

**Summary Minutes  
City Of Sedona  
Citizens Steering Committee Meeting -  
Sedona Community Plan Update  
Community Plan Room, 1725 West S.R. 89A, Suite D, Sedona, AZ  
Tuesday, March 5, 2013 – 3:00 p.m.**

**1. Verification of Notice, Call to Order, and Roll Call. Members of the Citizens Steering Committee will attend either in person or by internet conferencing.**

Chairman Thompson called the meeting to order at 3:01 p.m.

**Roll Call:**

**Committee Members Present:** Chairman Jon Thompson, Vice Chairman Rio Robson and Committee Members Mike Bower - arrived at 3:05 p.m., Jim Eaton, Angela LeFevre - joined by Skype at 3:05 p.m., Barbara Litrell arrived at 3:02 p.m., Marty Losoff, Elemer Magaziner and Gerhard Mayer. Judy Reddington and John Sather were excused.

**Staff Present:** Cynthia Lovely, Donna Puckett and Mike Raber

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

Mike Raber indicated that now that our Outreach Team is taking a different focus with the draft Plan coming out eventually and maybe wanting to be champions of the Plan as an approach, if any Committee Member wants to consider something different let him know. We have had the same group together for quite awhile and we talked about this a while back, in terms of coming up with a little different mix, if you want, and if anybody wants to do something different just let staff know individually, and we can take that into account. We are looking at a little different focus with our whole outreach, with the draft Plan coming up, so he wanted to bring that up.

*Note: Barbara Litrell joined the meeting at this time.*

Mike Raber then announced that he is going to introduce the new Planning Director next time -- Kevin Snyder, and he is sure the Committee will enjoy meeting him. Staff is very much looking forward to working with him.

Gerhard Mayer indicated that he attended his last Parks & Recreation Commission meeting Monday, a week ago, and there were a few items that pertain to our group. One is the City's Capital Improvement Program and he suggested that they have a work session that one of the Committee Members might attend, and it was accepted, so we just have to choose somebody to go there. He also wanted to made the Committee aware of the Capital Improvement Program, which is for the fiscal years of 2014 - 2023 and it contains a lot of things the Committee is discussing, i.e., priorities, Master Plan and Community Plan, so it is very important that we be kept in the loop so it is coordinated.

Additionally, Gerhard Mayer referenced an article in the *Red Rock News* about asking citizens to participate in input for future projects, which is parallel to what the Committee has been doing and to what the Master Plan has been doing, so that is something you might want to keep for the record.

*Note: Angela LeFevre joined the meeting by Skpe and Mike Bower arrived at this time.*

Mike Bower announced that the Forest Service Transit Study has moved along a little and NAIPTA (Northern Arizona Intergovernmental Public Transit Authority) is involved. They have hired Nelson\Nygaard to continue with the study and they did the first transit study for Sedona that basically said how to go about it, so that is something we should strike up a stronger interface with,

now that we need to write stuff. Jim Eaton asked if they also did the Red Rock Crossing Study and Mike Bower indicated yes, they are pretty knowledgeable of our traffic problems.

Gerhard Mayer indicated that there was also a hearing that was attended by the City bicycle guy and it was about bike and hiking trails within the City, and there were about six trails discussed and most of those go through private property, so they are going to approach the property owners to see if they will give an easement or something, and there was a strong opposition from people who own property along Dry Creek Road, which has been a favorite spot for mountain bikers to go through property to hit a trail that loops around that Stupa and back down, so they really object to it. Another one is at Airport Road, which cuts right in the middle of two properties as well, so that is something he wanted to put out there for the Committee.

Mike Bower announced that he has been asked to do a Coffee Talk for Gardens for Humanity and it is Monday from 9:00 a.m. to 10:30 a.m. at the Java Love coffee shop, and they want him to talk about how agriculture or community gardens are shaping up in the Community Plan input we have received, so he said yes, and he will do that if he has the Committee's blessing to do so. Barbara Litrell asked if that is part of the Spring Planting Festival and Mike stated yes.

