

**Summary Minutes**  
**City of Sedona**  
**Planning & Zoning Commission Work Session**  
**Vultee Conference Room, Sedona City Hall, Sedona, AZ**  
**Thursday, February 14, 2013 - 3:30 p.m.**

**1. Verification of Notice, Call to Order, and Roll Call. (5 minutes 3:30 – 3:35)**

Chairman Losoff called the work session to order at 3:30 p.m. and explained the purpose of the work session.

**Roll Call:**

**Planning & Zoning Commissioners:** Chairman Marty Losoff and Commissioners Eric Brandt, Michael Hadley, Scott Jablow, Geoffrey Messer and Norm Taylor.

**Staff:** Barbara Ashley, Ray Cota, Karen Daines, Andy Dickey, Marlayne Hatler, Audree Juhlin, Cynthia Lovely, Charles Mosley, Rachel Murdock, Donna Puckett, Mike Raber, Ron Ramsey and Brenda Tammarine.

**2. Discussion regarding the first drafts of the Fiscal Year 2014 - 2023 Ten Year Capital Improvement Program. (60 minutes; 3:35 – 4:35)**

**Presentation, Karen Daines, Assistant City Manager:** Explained that the department representatives are going to run through the actual projects and explain why they are necessary and why they are being requested. She previously talked about how they came up with the plan, what was included, and some of the changes made in the documentation since last year. Karen then indicated that although this is a 10-year proposed plan, it has already changed since the Commission got it two weeks ago; it is really a working document, so as additional input is received the timing might change, etc.

Karen stressed that this is not a funded plan, so although the Commission might see \$16 million, and she is not sure if the first year includes one added item, but it doesn't mean that level of funding is available in year one -- in fact, she can say for certain that it is not, and that is part of the reason staff needs input from the Commission and will be holding other public meetings to determine priorities, because there is a limited amount of funding available.

Karen explained that some projects come out of dedicated funding sources, but many of the projects are just General Fund, and staff is looking at using Capital Reserves or General Fund Reserves to pay for them. There is not a lot of new money coming in to support the CIP, so that is part of the challenge in balancing the needs with the available resources.

Karen then referenced the final page of the document that lists the projects that have come out since last year, and two things will probably go into that list. Most of those things came out because of a lack of resources. Last time, we talked briefly about undergrounding the utilities on SR 89A and there is an overwhelming desire to do that project in the community, but it is \$8.5 million, and there is no money for that, so if the feedback is that is a really high priority, then that is information that will be passed on to the City Council for discussion as to where we would find funding and raise the resources to do it or we just can't pay for it.

Chairman Losoff asked if there is a philosophy that we want to do this and know we can't afford it today, but we can start sitting up a reserve, so that in five to ten years, we dedicate money for that purpose. Karen stated absolutely and explained that is really a matter of that prioritization. There is very little, if any, new money coming in to support the CIP, so most of the new ongoing revenue is pretty much in line with the operational requirements. We now have the availability of some of the reserves and that is what we have been using, and this year, we used about \$11 million to

accelerate things like drainage and streets projects and some sidewalks, so for something like the undergrounding as an example, it is going to be an issue of setting current reserve funds aside, in the hopes of someday having enough money to underground those utilities, with the idea that there is little new money coming in to add to that, or do we use that reserve funding for things that may be perceived as higher priorities or greater needs, such as things like drainage. It is an aesthetic project versus health, safety, etc., so that is the dilemma in the policy decision-making.

Karen mentioned that there aren't any projects in here from the Community Plan, because the Community Plan is not a plan yet. It is a lot of concepts and ideas and they are getting community input on the priorities of the community, so we don't know what tangible projects will come out of it yet, and it would be presumptuous of staff to put anything in right now, even though this is a 10-year plan. She would imagine that as staff goes through this exercise a year from now, there will be a lot of things in here, possibly shown as unfunded, or on that last page that are future concepts.

Karen explained this meeting is their first public meeting, so as things are generated from this discussion and others, things will probably be added to the list as future concepts, so staff will share that list with the City Council and let them know of the various discussions that occurred about those different projects. If any of those elevate to the point that the City Council or staff say it is really an important item that was omitted, then they will direct staff or staff will try to integrate it back in, in some fashion. It is still very much a working document at this point.

Chairman Losoff indicated that the Commission doesn't want to micromanage projects, and he then asked Karen tell the Commission the steps taken in this process that got the CIP to where it is today. Karen explained this is the third or fourth year that the City has created a Capital Budget, so staff has taken the time to recognize that the operational requirements in the process of developing the Operating Budget is much different than the Capital Budget, and while that is largely done on a year-to-year basis, looking at a one-year snapshot, talking about capital infrastructure needs that are often multi-year projects and multi-million dollar projects require looking at a longer horizon. In the last couple of years, it was a five-year plan, and they had a staff committee, which this year was comprised of herself, Audree Juhlin, Chief Cota, Andy Dickey, Charles Mosley, Brenda Tammarine, John Smith and Barbara Ashley, so it was a group of Department Heads who all have a piece of this.

Karen indicated that this year, the projects were segregated by program area, so Parks & Recreation has all of their projects and they know from either their Master Plan or from their experience the upcoming needs, so they are really forecasting out what needs to happen. The Drainage Master Plan, for instance, has ten years of projects, so staff is identifying all of the things that are important. A couple of other things staff did is identify the segments of projects, such as study, design, engineering, land acquisition, etc., and staff tried to identify funding sources in general at this time. So, we know that for a creekside something -- we have a certain amount of Parks Land Development Fees and those are dedicated funds that can only be used to acquire parks land, so we know that is not going to compete with the General Fund for that portion of those costs, so you will see that funding sources are identified by segment within the document. Again, it is not a funded plan; these are concepts and ideas. Many say "General Fund" and there are not enough General Fund dollars to fund all of these projects, so that will come with the balancing done later.

Karen explained that at this point, staff wanted to get everything on the table that might be necessary or high desires of the community, and then staff identified if there were operational impacts. A lot of the projects don't have a lot of operational impacts, but if the City was going to build a recreational center, staff would have to identify 16 full-time positions and utility costs, etc., so even if we had the capital dollars, if we didn't have the operations to support it, we shouldn't build it. There is a description as well as the project justification, so for any of these projects, it is expected that there is sufficient justification and explanation as to why it is necessary.

Karen indicated that now is the point where the City goes to the community to ask for public comment and input on the high priorities and needs of the community. The Commission is the first group and there will be a general public meeting, plus staff will go to the Parks & Recreation Commission, the Budget Oversight Commission a couple of times, and the documents are on the website, and as staff goes through different updates of the document, it will also be updated on the website, so input can be obtained that way. She or this group will probably also be going to the Chamber of Commerce Board meeting and possibly a Main Street Board meeting, so staff is trying to do as much outreach as possible to get feedback. Ultimately this will go the City Council in April and they will tentatively approve it in May, and then do a final approval the end of June. That approval will be of the ten-year plan in concept, but an actual legally binding budget appropriation for only year one, Fiscal Year 2013-2014. The rest is just a plan.

