

**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, February 5, 2013 – 3:00 p.m.**

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

Chairman Thompson called the meeting to order at 3:03 p.m. and roll call was taken.

**Committee Members:** Chairman Jon Thompson, Vice Chairman Rio Robson (excused) and Committee Members Mike Bower (joined at 3:06 p.m.), Jim Eaton, Angela LeFevre (joined at 4:40 p.m.), Barbara Litrell, Marty Losoff, Elemer Magaziner, Gerhard Mayer (excused), Judy Reddington and John Sather

**Staff:** Cynthia Lovely and Mike Raber

**2. Announcements from staff and committee.**

Mike Raber informed the Committee that the retreat will be Saturday, February 9 at 9:30 a.m. at Judy Reddington's house. Marty Losoff asked if an agenda would be sent out. Mike informed the group that one will be forthcoming. Marty asked if there were directions to Judy's house. Judy indicated that she will send the directions to Mike Raber for distribution.

Marty Losoff stated that the Planning & Zoning Commission will have a work session on February 14th at 3:30pm in the Vultee Conference Room, to discuss a comprehensive review of where they are today. Additionally, all but one of the Commissioners attended an E-T-C meeting. The Committee members are invited to attend the Planning & Zoning Commission meeting. This first topic on the agenda will be the capital improvement plan.

Chairman Thompson stated that the City Council will be having a meeting to discuss the 10-year Capital Improvement Plan. The meeting will be held on February 19<sup>th</sup> at 5pm at City Hall. The Chairman encouraged the Committee members to attend.

**3. Public forum for items not listed on the agenda.**

*Chairman Thompson opened the public forum.*

**Carol Wirkus, Sedona:** Ms. Wirkus stated that there is a need for cost consideration when drawing up the Community Plan. She felt that the three E-T-C scenarios were very similar, and additionally, that the system of public transportation was woven into the three themes in such a way as to make it appear that there was more public interest in this than exists. She supports public transportation where it makes sense. As laid out in the three visions, public transportation does not make sense and this is not the direction that the community provided. She believes the City cannot afford to purchase the land needed for the improvements and cited the Roadrunner expenses to support her argument. She also commented that most visitors to Sedona are day-trippers that want to spend just a few hours in Sedona and are not interested in public transportation. From the perspective of the residents, she would like the Committee to consider if they use public transportation themselves. In her opinion, neither the visitor nor resident is likely to use public transportation. She encourages the Committee to keep in mind that Sedona is a city that lives within its means.

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

#### **4. Drawing for Prizes for E-T-C Respondents.**

Chairman Thompson stated that the Committee received 368 tabloid responses and has 298 responses with names. The computer was set to random.org, and a random number was generated. Once the number was generated, it was compared to the numbers attached to the residents. Chairman Thompson then generated three numbers: 83, 208 and 49. The numbers were verified with the resident numbers, and the residents selected were Neal Margolin, Hal Driggs, and Rolf Murchison. These individuals will be contacted by the Committee. If these individuals are unable to be contacted or refuse the prize, Staff will generate another random number.

#### **5. Discussion of E-T-C Results.**

Cynthia Lovely then discussed the results of the dot tabulations. She distributed charts to show the results of the blue dot exercise. She noted that areas of interest were the Cultural Park, Airport Mesa and the Creek Corridor. Out of all three panels, transportation and circulation were of strong interest. The Venn diagram results yielded a strong preference for Environment/Community as well as Environment/Community/Tourism. Jim Eaton interjected that there were a lot of dots localized around the middle of each diagram.

John Sather requested the pictures of the dot distribution be posted on the walls in the Community Plan room. He added that he committed to many people that this was not a number counting exercise. The numbers don't reflect the emotional part of this – which is represented by the centralized dots. Cynthia stated this is not meant to be a scientific analysis. However, some of the public is interested in a count.

Cynthia then went on to explain the tabloid results, and it was found that the results of the E-T-C preference were similar to what was found at the meetings. She stated that not all of the respondents answered all the questions in the tabloid, so the data is not reflective of every tabloid collected. Cynthia also explained a bar graph that represented E-T-C preferences with regard to locations on the map.