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

*The Chairman opened the public forum.*

**Paul Jankovsky, Vice President of the Big Park Regional Coordinating Council and Chairman of the Vision Committee, Sedona (Village of Oak Creek), AZ:** Indicated that he is here because of an article in the paper and it was coordinating a little with what they are doing in the Village. He has lived in the Village for 12 years and this all started a couple of years ago, when they had a guy by the name of Mel Copen, who passed away about a year ago, but Mel's legacy lives on. He started some surveys, and roundtable surveys were taken as to what the people would like to see the Village look like 10 to 15 years from now. This started the "Mel Copen Vision" and after he passed away, they used his name and came up with a 501(c)3, which is a tax-exempt fund, and they started raising funds for what they might need to support their endeavor. They have no City Council and no Chamber of Commerce. Elemer Magaziner stated, "Join", and Mr. Jankovsky indicated that they are going to talk about that in their Vision Committee. He has given a copy to Mike Raber and he would be happy to read it, but he doesn't want to spend his three minutes doing that. He would like to let the Committee know that they have a Mission Statement and Vision Statement and they are going into their Action Plans. Their Action Plans -- he has a number of them in the back of his mind, including the Chamber or a relationship to the Sedona Chamber in some way, but that is basically what he wanted to say. If you want him to read the Vision Statement, he would be glad to; otherwise, he will just ask if the Committee has any questions.

Chairman Thompson explained that the Committee is not allowed to . . . Mr. Jankovsky interjected his thanks for having him, and the Chairman thanked Mr. Jankovsky for his comments and indicated that his handout will be distributed.

Jim Eaton wanted to correct the record by pointing out that the Committee can ask questions. Mike Bower then asked if Mr. Jankovsky could give a brief synopsis of how they are looking at traffic issues and potential solutions.

Mr. Jankovsky explained that the Village has the "*All American Highway*", which comes in through the Village and all of the businesses basically are on either side of that road. There are the roundabouts and there is not too much they can do with what they already have allowed to be done. He would have changed some of those thoughts if he had had an opportunity, but it is what it is the way it is. There is going to be some widening of the road from the Forest Service office to I-17 in the near future, which would continue the highway on into Sedona.

Marty Losoff asked if this could be a future agenda item to talk about how we are going to relate our Plan to the Village, eventually we are going to have to do that and at one time we talked about being more global, and we probably need to start thinking about that. Mike Raber indicated that the whole regional issue is part of the discussion, so eventually that will . . . Mr. Jankovsky interjected that is what caught his eye -- why the Village was not included, but then down below, it says that is why we have always welcomed their comments and suggestions, and they are offering to work with the Committee on that too.

Marty Losoff noted that there are two different organizations and both are struggling with the name; they both wanted Sedona and the Verde Valley or Verde Valley and Sedona, you know they are going back and forth, so it is probably a good agenda item for the future. Mike Raber stated that with Mr. Jankovsky's permission, he can distribute the Vision Statement to the Committee. Mr. Jankovsky stated with one caveat, this has not been totally voted on by Big Park Council, and they don't meet until a week from Thursday; however, all of the Vision Committee Members have agreed and the President of the Big Park Council is on his side, so he thinks it is just a formality, but they haven't had formal approval through their Big Park Council. Mike Raber then indicated that staff can wait and Mr. Jankovsky repeated a week from Thursday, and you are welcome to join them.

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

**4. Discussion/possible action on: interrelationships of plan concepts and topics; ETC results; and plan organization and planning schedule. (1 hour and 40 minutes - 3:10 – 4:50 p.m.)**

Mike Raber referenced the memo that accompanied the packet and explained that we are making a big shift right now to plan production, and there is a really tight timeframe. Staff needs to start taking a bigger role in actually getting the Plan components put together and trying to keep the Committee's work focused on the bigger picture at a higher level, focusing on the big ideas or the items that really need to be worked through, and let staff work all of the details and the process, so we aren't talking about process.