**Commissioners' Questions and Comments:**

Commissioner Taylor noted that some projects are funded from the General Fund and asked if the General Fund comes from the Sales Tax. Karen explained that the General Fund comes from a variety of sources, but about 60% is Sales and Bed Tax, so the majority of our funding for the General Fund is from Sales Tax, but we also get State Shared Revenues and some User and Miscellaneous Fees that are charged. Commissioner Taylor then noted that he also saw some projects that said specifically Sales Tax. Karen explained that projects that specifically say Sales Tax will say General Fund, once this document is final, because there are other sources within the General Fund, so that is a euphemism for General Fund at this point.

Commissioner Brandt asked how the revenue was projected and if it was projected to be what it is now or if it was increased. Karen explained that staff did a workshop with the City Council in December as the budget kickoff, and the main focus of that conversation was around availability of revenue for CIP projects. For the current year's budget, almost all of the capital projects that are funded were almost entirely from reserves. There was no new money coming in to fund capital, because right now and in the five-year forecast, the ongoing incoming General Fund revenue -- Sales Tax, State Shared Revenue, etc., is just about equivalent to our operational day-to-day requirements, taking Wastewater out of this right now. With the economy improving, we expect to see some improvement, but the growth is expected to be very gradual. Staff is forecasting about 3% for the next couple of years, and then about 5%, but staff doesn't expect to see 10% to 15% or double-digit increases to the ongoing revenue sources at this point. Staff has seen a tremendous amount of increased demand from the community for all kinds of programs and services, so we have to be very careful that our ongoing operational requirements aren't surpassing our ongoing revenue. We are okay; we're certainly not going to be growing at any great magnitude, but we are okay on the operational side. It is the capital side where we really have no sources of funding. The minimum amount of reserves will be gone within the next 18 months if we do the capital we think we need to do, so we do not have an identified revenue source for those out years.

Commissioner Brandt then indicated that under the Community Development block there is quite a bit planned for the City about traffic, pedestrians and bicycle lanes, and he asked if Karen could tell the Commission about that. Chairman Losoff indicated it is on page 3 and Karen indicated that it was a consolidation; there was a Trails & Urban Pathways Plan, a Transportation Plan . . . Audree explained that this was a plan in the past that has been brought forward year after year for different planning purposes, and different planning projects have been consolidated into one. Charles Mosley would be the best person to answer that, because it was just combining a number of different projects that have been identified from the past.

Commissioner Brandt then asked if it was planning that was planned to be done and Audree indicated that at least Community Development's portion was previous planning projects, but she is not sure about the ones for trails and Parks & Recreation. They just stuck it under Community Development for planning purposes, as consolidated planning.

Charles Mosley explained that the whole thing about traffic has evolved. Several years ago, the Public Works Department had proposed to do a citywide traffic study, as the Community Plan

update was approaching, and the aim was to project what traffic volumes we expect in the future, and if we need new connectors, etc. At the same time, Community Development was looking at enhancements to the SR 89A corridor.

Mike Raber then explained that staff was looking at Form-Based Codes and redeveloping the corridor, and that was all the way into 2009. Charles Mosley added that at that time, staff said it didn't make sense to pursue them separately, so they were combined, but with the economic downturn that fell off of the program. Then, when we started talking about this program, trails were coming up and the concept of a walkable community, so when all of it started coming up in the same budget, the comment was if we are going to do this traffic study, why not study the trails at the same time, and then everyone realized that we were going to add these things together in a citywide concept of studying transportation in general, hence you get to the multi-modal -- bike, walkability, trails and vehicular traffic. They are all interconnected, so we said they need to be put together, and that is a brief history of how we got to where we are today.

Chairman Losoff asked if the money is funding a study or if the money is to implement a study that was already done and Charles explained that these are monies funding the study and implementation further down-the-road, but the \$750,000 is the study.

Commissioner Brandt indicated that is like \$3.5 million or \$4 million, so he was curious about how much of that is study, etc. It seems hard to put a number on it. Charles Mosley clarified that the study is shown as \$750,000, and the Commissioner noted that the first year is completely study. Charles Mosley agreed and explained that it sounds like a lot of money, but if you are going to do a study of this scope, you are going to have a number of community meetings to discuss what people think, etc., and the interconnections of this whole concept.

Chairman Losoff indicated that maybe five years ago, it was proposed to have a consultant come in and at that point the rate was about \$450,000; however, Mike Raber explained that was for the Redevelopment Plan. The Chairman then noted that when you start talking about consulting fees and studies those monies start to add up and that is probably why we are looking at that kind of number today. Mike Raber asked if that is including a land use-related or code-related redevelopment study like we discussed before or if it is solely the transportation.

Charles Mosley explained it is pretty much the transportation, but within that, one has to look at what 89A is going to look like, so the form-based aspect may not be fully there, but the corridor study aspect of medians or no medians, and possibly city center configurations and that impact on traffic are in that study, so it is kind of part way, but not all the way.

Commissioner Brandt noted that to get a grip on what the planning is until Fiscal Year 2020, it pushes right up against the Community Plan update, and Charles Mosley explained that the intent was not to do this until we know what is in the Community Plan. The Commissioner then indicated that makes sense, but the vote is going to be in the spring. Mike Raber added the vote is targeted for the spring of 2014, but maybe that doesn't start until the end of the fiscal year.

Karen pointed out that Fiscal Year 2015 starts July 1 of 2014, so the vote would happen in the spring and we would start with this project in July. The timing was set-up that way to coincide with the Community Plan. Chairman Losoff referenced the two under Community Development -- the study and property acquisition, and indicated that those should be a consideration when the Community Plan is dealt with. Trails and pathways, etc., is a high issue in the Community Plan; the Committee hears that a lot. Also if we are going to do a study for that amount of money, we should look at a bigger picture, not just traffic or trailways, but what is going to happen to the SR 89A corridor, etc., so it may be premature to think about that right now.

Commissioner Brandt suggested calling it citywide planning instead of citywide traffic and asked if the \$4 million in this coming year is premature. The Chairman explained that for any property acquisition, there may be some very strategically located properties that the Community Plan

identifies, so before we start buying things . . . Karen explained that the \$4 million was a placeholder based on the fact that out of the City Council's priorities session last fall, they identified a number of pieces of property or needs for property for parking and other things. Her sense is that this is going to come out, because there is not \$4 million for property acquisition; we don't have it, so that may be one that ends up on the future concepts list.

Commissioner Brandt indicated that he doesn't think having a multi-purpose facility at the wastewater treatment plant under Parks & Recreation is a good thing to do, until every other property in the built parts of the City are exhausted for this facility, like the cultural park, because we shouldn't be doing sprawl development. If it is open space, great, or some type of passive use, fine, but an active use isn't appropriate, because he doesn't want to encourage sprawl.

