff added that Bill's issue is one we have always dealt with -- how do we get back to the public and that will be our next public program.

Marty Losoff then noted that we also talked about expanding the time if possible to ensure that we cover all of it, and the Chairman suggested putting the first two on the agenda for next time and if we can't get through them, we can expand time for the next meeting. We will do Community First and then Environment First.

Mike Bower suggested that if there was facilitation with three boards, as ideas crop up we can place them, and we might fill out all three pretty well in one meeting. It is possible that we don't have to stay focused on the two things first, just try to tackle them and keep deciding as a team -- like the idea of a water slide, is that a tourism thing or a community thing, etc., and we can put it on a board and keep moving. If you look at the chart, those first two steps are that. They are brainstorming what these things are really saying, what are the ideas and in which of the three categories do they really belong. Where does the museum belong -- is it a tourism thing, although it could be argued that it is a community thing, and that is the nature of our argument. Then, we will all kind of be on the same page to take that list of ingredients and craft a more holistic vision for each of the three things. Marty Losoff indicated the need for a strong arm to keep everyone on track, so we don't play the ping pong game and just brainstorm, then we might get it done.

Chairman Thompson indicated that is a good suggestion and if we start at the bottom we can just go through them. Mike Raber added that we can do an extended meeting if we don't do P&Z for the second week in March.

Elemer Magaziner asked if Tourism could be generalized to Economy, because a lot of the things have to do with economy, and the Chairman suggested seeing how it develops, because the last thing we have to do is put a title on it.

Barbara Litrell indicated that she can be one of the people writing on the boards and Mike Raber asked if everyone knows what the homework is. Chairman Thompson clarified that there isn't any homework -- they aren't writing anything on this first part.

Chairman Thompson then asked if the Committee Members all felt they are being heard and several members indicated that the Chairman is doing fine. He then encouraged the Committee Members to let him know if they ever have a problem.

Jim Eaton stated that on that point, we have a bunch of very windy people and they like to talk for a long time. If everybody would organize their thoughts before waving their hands in the air, so they can talk shorter, it would be much appreciated.

- 6. Discussion regarding future meeting dates and future agenda items. (5 minutes 4:55 – 5:00 p.m.)**
Tuesday, March 20, 2012 – 3:00 p.m.
Tuesday, April 3, 2012 – 3:00 p.m.
At the “Community Plan Room”

The Chairman indicated that the next meeting will be on March 20th and the following meeting will be on April 3rd.

7. Adjournment.

The Chairman adjourned the meeting at 5:02 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 March 6, 2012.

Donna A. S. Puckett, *Recording Secretary*

Date