Mike explained that he is proposing that staff spend the next couple of months organizing the background and the outline of the Plan; putting the chapter components together; identifying the key issues in the current Plan, which we really haven't talked about, and preparing some rough goals and policies, and then staff can test those with some individual Committee Members. One example is that some of the previous Format Team Members worked on the outline details, and staff can go back and start testing some of those things with them.

Mike indicated that staff feels that to make this work effectively in the timeframe allowed, if we can take that on and let the Committee run with the bigger issues, we will be in a better shape, and staff can bring these details back to the Committee and get the Committee's reaction rather than trying to hammer some of it out in Committee meetings.

Mike then explained that the full Committee can focus on the bigger concepts and what the emerging vision is, then staff can take that and integrate it into the work that staff is doing. As the Committee works, we can also discuss how these bigger ideas and concepts line up with what we heard from the community, to test that a little as we go.

Mike explained that by May, if we can focus on starting a draft and talking about implementation, we will be in good shape, and if the Outreach Team or components of that can start working on how to respond to the public on the ETC stuff this month, and then possibly starting next month, start talking about how we are going to do the outreach on the draft, which becomes the other piece of this picture in sort of a three-legged approach.

Mike stated that for today, we had discussed focusing on the brainstorming exercise with linkages between the ideas and the elements, using the "String of Pearls" concept that Mike Bower talked about and trying to demonstrate that. If the Committee also identifies what the big planning

concepts and ideas are for this and future meetings, that would be really good. Staff included in the packet some of the stuff that the Committee came up with at the last meeting -- Plan Attributes, some higher level direction discussion, and Cynthia put together a list of some of the ETC common issues that we talked about going into the tabloid and sorting that out with the written comment responses we got, to come up with the top issues list, and with Barbara Litrell's analysis too. Between all of those things, if as a group, we at least identify the top ten issues that the Plan needs to address, before we get into any major brainstorming, it will help staff organize the Plan elements.

Mike again indicated that if we can start doing that, then if necessary, we can come back and revisit the priority, but that would really be where staff would like to go to start this off today. Cynthia added that to reiterate what Mike was saying regarding the attachments in the packet, between the three different documents, there are probably about 30 different topics and issues on the list, so staff would like to know the top ten. At the last meeting, there was a lot of talk about the big bold ideas and getting into discussions about the meaty issues, so staff is asking what those top things are that the Committee would want to talk about, and then at future meetings, those can be on the agenda for discussion.

Mike Raber stated that the "String of Pearls" concept is one of those big ideas, and that is an example of the kinds of things that could be put on the list, and then we've always got that out there that we can come back to when we want a central item to start a discussion with.

*The following question was written for discussion purposes: What are the top ten issues the Plan should address - that the Committee should discuss?*

Elemer Magaziner indicated that he is trying to get clear what staff wants on the list -- issues are like problems, like traffic. Mike Raber stated anything that seems that it is an item for discussion that the Plan needs to address -- that is the key thing to staff.

Mike Bower indicated that the word "issues" does mean problems, but he would just substitute "problems" or "ideas". Elemer then explained that he was wondering if we are limited to problems or if we are going broader. Mike Bower stated that instead of using the words "String of Pearls", the real underlying community idea or issue is community gathering places or a community town square. Some people jump to a solution, and in a way a "String of Pearls" is a solution, and kind of a wishy-washy easy one to make the issue of is it one consolidated central gathering place or a series linked. That is a question, so that is one of the big issues -- how do we really address community gathering place? As we think about "String of Pearls, we always want to think about the either/or that exists; do we really try to make one heart of town or do we let a "String of Pearls" concept gain us something else, which is more acceptance with a little bit more walkability and potentially a little bit more flexibility. One of those pearls could eventually grow big and become a dominant part of town, and if you just pick one location, you are less flexible as a community in the ability to see which way the wind blows, what kind of developers will step-up, and what properties get assembled together.

Jim Eaton stated that in the last meeting, Max Licher suggested that the Committee start working on actual planning vignettes, something with some substance to them, and he liked that idea. Sooner or later, we will have to do something like that in the Plan, whether it is graphic or in words or both, but he would like to ask if Mike Bower agrees with that or has something in mind.