Jim Eaton requested that the Committee get copies of the data. He indicated that he did not trust the results of the dots.

John Sather then questioned some of the totals on a chart, and it was found that the totals did not include totals for each of the days. Judy Reddington stated that she believes the data crunching could be dangerous; it is hard to take the information and quantify it. However, as a community, the conversation that took place around these charts and with the dot system was valuable and important input, and insights were gained. She also stated that the Committee has two years worth of comments and suggestions that should be put into the same hopper and be counted. She also mentioned that a number of the previous comments did not include tourism, but the concept of tourism was reflected in the E-T-C exercise.

Jim Eaton stated that people may have been responding to the way specific case studies were written, and that may be misleading.

Marty stated that this is a snapshot from those 200-some people that were at the meetings. This is a good picture; a lot of work was put into the graphs and charts. This doesn't mean that it's the final version of the plan. For today, this is good. We do have to be careful on other things. Marty stated that, for example, he has a friend that brings up the fact that nothing about bike trails was in E-T-C. Marty stated that the vision is for 20 years out. We need to look at the big picture and put it into perspective. There is nothing outstanding that was found. We've had a lot of information from the last 2 years, but we have enough information to put a draft together. Marty expressed his appreciation to Jim Eaton and Cynthia Lovely for the work that was put into this.

Chairman Thompson stated that the point of this exercise was to determine the community's collective vision, and he would like the Committee to approach this information with that in mind.

Elemer commented that what is interesting about the data is that nothing jumps out; they do not see information that the vision is all tourism, or all environment or all community.

John Sather said that what jumps out to him is that there is a balance between the three visions. We live in one of the most beautiful places on earth, and the residents here aren't overly concerned about the environment. John stated Lake Tahoe is an example, where they live without significant conveniences for the sake of the environment. What he learned from this exercise is that there is a balance. The community is telling us that these three things are of equal importance. The question is: Are we currently balanced in those areas? That is the key when writing the Plan.

Mike Raber commented that the meeting's exercise should be looked at differently than the tabloid results. The next level that we need to pay attention to is the tabloid comments. Staff wants to suggest a couple things regarding the process and how the Committee analyzes the information. A smaller group may be needed to look at this information and sort it out.

Barbara Littrell indicated that the community recognizes tourism as an economic driver. She had people tell her that they were surprised with respect to what they checked off. The message she is getting is that people want to be sure that the Committee is integrating the elements of tourism and environment. There also should be activities that are harmonious and that fit well with the community.

Mike Bower stated that his take mirrors what he has already heard today. The Committee needs to strike a balance between the three visions. This is something new. Years ago, there was arguing about these issues; this has changed. Some of the comments from people were that this exercise inspired them to think about the town in a different way. If we get hung up on analyzing the data, we will forget where we need to go. We need to go to an inspirational vision.

Elemer Magaziner stated that we keep saying that Sedona is a beautiful place. A lot of the environment is ecology, and that element was not written into the E-T-C picture. If so, that might have changed the results. The same can be said for Community and Tourism. There are different interpretations of these elements. He affirmed Mike Bower's comments that this exercise changed people's perception.

Jim Eaton stated that we have more than one environment and stated different environments like natural, people, building. All of those together make Sedona what it is. He agrees with Mike that we have to look past the tabulated results from E-T-C. We wouldn't be fair to the community if we did a bean-counter plan based on the numbers. He doesn't trust the results of the pie charts or diagrams but feels that a lesson is learned here. That lesson is that we still need a survey to get some additional information.

Chairman Thompson agrees with Judy regarding being careful with the number analysis. He believes the tabloids are more scientific than the blue dots. The major message to him is that there is more of an emphasis on environment and community than on tourism. There is a difference between the information gleaned from those at the meetings versus those that just read the tabloid and filled out the survey. He thinks that some more study of this would be valuable and thinks there is something that we can pull from this. He does not agree that the results tell us what we already know. The tourism vision that the Committee created was not the stereotypical version that people are used to. The people at the meetings perhaps saw that there is a positive aspect to tourism.