Commissioner Messer indicated that a study on bike paths and trails is a really expensive thing given our limited area for more bike paths and trails. We have bike lanes going down SR 89A and trail access all over town, so it seems like a huge expenditure for little results. Also, it seems that some of the prices seem really padded, like \$50,000 to put up two posts in Uptown for banners; he could do it for \$20,000, and across the board, there were a lot of things that seemed exorbitantly high, so he wonders who sets the prices, because he is familiar with the price of steel and he doesn't see \$150,000 for the shade structures in the park.

Commissioner Messer then indicated that he was under the impression that Barbara's Park was built by donations and they raised those funds. Now, we are asking for it to come out of City funds, and it fell, but didn't somebody's liability insurance cover what happened? Why is the City coming up with \$1.5 million to do it? Commissioner Taylor indicated that he seconds that question. Additionally, Commissioner Messer indicated that another thing he kind of objects to is the closed circuit TVs to monitor non-existent vandalism and theft. It seems like big brother everywhere in the parks, and it is \$75,000 for those closed circuit cameras to protect facilities that aren't under siege.

Karen explained that within the last few years, there have been a number of issues of vandalism at Posse Ground and Sunset; the pool was broken into this year, so we have had incidents. There is some concern about some additional activity potentially at the wastewater treatment plant, due to the opening of the wetlands to the public; however, in the last year, there haven't been that many instances of vandalism. The last discussion was that staff would probably take this out of here and put in some smaller amount as a placeholder in the operating budget, because this really isn't a project that should be in the CIP, since the individual cameras don't rise to the threshold of what would be a capital project, and we would continue to work with PD and the different facilities to monitor the need to do that. There are some additional cameras planned for this campus, because of safety, etc., with night meetings and staff walking to vehicles, etc. Currently, the ones for this campus are the only ones staff has actively planned.

Police Chief Cota indicated this was discussed in the last CIP meetings and he doesn't disagree in terms of the level of activity and whether or not there is a specific need right now, but that level of technology is needed within the City, probably in a portable sense more than in a fixed configuration, because it does help in terms of being in more places than one, and with that technology, it would have the ability to help us identify potential suspects in various damaging situations. Just this past week, we had somebody drive onto the grounds of Red Rock High School and they did significant damage to the soccer fields, and that happened on two occasions. If we had the technology that allowed us to be in various places, it would be helpful.

Karen explained that in terms of Barbara's Park, the City was in this project for let's say \$2 million, and . . . Chairman Losoff interrupted to say that as background, when it came to P&Z, it was presented that it wouldn't cost the City any money. The money was to be raised by donations and that would cover most of the cost, and the City would absorb the operational costs, but it would not be responsible for the construction. Karen explained that is not the current concept; there were outside sources to the tune of . . . Charles Mosley explained that the Commission is right that the project started out to be fully privately funded; however, the cultural park shut down and the City

had an issue with monies that had been given to the City -- the Heritage Fund Grant, and the decision was made that in order to keep the Heritage Fund Grant within the City, we would go to Barbara's Park and ask to participate in the project, and that is how the City got involved. The grant was like \$600,000 and it was a way to keep the money within the City; otherwise, it would have gone back to the state's General Fund. Karen added that the Commission can see the distribution of outside resources versus City funding. It is about \$100,000 of outside sources, so the design was completely paid for by outside sources, and the City has now moved forward with planning the construction. Expenditures are about \$700,000 and that is what the City has put into the project to date, to build it to the point at which it collapsed. If the City moves forward with the reconstruction, that amount would be reimbursed by insurance and the insurance company would cover us to rebuild it to the point at which it collapsed, then to finish the construction is the other \$800,000. The total project cost is about \$1.5 million for the structure and there will be a work session with the City Council in March for the Council to make a decision on whether or not that project gets reconstructed.

Commissioner Messer indicated that is kind of like a three-car Monty thing, because when it was presented, it was Friends of Barbara coming together to build this, and they wanted permission to acquire the land to do that, but then the Commission didn't get the feedback about the Heritage Fund, etc., so there was a gap that he didn't know about.

Chairman Losoff indicated it is somewhat controversial, but the various contractors, etc., and their insurance companies are responsible, and they told the City that they are good for their part, so they should reimburse up to the point it collapsed, but going forward, there is more money involved.

Karen then referred to Commissioner Messer's question about how the cost of the projects are determined and explained that staff relies on their professional experience of what things have cost in the past. Obviously, Public Works has a great deal of experience in doing drainage projects, street overlays, sidewalks, etc. and know what they cost. As far as the shade structures, there are no \$150,000 shade structures; those are \$50,000, and the one project for Posse Ground was also another \$100,000 of playground equipment, and \$75,000 of that additional is tentatively outlined as coming from outside sources, so there is a movement of some donated funding to do an all-inclusive playground at Posse Ground, which would be going beyond ADA accessibility to actually have features that are inclusive for . . . Chairman Losoff interrupted to say regardless of the dollar amount, the City still goes out for bid and Karen stated yes, we do.

Commissioner Messer then stated that regarding the banner posts, it seems that would be a Chamber of Commerce expenditure from the local merchants. Why would the City take on promoting it? He then asked if it was in the hopes of generating more Sales Tax to justify the expense for the City to put that up. Karen explained it is a carryover project that won't get done this year. It was a request from Main Street that the City do this. Audree Juhlin added that Main Street asked that this project be included, so staff prepared in the last CIP budget what we thought they were trying to accomplish, and it was about \$50,000 for two different sites for banners to go over the roadway. Staff has had to change the policies before we can get into locating the sites, so we are moving that forward to the next fiscal year. Karen Daines then added that this could be something that is appropriate for the Chamber or Main Street to fund, but it isn't out of line for the City to do this for a particular district.

Commissioner Messer indicated that his last comment is about the art in the roundabouts. There are plenty of artists in Sedona that would freely create art for the exposure, and there is \$220,000 budgeted for that art and we have a plethora of artists in the community. Chairman Losoff noted that it probably is not unusual for a City, the Chamber and groups like Main Street to partner on various things, so that is something anybody can look at.

Commissioner Jablow indicated that regarding the banners, while it may be common for a City to contribute that, does that occur when the City already donates hundreds of thousands of dollars, was it \$200,000? Karen indicated it is about \$270,000 for the visitors' center and \$250,000 for

destination marketing, but this came from the Main Street merchants. It wasn't a Chamber of Commerce thing; it was the Main Street Uptown merchants wanting to advertise their different events. Commissioner Jablow indicated it is a good idea for good visual impact, but if we are trying to save money . . . Karen explained this is one that isn't affected by our comments, because this is an approved project being carried over, because we didn't get it accomplished this year.

Commissioner Jablow then referenced the creekside park at \$3.9 million that is a category 3, but in some places it mentions creekside park and in other places it mentions creekside walk, but where are we with that plan? Is it going forward or just in the talking stages? The Commissioner indicated that he also wanted to verify that area is a flood zone and Charles Mosley indicated yes. The Commissioner then asked if it floods out, should we plan for \$7.8 million and Charles Mosley stated no and explained that there are many parks built in floodways, but you basically flood-proof the floodway and walks. You have to plan for maintenance, but not for replacement.