Mike Bower indicated that Max's letter said it pretty well, it is just when you think about what he presented for Schnebly Road, it was a radically different vision than the current Zoning Ordinance or Plan talks about, but it embraces a lot of the comments the Committee heard, and on top of that, he took it to a level of actually dealing with all of the landowners, and on his own gained acceptance for that, so the reason he did is because he drew it and incorporated ideas and it made people quit arguing and go, "Oh wow, I can get it, I see it", so the concept of including vignettes or site-specific ideas is important to just help people come together around what the goals might mean.

Jim Eaton asked if we have in mind to do something like that for each pearl . . . Marty Losoff interrupted to ask Jim Eaton if that is a top ten issue or a separate approach in doing this. Jim Eaton explained that he was just following up on what Mike was saying.

Mike Raber indicated that is fair game, because we need to understand whether it is part of the substance of the Plan or how it is conveyed. Those are all things we need to know. Chairman Thompson then suggested while the Committee is compiling this to try to not get too deeply in discussing the pros and cons of the concepts, etc.

Elemer Magaziner suggested that the Committee go a little higher with community gathering, because he had four main issues that have to do with the experience that citizens are looking for, regardless of how it is provided. Elemer then presented the following:

- **Unity Among Sedona's People** - which is that diagram that he prepared a long time ago, so just the idea of people wanting to experience being around other people, whether it is visitors or residents.
- **Inspiration and Renewal from Sedona's Natural Environment** - people who come here want to experience what they get from nature, not just the vistas and the views, but the energy that is here, and he has subheadings for those.
- **Sedona's Unique Town Character** - experience that, so that is where the historical heritage goes, the arts and culture, the spiritual energy or whatever.
- **Health and Prosperity** - things like the diversified economy, local food production, clean air and water, stuff like that, and maybe different approaches to health that are coming in.

Marty Losoff agreed with Mike's earlier comment that we shouldn't be focusing on things like the format or stuff -- big picture items, and he is biting his tongue. He thought we weren't going to be making lists anymore. Before he gives his top ten issues or whatever, how are we going to decide which are the top ten issues? We are going to go through this again and again, and he hopes not.

Mike Raber indicated there should be some discussion about priority, but if we can't arrive at that . . . Marty Losoff interrupted to say a list was made last week and we have Barbara Litrell's letter that outlined a lot of stuff, and he thought we were going to use that or Chairman Thompson's to come up with something. All of these things can go in it, but if we are not going to do that, there is another list, so he will add to the list:

- **Circulation** - should be on the list and be part of the top ten issues, and that would include bikes, cars, tourists, pedestrians, walkability -- all of those things. Mike Raber asked what about circulation and Marty Losoff stated that if we are making a list, we are putting on big ticket items. Circulation to him is everything we have discussed and heard from the community -- traffic issues, walkability, more and better bike paths, how we are going to move cars in and around now and in the future, and what the new mode of transportation will be. Circulation to him is a big picture -- not traffic and walkability, but circulation, and all of the other things fall under circulation -- walkability, pedestrian traffic, and tourism in terms of walking around town, bikes, cars and so forth.
- **Sustainability** - this would be economic, environmental and social. In his mind, we were going to be doing the "String of Pearls", and he would have had ideas for each one of those, but we will just make our list first he guesses and come up with those things.

Chairman Thompson explained that what we discussed earlier was that the "String of Pearls" was like a solution to the big idea, which was the idea of interacting with people, so we kind of backed off of that and said let's get the big ideas that we know we need to cover, so we have them in front of us and don't miss something, because if we just dive in . . .

Marty Losoff interrupted to say that he just isn't going to sit through making too many more lists and continued identifying his top ten issues as follows:

- **Natural Beauty** - that would include Oak Creek, trails and the Forest Service.

Mike Raber stated that he appreciates Marty Losoff's concern about reiterating stuff that has come up before, but maybe there is a little bit of a misunderstanding in what we are looking for. We keep hearing about big ideas, big concepts and we think we've reiterated some of those in the list that the Committee started last week, but we want to know if we are getting it all down. It is not just topics, but what are the big ideas? Like the whole thing about community gathering place -- that is a big idea, so something more on that level is healthy.