Judy also found the results of the pie chart slightly skewed. After listening when people were talking at the meetings, she felt that people had a respect for all of the elements and a surprising respect and tolerance for tourism.

Marty stated that the Committee is all saying the same thing. The results are not scientific but there is some good information that was gleaned. From a sampling point of view, they still do not have feedback from a major portion of the community, but that may be ok. He likes what happened with the E-T-C exercise and results and would like to move on.

Jim Eaton stated that with regards to the comment that years ago residents were opposed to tourism, he's not sure that the demographics have changed enough to make a difference. More people today understand what tourism does, but there is business in town that is not tourism.

Judy supports Elemer's comment in that we are uncertain if we know what people meant by community - is that the culturally rich fabric of the community or community gathering places. The same can be said for tourism and the environment; there are different interpretations of these.

John Sather stated that the people were responding to this vision of tourism, and that is actually different from today's state of tourism. As we write the plan, the Committee needs to ask how to get from the vision that was presented via E-T-C to where we are today. We need to answer the question of how tourism is defined today and what the community plan can control with regard to land use, how we deal with circulation, capital expenditures, and other points. He feels we are a more tourism-driven town.

## **6. Discussion/possible action on the planning process**

Mike Raber suggested the Committee have a small group that looks at the common elements in the E-T-C results. This small group could give the Committee some direction on how to lay the rest of the plan out, generating a narrative that would get the Committee pointed in the right direction. That would set the stage for how we would begin working. That might be better than having the Committee weigh-in on all of the comments. This would be something that we'd want to see happen immediately.

Elemer asked if the small working group would take everything the Committee found out in the last two years. He suggested that there may be something different if the group went back over all the comments gleaned the past couple years. Mike replied that he just sees this as looking at the tabloid responses and E-T-C responses.

John Sather also inquired about which comments and responses the small group would look at. Mike Raber again responded that the group would be reviewing the tabloid comments. John replied that he thinks there isn't an easy flow from Point A to Point B. It would be better to work back and forth – vision and then policy. He also commented that if the Committee does break into groups, then those groups aren't becoming drivers; they are a process to get the work done.

Barbara Littrell commented that she would be willing to serve on the group that summarizes the E-T-C comments.

Jim Eaton stated that the Committee is over-thinking this process. He sees the plan broken up into chapters. One chapter is mandated to be on circulation. He sees 1 or 2 people assigned to get all the information together on Circulation. He suspects the plan will have a chapter on housing. He sees certain people getting together all the information they can on housing. These small groups fill "buckets" with information. When the groups have those buckets filled, then the Committee will be able to start writing.

Judy Reddington commented that Jim Eaton's suggestion is an interesting approach. Additionally, she feels it is hard to be productive in a large group. She recognizes the necessity of small groups that have jobs. At the same time however, all of those on the Committee joined the planning process with dreams of having some impact on planning in the long run. With respect to quorum and notice issues, she believes the small groups should be open. Members of the Committee who have interest in a particular area should be welcomed to participate and appear at the meetings.

Mike Raber stated that those meetings would have to be noticed for the entire group, but he stated there may be a way to do that.

The Chair restated the question of having a small group work on some issues. Mike Raber responded by saying that the Committee needs to talk about the process before we do this.

Mike Bower replied that there are some different ideas on the table right now. He is uncomfortable having a small group draft a vision because the Committee would be continually questioning their work. He would be interested in a small group just pulling out information from the comments. In terms of writing the plan, he believes this would be best accomplished by having larger group "messy meetings". Mike Raber responded by stating that it seems important to figure out a common direction on what we are hearing from the E-T-C project. That may be best done by a small group. He expressed concerns about a timeframe.

John Sather stated that perhaps a good way of doing this is to start throwing words up on a wall and start discussing. Someone speed reading and going through every comment to make sure nothing is missed may be a good way to facilitate this. It will be important to tell the community what they did with the E-T-C exercise. His firm works on projects like this using a total immersion environment, where you throw ideas on the wall and get a vision. Then someone that is a terrific writer weaves that together. He would like to see this as a group exercise rather than a small group exercise. As an aside, he also addressed the comments made by the public speaker and indicated that nothing on the E-T-C boards said that it will cost the City anything.