Karen added in terms of the status of this, it has been a high priority based on feedback from community meetings, the Community Plan and the Park & Recreation Commission's Master Plan, which indicated that some type of creekside access is a very high priority for the community. Another reason it is in here is you can see \$1.5 million in year one and that is Development Impact Fees. We have about that amount in that account that has to be spent on parks land, but she thinks there is going to be a lot of discussion about whether that gets done for creek access or it is put toward the acquisition of the historic property on Brewer, which also has a lot of community interest, or there is the ADOT property at the "Y" where we could put a pocket park to beautify that intersection. This is just one idea that is a high priority for the community, but how we would fund anything beyond \$1.5 million, and creekside land is pretty valuable, so how do we find funding for the construction of a park -- there is no money for that. At this point, this project is a desire, but we aren't actively doing much. We have watched for properties that might be available, but nothing has been identified at this point, so the City isn't even looking at a piece of land at this time, and after the Parks & Recreation Master Plan was completed, there was also some conversation questioning if there is some potential to partner with the Forest Service to use Forest Service land adjacent to the creek, if we do the improvements or something along those lines.

Chairman Losoff asked if it is Commissioner Jablow's idea to keep it in or take it out and the Commissioner stated there is no real money for it; it is a category 3, so he would say to move everything down a year and see where we are in future years. He likes the idea, but he would rather see the utility poles come down. That area looks like a City; take them down and go back to a nice community. There is no money and it is probably the highest ticket item on the list. There was a shared plan years ago, and APS had plans to share it with the City, but it fell by the wayside. It should be kept on the list for future projects. He would rather see \$3.9 million put in the fund for that over ten years, to then take those poles down.

Commissioner Jablow then asked about the Police radio enhancement; he is all for technology, especially when it comes to Police, but he is familiar with the Cottonwood project of building their own communication center and the City already committed funds to that project, plus manpower in meetings to look into what they are doing in Cottonwood. If we go forward with a Cottonwood co-share or moving dispatch to them, why do we need \$430,000?

Police Chief Cota explained that Sedona participated in the study in terms of providing information about our own operation and the cost of future needs, and when the study was completed and they came up with their business models and cost projections, it was going to be far above what our means were going to be as a City. We were talking about multi-million dollars of investment, both in capital costs and operating costs, so we realized that we weren't able to participate. That being said, the radio is something completely different from that project, and even Cottonwood's radio system somehow touches the radio system we are on. When the Police Department was created in 1988, there was no radio infrastructure for the Police Department, so we hopped on the Fire District's radio system, and that is the way it has been since 1988. We have certain infrastructure on their system that is getting old and needs to be upgraded. A lot of the components are old

analog components that require a lot of onsite visits to maintain. Current equipment is computer-controlled and easily maintained, and for some of the equipment that we have now, we have to buy parts on EBay in lots, because we can't find them anymore. We need to upgrade the system, and in this past year we had to comply with the Federal Government requirement to go to narrow-banding, and we have found that has reduced our ability to cover the rest of the City, so we are looking at ways to increase the radio coverage so Officers are able to talk to one another and to dispatch, and these figures represent the infrastructure and equipment needed.

Commissioner Jablow indicated he would rather it stay in-house, but if you were to go to Cottonwood, why would we need to spend that here? Police Chief Cota explained that even if we found the Cottonwood proposal to be good for us, these costs would still have to be incurred. The Commissioner then asked if the system is 800 or 900 megahertz now and the Police Chief indicated that we are still on a UHF system; to go to an 800 megahertz system would be millions of dollars. The Commissioner asked if it would be better and the Police Chief indicated it would have to be studied, and it would cost about \$50,000 to do the study. Commissioner Jablow then noted that he didn't want to put good money after bad, if we could get funding and go to a state of the art system now on one 800 megahertz system and ultimately save us money . . . Police Chief Cota indicated those are things that we can explore in the study, but ideally, if we went to that kind of technology, we would want to engage in some discussions with the Fire District, to possibly create some shared costs.

Chairman Losoff asked if the Commissioner's suggestion was to put the underground utilities as a high priority and take it off of the future list, and Commissioner Jablow indicated he would not say high priority, but put it back on the list. Karen clarified it came out of the plan and is on the list of discussion items.

Commissioner Taylor indicated that it would seem the power lines would be something done in conjunction with any major improvements on SR 89A, so leave it there, they certainly should come down, but he doesn't know that it makes much difference whether it is this year or three years from now. If you are going to dig up the area, etc., that is the time to do it. The big number that bothers him is no traffic studies. He recommended a book to a couple of people and on page 81 of that book, it says "Traffic studies are bullshit", and the book is *Walkable City* by Jeff Speck. The author explains that statement about traffic studies and also goes into parking garages and other things related to a walkable city.

Commissioner Taylor then referenced page 4 about making the property at the "Y" a park, and indicated that he is not sure that should be done to pretty up that corner. Karen explained that is part of the \$4 million appropriation for property acquisition that says miscellaneous sites. The ADOT property at the "Y" was the least expensive of any of those, like less than \$100,000. When it was acquired, it was over \$1 million, but land values have declined and they took part of the parking with the roundabout, so it isn't very usable now. It is a visual blight, so the idea was that this would be our only opportunity, because ADOT is disposing of that property, so they will put it out to bid, but there is a rule that if a City is intending to use it for a public purpose, we would pay an appraised value, or if it is for a transportation use, there is a different formula, but it wouldn't have to go out to bid, so the City has like a right of first refusal.

Chairman Losoff stated that he doesn't think it is going to happen and Karen indicated it is an opportunity, because if we miss it now and it is acquired, it potentially could become something we don't want in that visible intersection. This isn't a \$4 million project; it was around \$100,000, which might make a lot of sense. Commissioner Taylor indicated with that kind of price, he would . . .

Commissioner Taylor then stated that he agrees with Commissioner Messer about the banner structure; that makes a town a little honky and for the City to spend money on it, when there are so many other things, he would put it off the end of the chart, so put it in 2024. Karen explained that it is an appropriated project in the current year, so the ship has sailed on that. Chairman Losoff suggested that the record note the objections.

Commissioner Taylor then indicated that he also thought the City wasn't putting money into the Barbara Antonsen Park, until recently. The Commissioner then referenced the Jordan Historic Park and Chairman Losoff noted that nothing is appropriated for the next couple of years. Karen explained this was the City's portion of approximately a \$2 million project, so the \$529,500 would be the City's contribution. The Commissioner added that he doesn't really have a problem with Posse Ground and putting up shades, as long as they do it in a reasonable way. Karen reminded the Commission that this project is \$150,000, but \$50,000 is for the shade component; the rest is for the other amenities.

Commissioner Taylor then referenced the project for the multi-purpose facility at the wastewater treatment plant and indicated that he is totally against that; that is sprawl. We've already built a theatre at the high school, which he didn't know was going in there, because he would have been against that too, but now we have the Barbara Antonsen thing and we're still talking about the cultural park, and now we have funds in to put something at the treatment plant. We're talking about trying to have a City where people walk to these things and to put it at the treatment plant invites Cottonwood to spread up this way, and then you don't have the separation between cities. We don't have a community center yet and he doesn't even see that on the list.