Marty Losoff continued to present his top ten as follows:

- **Land Use/Land Development Code** - that would be things we discussed already -- how are we going to reorganize, rezone and redevelop.

Marty then indicated that he could keep going with Governance, Tourism; there are all kinds of other stuff, but he will shut up at this point. Chairman Thompson noted that all Committee Members are struggling right now with approaching this from different perspectives, and that is the problem. Elemer gave some things on the previous page, which to him (the Chairman) come at the big ideas from a different perspective, and Marty has just given some things that are like big categories, but if you look at Natural Beauty, for example, we don't have to discuss natural beauty. We know the public wants it, but as much as it hurts, we may still need to stop here and try to refine what it is we are trying to get. We're not trying to get solutions or categories, we are trying to get topical issues that we need to debate to figure out how we're going to treat them in the Community Plan.

Marty Losoff explained that when he says natural beauty, that is the big rubric and under that comes access to Oak Creek; working with the Forest Service to help preserve the forest, because we can't do that alone, and then trails. Then with the trails, there are also the issues that Mike Bower brought up before -- the Forest Service is talking about shuttle systems. We need to be in on that and it should be part of the Plan, if they come up with that, which goes back to his issue of circulation. When he says circulation, that is the general rubric and it would include walkability, bike trails, cars and other modes of transportation, etc., so he is not just giving one word, in his mind he has outlined the Plan on a big scale. Whether we come up with a central meeting point or a "String of Pearls", those are solutions. First, we have to generate our vision for Sedona.

Gerhard Mayer indicated that he sees it totally differently. He sees all of those things mentioned as little pieces of a puzzle, but we still need to define the label we are going to put to Sedona. What is Sedona going to be in 25 to 50 years? Is Sedona going to be a quality city to live in and do business in and visit as a tourist? That is how we build that pyramid to the top to reach that goal, rather than by bits and pieces here and there. He sees this as the goal and where we have got to go and how we are going to build it up to get there. We need to define the label we are going to put to Sedona.

Barbara Litrell indicated that she liked Mike's constellation idea of what the big ideas are, because it is then how they are connected, but she and Angela spent about two hours one day going over all of the ideas and seeing what fit where, and there were five circles that the people of Sedona should be able to look at and say the Committee heard us and is addressing those areas. Whether we call them issues or opportunities, they need to be able to look at this and say that we came up with what they cared about, which seemed to fall under the ideas of keep these things, preserve these things and fix these things. It is like what are those things, and then will the Committee be able to look back in 10 years and say we had a good Plan for each of those areas, a lot like the last Plan for Uptown and for SR 179.

Barbara Litrell indicated that the ones she and Angela came up with are the following:

- **Building Community** - whatever the solution is, whether it is bike paths, other paths or "String of Pearls". It is something that our community wants addressed in this Plan.
- **SR 89A** - it was under a number of guises, whether it was congestion, beauty, safety, walkability or community, but SR 89A is a big chunk of something that needs to be

addressed. On down the road, we should be able to say we fixed that, and the note to the Council was also influential.

- **Congestion** - one person wrote a long note related to congestion that summed it up by saying, "Congestion in all ways." It is circulation, air traffic, noise; it is just a lot of stuff, so we can look at it as circulation, but he broadened it more to congestion.
- **Economics** - it can take in a lot of different areas, but economics for Sedona means that we want to be around in 50 years, and what is that going to take?
- **Natural Resources** - it has been mentioned in different areas and people want it preserved, fixed -- whether it is water, air, all of those, but it seems to be an important area.
- **Sustainability** - we also talked about the same concept that Gerhard Mayer had, which is what is going to be the big thing that causes people to say yes, this is the new vision for Sedona, and they came up with sustainability. People want to say down-the-road, this is the Plan for the sustainability of Sedona, which ties into quality of life, economics and everything else, but as a group, we need to determine whether we believe sustainability is going to be the hook on which we hang this Plan, because now we are at the point where the Plan has to be understandable to the people and be clear that we know what is important and what direction it is going to take. Then all the specific solutions become the strategic, tactical plan. It is like, have we gotten the right ideas and is that where the community wants to move Sedona?