Elemer stated that there is a difference between the present and the future. The plan moves us from the present to the future. If we believe that what we've found is a balance between the E-T-C elements, that is not a vision - it's a direction. He agrees with the comment that this needs to be open heart surgery - an unstructured, brainstorming session that is open-ended. He doesn't believe this is a small group activity.

John Sather would like this Committee to get on a trajectory. He would like to make sure that, when things are written into the plan, that they are balanced.

Jim said that this project won't flow like a river; rather, it will ebb and flow like the tide. He stated that his words may have been misleading when he said that one or two people should write a chapter. However, one or two people should be responsible for sitting down and working on a topic. Those people do not need to necessarily be from the Committee; they could be people that know a lot about that particular topic. As soon as we have gotten enough stuff together, we should start writing. The whole committee should be involved in analyzing this, but the whole Committee won't sit down together and write this. There will be some back and forth. It will be messy, but it will be an orderly messy.

Marty commented that it may be messy, but the Committee can still have some ground rules. There has been a lot of "ping-ponging" with regards to comments. The Committee members just need to say their peace and let the conversation flow instead of going back and forth to defend the comments.

Chairman Thompson then stated that he would like those that submitted a work process to go over that process and briefly explain it.

Judy commented that she is in favor of what Mike says but in different terms – like preponderance of concerns or weighted concepts rather than a vision.

Mike Raber then spoke about a timeline for the process with emphasis on getting a draft plan together in the next five months. At the end of June, the draft needs to be handed off to Planning & Zoning. There needs to be some agreement on the process as well as the plan content and organization. There should be discussion of possible teams about this, such as format team,

working teams, a team that goes out into the community, a group that works on goals and policies and a vision team that looks at E-T-C. There should be agreement on all of this in February.

The plan for March would include preparing draft goals and policies, determining what the outreach needs are, working teams form and meet, the vision team submits a proposal to the Committee and a public outreach team meets. The plan format should also be finalized. In April the working teams would meet and develop chapters, draft text, and have a reality check with Planning & Zoning. There would also be some sort of presentation to the community with or without garnering their feedback. In May the working teams would continue, there would be document design, drafting and editing text, production and Committee review. June activities would include finalizing the draft plan.

Jim Eaton believes this process is too complicated and rigid. He would like the Committee to agree on a general format or outline of the chapters by the next meeting. He stated that we can't spend all of our time attacking everything. Some of us have more focused talents and should use those to collect all of the material and written comments and take it from there. When we get everything together on one of the chapters, then we can start to write a draft. Ultimately the whole Committee will need to read and approve everything.

John Sather inquired if someone could take the existing plan and boil it down to a 1 or 2 page idea of what we should keep. There is talk about the vision, but do we have or need a new vision? He stated that perhaps part of the problem is that there is meat missing in how we use the plan.

Mike Raber replied that he has started to put together what the essence of several of the chapters of the plan really is. John Sather then said that we can stay very conceptual early on and let other subgroups fill in the details later.

Mike Bower then referenced his plan and indicated that where we're at now on his plan is feedback from community. In his eyes there is work to go before you dive into drafting the plan. Analyzing goals should be done early on; the Committee did not do this. He is glad that Mike Raber included a subcommittee to do this in March. He also pointed out a diagram that Elemer showed a while ago regarding fostering citizen unity. He stated that the problem with diving into the elements is that you run off and start trying to create some kind of collective vision that is not just a vision statement. Ideally one would use the ideas that were heard and form that into constellations. If you can relate constellations of ideas to the specifics of the town, then when you go to craft each individual element, you'll see that element in the context of other things. He offered to give the Committee something of an idea of what he means at the next meeting.