The Commissioner then referenced all of the sidewalk and sewer proposals, and indicated they are really hard to follow, and he would suggest that Public Works draw a plan to show where those are and maybe put the proposed sidewalk in red and 2014, etc., and then ten or twenty projects could be together, so you don't have to figure out where they are. Karen stated, so maybe a larger full-page schematic that shows all of the various sidewalk projects and the Commissioner indicated that is right and it would make it much easier if it was put in sections, with storm drainage in a section, sewer in a section and sidewalks in a section. Not necessarily as one project, but as kind of a summary for a bunch of sidewalks, etc.

Chairman Losoff pointed out that if you are going to put in a drain, it could affect the sidewalk, etc., so you want to look at the whole picture. Commissioner Taylor agreed and indicated it would be much easier for the Council, because he had a hard time figuring out some of the locations. The Commissioner then referenced page 35 about a pathway at the Sedona School that ADOT is somehow involved in, because they are putting up some of the money. He then asked if they have to be involved in the planning, and Karen explained that is a Safe Route to Schools project that is grant funded and ADOT is the funding source, so they need to approve what is happening.

Commissioner Taylor asked if they are going to get into the planning of it and Charles Mosley stated no, the City will keep planning control, but because it is federal funding with rules regarding procurement of designers, etc., they will be involved. Currently, this project is in a holding pattern, because of Map 21, which is the new transportation funding bill. It changed funding allocations, so ADOT has to reevaluate a number of projects and determine whether or not they are going to give us funding, and if so, how much. This particular project is in conjunction with the school and the City; it will probably take about three years to move through the whole thing with ADOT's assistance and funding. We just make sure they stay on track doing what we want them to do from the concept standpoint. They would do the engineering and consulting, etc., but we ensure they stay on the concept.

Commissioner Brandt asked if that is sidewalk improvements and Charles Mosley explained that the segment involves improving an access way to the school that crosses some land owned by the Medical Center, and they gave the City an easement a number of years ago. Then, it goes to the school, and the school wants a walkway/bikeway about 10 ft. wide on their property to go to the front for the kids. Commissioner Messer asked if it connects those fields to the school's property to the baseball fields and Charles Mosley stated no, it would just be connecting access to the school.

Commissioner Messer indicated that the sidewalks are a high priority; the kids are out there with no sidewalks getting off of buses, and it should be like one of the number one things. Commissioner Taylor then referenced the Hummingbird House on page 41 and indicated that is involved with

Brewer and Ranger Roads. He then asked about the prognosis; he has seen the owner packing sandbags with every rain, and then taking them down. They already had a lot of damage, so is this really going to happen?

Cynthia Lovely explained that the Historic Preservation Commission was considering funding the flooding control project, but it looks like it will exceed that dollar amount, so the owner is getting estimates from engineers, so we are waiting for that estimate and to find out what they want to do, and then the other option might be to use a matching grant from FEMA, which would come through the County, so we are waiting for more details from them. Karen then added that is being run through a different track than this. This is a project that is downstream from the Hummingbird House issue and Charles Mosley explained it is improving drainage in the Soldier Wash area and we are estimating the cost to bring it up to a 25-year capacity. They were hoping to do it in the Fiscal Year of 2014-2015 and 2015-2016, but we are going to be looking at how we negotiate those improvements. It could affect Tlaquepaque and Los Abrigados and impact their existing facilities, so this is optimistic. The people want it to happen, but there are probably going to have to be some negotiations.

Commissioner Taylor referenced a project for a retention basin on forest land on page 44, and Charles Mosley indicated they were open to the concept, but we need to find areas and see if it seems feasible. The concept is that if we can slow flow coming out of the forest above the City, it might benefit storm drainage control through the City, but we have to see if it is feasible. The Commissioner asked if retention basins could be used to control the flooding past the Hummingbird House and through Tlaquepaque and Los Abrigados, on the north side of SR 89A. Charles Mosley indicated that would involve an engineering study to see if it could, but more critical is getting the Forest Service to buy into that. They completed a trail study in that area . . . Chairman Losoff asked if the Commissioner is suggesting that more money be spent to do that study and Commissioner Taylor indicated that he is suggesting that they look at that as a solution to Tlaquepaque. They have the item for retention basins on forest land; however, Charles Mosley pointed out this is above the City and Little Elf area, etc. Chairman Losoff again asked the Commissioner what he is suggesting, and Commissioner Taylor stated that it be in and looked at as a solution.

Commissioner Taylor indicated that he guesses the planning group is looking at the Uptown parking structure, but he sees that as a big design problem. Solar power for City facilities is \$50,000 and he guesses that is just for planning.

Commissioner Hadley indicated he would echo some of the comments about the multi-purpose facility at the wastewater treatment plant. It seems that we should concentrate on things that are more central to the City. Karen clarified that this was for a study to determine if there are any viable economic uses of the hundreds of acres that the City owns there, to give the City some guidance about the potential of that land, so she is going to change the title of that. In the bigger picture, once we have determined how much of that acreage is needed for effluent disposal, what else we can do with it? She will make that more clear. Chairman Losoff suggested saying a study for use of the wastewater park, because the recent Parks & Rec. Master Plan showed it as a very low priority for more ball fields, etc., so if we want to spend any money at all, it would be to determine the best use of that property.

Commissioner Hadley emphasized that he put a very high priority on the Police radio systems enhancement. If the Police can't talk to each other they can't do their job of protecting us, so he rates that one very high. He also noticed that a lot of it is drainage and sidewalks, plus a lot at the wastewater treatment plant, so it looks like a lot of the money is programmed for the next few years, and then beyond that, if the City's growth is limited, because we don't have any more land to develop, is it a safe assumption that somewhere out ten to fifteen years, those improvements having been done mean we don't have to build so many sidewalks, etc., and then maybe money becomes available for a creekwalk, etc. Charles Mosley indicated that once you build them, it is a matter of maintaining them, but there is a cycle of public works and that is new things come along.

If you looked at this City in 1900, what people thought it should be is nowhere near the infrastructure that we would accept today, but once you get the storm drainage, etc., in, it is a matter of maintaining, but if new stuff comes along, you could see large dollar amounts popping up.

Chairman Losoff indicated that the art in the roundabouts is an issue that Commissions can discuss in terms of people voluntarily putting sculptures up. There was a strong feeling in the Commission about the Community Development issue and the study, and again, in talking about pedestrians, bikeways, etc., as Commissioner Taylor suggested, perhaps you put together a blueprint or some template showing all trailways, bike paths, sidewalks, etc., to see how it all ties in. Is there one pathway project, one sidewalk project; he doesn't know, rather than just do one study here and another one there, it should be all encompassing, so if we are going to spend \$800,000 or \$900,000, we should probably look at the whole City. It is the same thing with property acquisitions. He would hope any purchase would wait until the Community Plan is done, but he understands when there is an opportunity to jump on it; it just would be nice to do it with a whole picture. You heard about the banners in Uptown, and even though it is a small amount, is it something the City needs to get involved with?