Barbara then stated that those are the five things they came up with and it may be something other than sustainability, but it seemed like the one that most people would identify with. Gerhard Mayer indicated that if the Committee can find another name for it that would be great, because it has been misused. Barbara stated that it could be Quality of Life, but that is the idea.

Gerhard then stated that sustainability is every aspect, and Jim Eaton added that sustainability is extremely important and he has been thinking about it more than average, but it is only part of quality of life. There is more to quality of life than just sustaining or protecting what we have or keeping it going. Improving things and making things better is another part of the picture, and quality of life is an envelope that contains a lot of things -- sustainability; making things better; quieter; keeping ourselves in water, which is going to be more and more difficult, and he just wanted to make that point. Sustainability isn't everything; that is just keeping what you have.

Barbara Litrell stated no, not really. Sustainability means that in 50 years, 100 years, 200 years, Sedona is going to be here and have a good enough quality of life and good water, air, etc. Jim Eaton indicated that you are protecting what you have, in future conditions. Gerhard Mayer then commented that what you have needs to be improved to come to that level of sustainability -- we don't have it yet.

Angela LeFevre indicated that in talking about sustainability, one of the reasons she and Barbara came up with that is that the biggest dissent that we are going to face, when we put forward this Plan, is those folks who feel that we can't afford to do anything. We can't afford to do what they think of as pie-in-the-sky things, so if we start by talking about sustainability as a way whereby we move toward these goals and that they basically pay for themselves, that is what sustainability is all about. It is a way of affordability and being able to sustain a quality of life, and an economic quality of life, and you do that by the range of tools we discussed, but (audio unclear) maybe that will hit those equally that this whole Plan basically works for itself and it can stand on its own two feet.

Chairman Thompson wanted to add the following things that the Committee should discuss:

- **What kind of tourism we want.** What is sustainable tourism if sustainability becomes the overarching concept? Do we want to try to emphasize a different kind of tourism than what we have now -- less, more or whatever?
- **If we want to expand our economic base to include things other than tourism, what kinds of things should be in the Plan to proactively go out and do that?** Are there ideas that we can come up with? We know there are work-at-home businesses, but are there things we can do to organize people who work at home to make it more obvious that people

might want to move here to work at home or whatever, or are there clean industries that we ought to ask our new Director to pursue as part of our future?

Mike Raber then indicated that he would verbally summarize the items list:

- Building Community - community gathering spaces.
- Making sure we have some scenarios in our Plan; "vignettes" is one way to describe them, but the Plan graphically depicts some examples.
- People really experiencing community, not just us building community physically, but people being able to experience that through unity, inspiration, renewal, unique character, health and prosperity. Those are all facets of experiencing community. He hears a lot of focus on community.
- Circulation - traffic is an issue that has come up many times; having a more walkable community.
- We've also got the shuttle system that the Forest Service is maybe looking into again and being able to see where that is going and if there is something our Community Plan can relate to that.
- Sustainability is permeating the Plan; it is not that there is this one element called Sustainability, but it is a concept that we need sustainability across the board and in all the different parts of the Plan, and it includes economics all the way to everything else. Someone talked about maybe re-titling that and calling it Quality of Life or something like that. That is not a surprise; that has been a big item in our past outreach too.
- Preserving natural beauty, which could be everything from working with the Forest Service on making sure we continue to preserve the area around us to the trail system and access on Oak Creek.
- Making sure our Plan is clear about how we might amend our Codes in the future, our Land Development Code, and he agrees that there needs to be some direction with that.
- What is the label for our community? How are we going to view ourselves in the big picture? Do we need to really have something that stands out that way for everyone to see?
- SR 89A - how is that whole corridor redeveloped over time? How can we bring all of these different aspects of the community into that corridor, to enhance it and make it a great place.
- The issue of congestion.
- Economic sustainability
- Sustainability also means that we are fiscally sound and that we do have a Plan that we can afford, so to speak. At least there is a sound implementation program that gets us where we want to go.
- What kind of tourism are we looking at in the future and what is sustainable in the future?
- Expanding our economic base, and how do we diversify our economy?