Chairman Thompson stated that his own draft has a lot of commonalities to what was already discussed. He believes the Committee should define the format and collect everything the format team has done. There should be agreement on step one (conventions, table of contents, etc). After this point, the groups would be able to go off and write independently. If the Committee does a good job of drafting to the common defined format, then there may be a possibility of going to the City Council or Planning & Zoning early. Mike Raber expressed concerns with involving the City Council in this process. However, Planning & Zoning would be a possibility.

Elemer indicated that the charts suggested are linear, and that may be a problem. He suggested a PERT chart. He also suggested starting at the end by fleshing out what the plan will look like on a high level. This would mean that someone would be working on the end result all the time and continuously improving it. This would result in a version of the final product that would always be available. This would also be something that any citizen walking in to this room could see.

Mike Raber replied that one of his goals would be to recast this today. Marty stated that he would like to keep this simple. He believes the committee needs to come up with a consensus on this. He suggested that this be discussed on Saturday or the Committee extends these meetings so we're more flexible instead of waiting two weeks in between. Mike Raber suggested getting

agreement on this today so we can revise this for the next meeting. Marty commented that we need to start this process and also stated the Committee can bring rough drafts to P&Z meetings starting now.

Jim Eaton commented that he hopes the Committee is not hog-tied by too rigid a process. He thinks that Elemer sees some idea early on what the plan may physically look and sound like. He personally also understands how the plan looks because that is the way he works. He reiterated that he would not like the Committee tied down by a rigid process.

John Sather stated that he would like to come together as a work session from now on. He stated that Mike Raber understands this process and what needs to be accomplished. He also suggested that there be an executive summary of the comments. Barbara Littrell and Elemer Magaziner volunteered to do this. Chairman Thompson stated that the tabloid comments are well thought out and lengthy. There is a lot to read. Many community members wrote in the margins of their tabloid. The Chairman feels that the Committee members should personally read these to get their full impact.

Judy Reddington commented that an executive summary of the old plan and an executive summary of the tabloid comments should be distributed. A proposed format and chapters should also be presented at the next meeting.

After some discussion on correct wording on a motion to move forward regarding the process, the following motion was presented.

***MOTION: Marty Losoff moved that the CSC adopt the process that Mike Raber has outlined on the board, tweaking it if necessary after hearing the comments of the Committee today. Jim Eaton seconded the motion. VOTE: Motion carried nine (9) for and zero (0) opposed. (Vice Chairman Robson and Committee Member Mayer excused)***

Mike Raber clarified that Barbara Littrell and Elemer Magaziner will summarize the contents of the tabloids. John Sather asked if the tabloids can be left at the meeting room so all the Committee members have access. He also suggested that the Committee members post any ideas they have on the boards in the room. Barbara clarified that she will take the tabloids home for the first week.

Chairman Thompson clarified that this is not everything that is in the database. Every member of the Committee will receive a large text file that includes the online comments and the tabloid comments. In the actual tabloid is the information written in the margins; that is what he has suggested the Committee members review. He also stated that Barbara and Elemer do not need to take the actual tabloids home; they can formulate the summary from the text file.

Angela Lefevre asked if the comments in the margins were extensive. Chairman Thompson stated that the margin comments are more of a visceral experience; the bulk of the comments and feedback will be in the text file.

Judy Reddington commented that sedonaeye.com contains comments and criticisms regarding this process. John Sather replied that he puts little stock in online anonymous comments. Mike Bower commented that many others in the public will be countering what is written and commented on online.

## **7. Discussion regarding future meeting dates and future agenda items.**

The next meeting is scheduled for Tuesday, February 19, 2013.

Mike Bower asked to be agendized at the next meeting to share his information on the process flow. Mike Raber stated that the format committee should be a part of the agenda. Mike Bower suggested a brainstorming session. Jim Eaton commented that it was agreed a month or so ago to

turn this room into a big bulletin board where individuals can post any ideas or thoughts. John Sather asked if the format committee has an outline of the elements; he would like a list as he wants to put storyboards up.

**8 Adjournment**

Chairman Thompson called for adjournment at 5:08 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 February 5, 2013.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Johannah M. Rutschow

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date