The Chairman then indicated there were several comments about the Barbara Antonsen Park and access to the creek, and the Community Plan will talk about that too. It is interesting when you spend money on it and you don't want to throw good money after bad money, but for every person who says there should be access to the creek to walk the dogs, others say keep your dog away from it. The creek is a beautiful natural resource, so we should do something with it to make it more enjoyable. He also heard negative comments on the feasibility study -- the multi-purpose facility at the wastewater treatment plant, and we should look at the big picture, not just using it for ball fields, etc. If you look out ten to twenty years in the long-range plan, maybe we have no cars in Sedona and that becomes a big parking lot and we transfer people with a tram, etc. There are a lot of opportunities out there, so we shouldn't be hasty.

Chairman Losoff stated that all of the sidewalks should be put together. And, Airport Road improvements didn't come up, but we had all agreed that the road needs something, so he was glad to see that in there. He also agrees with the comments raised indicating that the underground utilities should be a high priority, and he doesn't know of many people in the community wouldn't agree to that --- cost aside, but again, if we are going to do some drainage or sidewalk work, it seems we should do it all together, so as projects and the budget are finalized, you can look at these things not as individual departments, but as a project and how they all tie-in.

Commissioner Hadley noted that undergrounding is a pet peeve of his. The City is a great looking place, but we have a few things like that, that really detract. If that ever was done, does APS participate in that cost? Karen explained that they used to have a cost-sharing and aesthetics fund to cost share with cities and towns to do those projects, but that is gone, so it would be 100% City-funded, and there are implications for the property owners that connect, because there would be some cost for them, so we would need 100% cooperation from everyone and that would be a challenge.

Chairman Losoff asked if there have been discussions about private-public funding for some of these projects and Karen indicated yes, several. There are projects that have asterisks and those indicate there is some cost-share, she had mentioned the Posse Ground Park and that was a \$155,000 project, but \$75,000 of that is from outside sources. Chairman Losoff asked if there could be bond issues for the underground utilities, if it was a high enough priority. Karen stated certainly, there are many mechanisms, but none of them are typically politically popular, particularly like a bond issue that has to go to the voters.

Chairman Losoff indicated that also comes up in regard to the Community Plan; people comment that these are great ideas, but who is going to pay for it? At some time, we have to address those issues head-on.

Commissioner Brandt asked if businesses had to step-up when undergrounding was done from Kallof to Airport Road or the "Y" and staff didn't know, but Charles Mosley indicated he does know that businesses have had to step-up and it can take awhile. One in Uptown that was going on ten years ago was just done this past year. Karen pointed out that not everybody has to cooperate at that particular time, so you still have an aesthetic issue with poles. Commissioner Brandt indicated that when the one section was done, it was understood that it was going to continue; however, Mike Raber explained that part of it was the Shared Agreement was no longer in place, which made a big difference.

Commissioner Brandt then asked if there are ways to slice up the project in smaller pieces or a longer period of time, and Chairman Losoff noted that without getting into detail, staff has heard the Commission indicate it should be a significant priority and we should find a way to come up with some way for it to come up, without saying it is too expensive. It is expensive, so we either have to set up a reserve fund or do something to accommodate some of the issues.

Commissioner Taylor indicated that the installation of those tall light poles along SR 89A bring your attention to those wires more. Charles Mosley noted that when the issue of undergrounding came up with the SR 179 improvements, and the City had to look at how much it could afford, we couldn't fund some lines we wanted to underground, so only a portion were undergrounded, and we sold bonds to fund a portion of those improvements. Commissioner Messer indicated that one way of deferring the cost is to get rid of the ineffectual studies of traffic and bike pathways, and take that chunk of change and put it toward that. We have one way in and out, so he doesn't know how much studying they can do. Karen reminded the Commission that that is also not funded. Commissioner Taylor stated that the point is don't fund it.

Commissioner Jablow asked if someone could research grants for federal or state money, and Karen indicated that grants take a significant amount of time to figure out where the opportunities might be; they become difficult with the restraints on staff and resources.

Chairman Losoff indicated that staff had done a great job in presenting the information, but he likes Commissioner Taylor's suggestion of putting them more in the category by project as opposed to departments, but having said that, he looks at this as almost a one-year budget, knowing that there will be a lot of discussion in the next couple of years about long-range planning, and then there may be an opportunity to do some significant study on what it will accomplish, in terms of the Plan itself, and that is why he doesn't see a lot of money being spent on buying land, etc. A Land Trust has been discussed, etc., so there are many opportunities, but this is a good start.

The Chairman then asked what feedback the Commission can expect and Karen indicated that if the Commission wants she can come back when staff has the final document. Commissioner Hadley indicated that would be interesting to see in an executive summary. Karen indicated that would probably in the June meeting or at end of May. At this point, they will present all of the comments they get to the City Council and staff may make modifications between now and then. In terms of formatting, staff may be able to make some supplemental to show projects more integrated, but to do an overhaul of the format between now and the end of this year -- but those are comments staff can incorporate for the process for the upcoming years. Some people want things aggregated, but others say they want to see how much is spent on drainage, etc. Chairman Losoff noted that once the budget is approved, then staff can play with it.

Donna Puckett noted that the summary format may not look exactly like Planning & Zoning would like it, recognizing that the format has to suit the Budget Oversight Commission, etc., so it will probably be reviewing what they have to put together for other purposes too.

### **3. Discussion regarding the Sedona Community Plan Update (60 minutes; 4:35 – 5:35)**

Chairman Losoff invited Jon Thompson, Chairman of the Citizens Steering Committee to join the discussion.

**Presentation, Mike Raber:** Indicated that the last meeting was the end of October to get the Commission's input on the approach with the three planning themes.

Mike then explained that the Committee went out to the community last month to gauge community preferences on the planning themes. There were three meetings and 250 attendees in total. A blue dot exercise was included to get a sense of those preferences, but the Committee also had the tabloid with the insert that people could take home, and that was followed with the delivery of that newspaper to households. The questionnaire is still available online and the theme displays were set up in the library, at City Hall, in the Community Plan Room, and at New Frontiers for a few hours. We have received 400 responses and a few are still coming in.

Mike explained that the Committee is now reviewing those responses and determining what that tells us. The meeting participants showed a tendency to support a good balance between the three themes, but the 60 pages of written responses will require a lot more evaluation.

The first handout shows the relative responses to the direct questions in the questionnaire that had a box for people to check, and the pie chart reflects a question that not everybody answered, so some people may not have known that was a question that they could respond to, but of the ones that did, it represents kind of the balance between Environment, Tourism and Community. The other one shows the relative responses to the visionary descriptions in the questionnaire, and as a Committee, it is too soon to draw assumptions about specific ideas without considering all of the comments, so there is a lot more that the Committee is still looking at before drawing conclusions, and not really looking at the numbers, but what the overall preferences might tell us in the big picture.