Mike Raber then asked if that catches most of the big items and Barbara Litrell indicated that it catches everything we said, but it divides into three separate things that are up there:

- First are Elemer's higher level values, which are well-stated and can almost be page one of the Plan, because it does express the four biggest values, which is what Sedonans are looking for. It has nothing to do with anything specific -- no solutions. It is strictly unity, inspiration, unique character, health and prosperity, and that can have its own dialogue related to the values.
- Second are specific issues or subject areas to be addressed, and that is where you've got community, economics and whatever.
- Third are a couple of techniques for doing it and expressing it, and those really are not part of our discussion today, although they can be at some point, which include the vignettes and those are ways to express what you are saying to make it clearer, but they are not really the essence of it; they are ways to depict it.

Barbara Litrell then indicated that if we all agree on the four big areas and all of the specific topics . . . Mike Bower interjected that he is not seeing what you are taking notes on. Values is one of the big ones, so values should be moved down to equalize it with Community, if he understands things

right; however, Barbara stated no and explained that the four big areas are number one. It is values, and she would just get rid of "big areas" and just say the four values.

Marty Losoff asked if the Committee agrees with those values and Barbara explained that is to decide if the Committee agrees, but first we have to separate them. Marty Losoff then stated that it is "values" in general then, not specific, and Barbara indicated that is correct, but nevertheless Elemer has those values and put four of them there that can be discussed, changed or accepted, and Barbara then listed the following:

1. Values
2. Specific subject areas and that may include community or priorities, whatever we call it.
3. Presentation techniques - Mike Raber noted the techniques may even be implementation, like the Land Development Code link.

Elemer Magaziner indicated that Barbara Litrell is making a critical point. There are different kinds of information being listed and they are all mixed up and that makes it hard to see, so we just need to sort them, because solutions are different than values, and values are different than techniques, and that is why he originally asked what was meant by "issues", because we are mixing all types of information.

Mike Raber then asked Cynthia Lovely if, for what staff is trying to do as we start assembling the pieces, this is going to be useful. Cynthia explained that another way to clarify it is that one purpose of this is to lay out the agendas for the next two months, so what are the topics that the Committee wants to put on the agendas that we will have a big lengthy discussion/debate about? What are those things that should go on the agendas? Marty Losoff doesn't want to see a list, but we need to know what to put on the agenda next time. "String of Pearls" is one item; it is on today's agenda.

Chairman Thompson indicated that we realize, working with each other for 2½ years, that we can't just simply dig-in, because we will take that topic as the most important thing of the day and spend all day on it, unless we know some roadmap of what we have to cover, and his take was as to what Mike Raber and Cynthia were looking for was for us to put up the issues and topics. What we came up with was that there are more than issues and topics to discuss. There are also values to discuss and techniques. The question is if there is an order that would be helpful and useful to do these in? Mike Raber then asked if staff should just try to figure that out.

Mike Bower indicated he is glad to hear that, because that is right on and what Barbara Litrell observed and Elemer Magaziner confirmed, he agrees with, so his recommendation is to see if everybody else sees the disparity between what we just threw up on the board, sees that it falls into these kinds of categories and sees that is a problem. It is also a step forward, if everybody agrees, because he thinks we have realized that we've got some levels of things to address, and then the question is, can you jump right to what John called the 'big ideas' without really seeing if there are some value-type higher level issues that we are having - disparate ways of seeing the values? He thinks we could, but it would take some discipline not to get too hung up, because he has read the Community Plan a lot and the West Sedona Corridor Plan, and he could take Barbara's SR 89A bubble and pretty much answer that from what has already been done, so as we move forward, he is approaching it kind of lightly and he could get past not having everything just so and in the proper order, but the issues are things like central gathering place and how we write about them -- one or many. That is one of the topics we should all debate, and then as Jim Eaton asked last time, "What is a "String of Pearls"? "What is a pearl, what is in it, what are the ingredients in it?" That is another "walkable mixed-use district" and we throw those words around, but we need to discuss that a bit.