Chairman Losoff indicated that these are not scientific studies, most of the Commissioners saw the meetings, and there is some skewing. In going through the written comments, there were a lot of comments on the airport, so it was almost as if there was a collective attempt by a group to write comments on the airport, but these were general responses and it is interesting. For everyone that says do this, someone else says do that, with a few exceptions. It is also interesting that the green line on Environmental goes all the way across.

Mike Raber explained that next the Committee will be determining what the higher level direction for the Plan should be, and then figuring out how we are going to deal with the details, so the second handout is the timeline to get us to the vote in the spring of 2014. The bottom is essentially the next five months to get to a draft Plan. The draft Plan goes through a 60-day review process, then comes to the Planning Commission for public hearings, then goes to the Council for public hearings and they adopt it, and then there is a 120-day period before the election, and then the election.

Mike indicated that staff will keep filling in the first five months as the Committee keeps meeting, but essentially the next couple of months, we are evaluating the feedback, and then we have to agree on those high level planning principles, get draft goals and policies together, get background information up-to-speed and assemble working teams. In April, we also want to start involving the Planning Commission on a regular basis, maybe in work sessions, as we get into the topical areas and chapters of the Plan; however, we may even want some Commissioners involved in the working teams.

Chairman Losoff noted that the Citizens Steering Committee discussed that since P&Z is one of the final eyes on the Plan before it goes to the Council, we don't want to wait to the end to see it, so the Committee will feed the Commission information as it goes along, not at the end, and the working meetings may be helpful. He doesn't know if we can combine meetings, but at least we'll try to get the working meetings going.

Mike Raber indicated that he could see us working with the Planning Commission well before getting into the hearing phase, so that could happen all the way into September on a regular basis.

### **Commissions' Questions and Comments:**

Commissioner Jablow asked when the funding comes into play; as Karen said, there is no funding and the regular funding is just enough to cover the expenses. Mike Raber explained that the Committee will start talking about that in a big picture way during this five-month period, because toward the end of that, we start talking about an implementation or action program, and that is where we discuss the priorities and try to set a specific kind of timeframe on those priorities and how they would likely be funded or come about to get implemented.

Mike added that a lot of the things in the Plan are going to potentially be over the long-haul and through the private development community, and we need to be clear about making some of those distinctions in the Plan. He doesn't see the Plan being just a laundry list for capital improvement projects; there could be some capital projects, but that is not the only way to fund the Community Plan, and that is a big misunderstanding in the community, so we need to be specific about how we see those priority items coming about and in what timeframes. If it is something that is going to take public sector funding, then it may have a much longer timeframe to get certain things in place before starting to fund it. That is the part that is going to be a little more complex.

Commissioner Jablow asked if it is mandatory that every city does this every ten years, but the state gives no funding. Mike Raber stated they did have some grant funding, but it was about \$10,000 per community to do general planning. Chairman Losoff indicated the state says you have to have a Plan; it doesn't say it has to cost anything. Mike Raber added there is the cost of doing the Plan and the cost of implementing the Plan.

Jon Thompson noted that the Commissioner is talking about the cost of implementing the Plan, and that is kind of what we are trying to hit on. We haven't really addressed the implementation costs very much, and to a large degree, he doesn't know that is really the Committee's charter. Our job is to find out what the public wants and we just discussed undergrounding utility poles and the public really wants that, but if you told them it was going to cost \$8.5 million and everybody that connects to the poles is going to have to spend their own money, would they still want that as much? It is an interesting question that the Committee has to address to come up with the priorities. We have said let's try to talk about the money part of it as little as we can and try to get into what the people want, and imagine an idyllic ten years from now and what that would be like. There is a lot to say for doing it that way, but that doesn't mean that we don't have to start addressing it, if we are going to come up with priorities.

Commissioner Jablow asked if that is going to be done before the vote and Mike Raber explained that an implementation program will be put together as part of the Plan. It is part of the draft Plan that will come to the Planning Commission for consideration, and then on to the Council, etc. That implementation program doesn't get into the detail like the Capital Improvements Program, but we . . . Chairman Losoff interrupted to say in the whole planning process, you don't want to talk about dollars; you want to dream. If you let dollars get in the way, you won't be dreaming, but in reality, certainly when the vote took place on the lights, we needed to be aware of the community's concern with financing, so as we finalize the Plan, we have to address it somewhere along the line, because it could make or break the vote on the Plan.

Commissioner Jablow indicated that is what he was getting at. He is concerned that if you put the implementation before the vote, some people say even if it is \$5 per year, they aren't going to vote for it. If you do it after the vote, you could say this is just the Plan, you vote on it, and then we are going to talk about funding, if it is approved. It is like the cart before the horse, which way are you going to go first?

Mike Raber noted that one thing needed in this Plan that isn't in our current Plan is a sense of that priority, so instead of having 100 different action items with no priority, he would envision that this Plan will have a much smaller list of projects with timeframes, responsibilities and maybe measures, so you can track the progress of certain projects; so a much smaller list, the highest priorities and the Plan gives a sense of how they will be carried out. Do we need to create a Land

Trust, for instance? Would we need to rely on the development community to make this happen? Would it be a partnership with the City? There needs to be some reality with those projects that the Plan says are the highest priorities, which is different than our current Plan, and that alleviates some of the concerns about having too many grandiose projects and how we can afford any of them?

Chairman Losoff stated that ideally we get the Plan approved, and then spend time with Commissions or Committees coming up with the funding mechanisms. Maybe some things are not possible, but some are, so we come up with all of these different avenues for funding.

Commissioner Jablow asked if the Committee, Commission of Council is going to set the priority levels and Mike Raber explained it is all three. The Committee will work with the Commission to recommend the draft Plan, the Commission will do public hearings on it and make your recommendation to Council, and then the Council adopts the Plan and has the final say on the priorities.

Chairman Losoff stated that the Citizens Steering Committee and the Planning & Zoning Commission together should come up with that, so there isn't a Plan from the Committee and another version from the Commission – we just work hand-in-hand. Mike Raber agreed that would be the best approach. The Chairman added that is why P&Z wants to start getting bits and pieces now and not wait for the big Plan. Mike Raber reminded the Commission that the voters have to ratify what the Council does, so ultimately it is up to the voters.

Commissioner Hadley asked what the drop dead date is if things got bogged down and Mike Raber explained that from the state's standpoint, we could go into 2015, but we don't want to do that.

The Chairman then asked the Commissioners about their thoughts on the meetings they attended and Commissioner Brandt indicated it was a great presentation and way to get the direction from the community and try to distill the ideas down; this pie chart of at least the people that came out is interesting . . . Mike Raber clarified that those reflect what was received in the tabloid; it is everything, but it is a reflection of the tabloid responses, not the exercise in the meetings.

Jon Thompson stated that it doesn't include the blue dots and Commissioner Brandt asked how that is to be tallied. Mike explained that a tabulation was done; it is a little bit different than the tabloid response in that it is not quite as comprehensive; it was real time in the meetings. As far as the yellow dots on E, T and C at the end, they were very equally distributed, which surprised some Committee members. It is a little different than the responses from all of the questionnaires, but he heard from the Committee that there was a more positive response on Tourism than they thought we would get, and possibly because of the way it was cast in the vision.

Chairman Losoff commented that in hindsight it might have been better to just give people two or three blue dots, because some came back for more and put them all on the same thing. Mike noted that even with that exercise, nobody turned in a tabloid at the meetings, so it was important to get those back. The Chairman indicated that he thinks the Committee is done gathering and now has to start putting some things together, but we have to be conscious of where the community is, become some people want something and others don't, but we have to look out ten or fifteen years, not at today and that is difficult, because some people just think of today.

Jon Thompson indicated that he wanted to reinforce that the feeling the Committee had in its last meeting was not to get too deep into the statistical aspect of this, especially the blue dot exercise, because that was a group exercise for the people to participate as a community and talk to each other, and they came away with a really good feeling, which is why you saw a cluster in the middle. When you look at the handout, which is from people returning their forms, you see some differences, but even with those you have to be careful. As an example, this pie chart shows that 259 people answered this question, so it was the equivalent of leaving the meeting and placing the yellow dot on the diagram, and 259 answered it out of 368 respondents, so over 100 people who

took the time to mark their tabloid, didn't mark the chart, and the Committee thinks it may be because they didn't understand that was another question. So, there is some skewing and when people did it online where it was just another question, it was clear they needed to do that, so this is more representative of people who did this at home, but even more representative of the people who did the survey online.

Jon explained that he goes into that detail to say that this is being handed out, because everyone wanted to know what it was and it is helpful to some degree, but there is a point at which you have to say read the forms and get the feeling from it and move on. It is easy when you turn stuff into numbers, but it is not that way. Mike added that with 60 pages of comments that is where a lot of the interesting stuff is.

Commissioner Brandt indicated he is glad the schedule is working out, especially with P&Z, and Mike added that we probably need to add that a little more than we have right now. The Commissioner indicated that he did a little research on why the same process failed in Scottsdale last year and asked if the Committee is up-to-date on that, and Mike indicated yes. The Commissioner then indicated that the direction for it to be transit-oriented in design was a major portion and a lot of people don't like the light rail in Phoenix, so they don't want it to come into Scottsdale, and a person elected to the City Council since then very strongly petitioned against it, and it only failed by a couple of hundred votes, 51% to 49%, so that and the funding for it and implementation – you are steering the City in the direction you want it to go. How hard they put on the accelerator is really up to people in the future as they decide if they want to spend the money on this or that, but they still have the ability to choose in the future, so that needs to be emphasized when it comes to the vote. It could be no government funding and all private funding, so that needs to be emphasized.

Commissioner Jablow asked if it is possible for the vote to be split on options and Mike stated no; it has to be yes or no. The Commissioner then noted that for one thing that somebody doesn't like, they can kill the entire Plan, which would be horrendous and Mike indicated that has happened in more than one community.

Chairman Losoff indicated that the Committee has a good pulse on the community, so there won't be any surprises and there will be a good consensus in the community. The Committee is trying to educate and communicate well. A couple of people told us different things about Scottsdale. They spent about \$2 million or \$3 million and voted it down, and some people said they didn't involve the community enough. Mike indicated that regarding the transit issue, it may have been part of the bigger problem of people having a perception that they were catering to the development community.

Commissioner Taylor asked how many people turned out to vote on the last Plan and Mike indicated it was about 50% or 3,000 registered voters and it passed by 64%. We have 6,000+ voters. The Commissioner then stated that if there are 6,000 voters and you are only reaching 400 people . . . Mike explained that over time the Committee hopes to reach more than 400, but that is how many chose to respond in this exercise.

Commissioner Jablow noted that the hearings will get more, but the Committee is doing 1,000% to get the word out there. The Chairman added that once a draft is put together, there will be something more tangible for the people to react to, and the Steering Committee discussed that if we find that we aren't getting enough, we can do a survey.

Commissioner Taylor asked if the survey is on the Internet and Mike explained it is on the website. The Commissioner then asked if there is a way to email it to people and Cynthia noted that the link to the website can be emailed, and Mike added that staff has a huge list that we mail to. The Commissioner then stated if there are 6,000 registered voters, 5,500 have computers; however, the Recording Secretary noted that the City doesn't have all of their email addresses. Commissioner Jablow indicated that we do have the email blast system; however, the Chairman indicated that if it

got to that point, there could be a survey for every voter. The Commissioner then suggested sending a mailing to everybody.

Chairman Losoff indicated that over the years the Commission has talked about its frustrations about not doing enough planning, and now as we get into this schedule, we hopefully will get very much involved.

Commissioner Taylor stated that the school system doesn't have to bring anything to Planning & Zoning, the Fire District doesn't have to bring anything to Planning & Zoning and the City doesn't bring anything to Planning & Zoning and those are all important things, and maybe with the school system legally we can't approve or disapprove, but just seeing what they are planning to do would help. If we are ever going to be a Planning Commission, we need to see these things . . . The Recording Secretary interjected that discussion probably should be agendaized for a future discussion, and the Commissioner stated that he thinks it should be a future discussion.

Chairman Losoff asked if the Commissioners agree and explained that we need at least two Commissioners to agree to that, if . . . Commissioner Taylor interrupted to say that he wanted to say that he is a little confused. He thought that as his neighbor calls it the "rust bucket" on Brewer Road . . . Both the Chairman and Recording Secretary advised Commissioner Taylor that we have to stay on the agenda. The Chairman then asked if there were any other questions about the Plan and Commissioner Taylor stated yes.

*Note: There was no response from other Commissioners about Commissioner Taylor's interest in agendaizing his concern for a future discussion.*

Commissioner Taylor then stated that he thought he saw something in the planning documents that referred to the building on Brewer Road -- the new building that the school system built, as being possibly a charter school in the future. Mike Raber indicated that might have been in the displays. The Commissioner then asked if that is the School Superintendent's office. Mike explained that is the current building versus the vision for the future that might have involved a different outlook. That is not a recommendation of the Plan; it was food for thought to get the community's response to those items.

Mike Raber then asked the Chairman if this item needs to come back on the 14<sup>th</sup> or 5<sup>th</sup> and the Chairman indicated that we can see what happens in the next couple of Committee meetings. Mike then suggested the March 5<sup>th</sup> or March 19<sup>th</sup> dates and explained that the Council wants to use this room on the 14<sup>th</sup>. Commissioner Jablow requested that it not be on March 5<sup>th</sup> and Mike indicated that it could be on the 19<sup>th</sup>.

**4. Adjournment. (5:35)**

Chairman Losoff called for adjournment at 5:46 p.m., without objection.

I certify that the above is a true and correct summary of the work session of the Planning & Zoning Commission held on February 14, 2013.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Donna A. S. Puckett, Recording Secretary

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date