Mike Bower then added that he could jump into issues and start discussing them, but he thinks maybe we could all say if we agree to see these differences, and then discuss the smartest way to go into it, and it could be that just staying on values is easier, because Elemer Magaziner presented the Committee with a salient document several months ago, when we were critiquing whether we

should even do ETC, and it basically told him that we all agree on higher level things a lot more readily than other stuff.

Marty Losoff indicated he would just as soon throw it up on the board and talk about it or we are going to get hung up on the definition of a "value" or what is an objective versus a goal, and we don't need to get into that, so he would prefer to start taking ideas and putting them up there. We have 2½ years of stuff and if we are going to debate what is an idea, value or issue, we're never going to finish the list -- let alone make a list. We should just arbitrarily come up with this, and he thought we did that last week, and that is not to say the "String of Pearls" was the ideal, but it gave the Committee things to throw darts on. We have this pearl and we are going to put in circulation, natural resources -- that is brainstorming and idea-setting, planning. We don't want to do planning having it so structured that we can't decide what we are defining.

Chairman Thompson stated that is a vote for digging right into these issues, and Barbara Litrell indicated that we can put the values part of that aside for another time, but the "String of Pearls" is a solution to a subject area, which might be Community or Building Community, so great, we have Community and one solution is "String of Pearls", but first, what do we want out of Building Community? People want all of the encounters, interaction, whatever, and fine we agree on that. "String of Pearls" is one, and then that solution can be discussed to see how it works, but there might be a second solution besides "String of Pearls" that might be an alternative, and a third. They all have their implications for bicycle paths, other paths and connectivity, so they connect to everything else, but they at least need to fall under some big idea that responds to what the public wanted, which was they want to feel more like a community, they want more gathering spaces -- not value, gathering spaces. "We want gathering spaces" is community.

Chairman Thompson asked if Barbara is giving an opinion as to whether the Committee should talk about values first. Barbara explained that she is fine if we go to Community, but she is not good if we go to "String of Pearls", because that is one idea that might be counteracted by four others. Let's start with Community and identify that "String of Pearls" is a good solution, and then go into what it is. Chairman Thompson then asked if she is ambivalent about whether we should start by talking about values, and Barbara indicated that values can be put aside or looked at to say those look good for now and we will come back to them.

Chairman Thompson indicated that he wants to hear whether the Committee Members want to discuss values rather than getting into the Community level issues, etc. Elemer Magaziner indicated that there is something used on projects called a Work Breakdown Structure, where we have so many tasks coming up that need to be done and we can't see how they all fit together, so it is a technique for describing the end result we are trying to achieve, and then breaking it into all the pieces that need to be done in order to get there, and it just lends some discipline and structure to what we are doing. He doesn't know how else to do a project; otherwise, we get scattered, so he is just making a suggestion that maybe we should create a Work Breakdown Structure that identifies the tasks we need to do, in order to get a document finished. It is a hierarchical thing, so it shows what depends on what. It is just a suggestion that would clarify a lot.

Chairman Thompson indicated that he kind of assumed that what staff started off with today in talking about taking over responsibility for the document itself and making sure it is done on time, etc., meant they were going to take responsibility for understanding how that project should flow, and what they wanted from us was to be able to give the overall high-level guidance on what needs to be in it, what the priorities ought to be, what the emphasis ought to be, etc., so we can stay at a relatively non-planning level, as far as the process is concerned, and let them worry about everything coming out alright and giving the Committee the details.

Mike Raber explained that as a Committee, it is going to be easier to react to something that staff is able to give back to the Committee than the other way around. Chairman Thompson added that it is about the only way that we are going to be able to get through, because as a Committee, if we were to try to come up with a PERT Chart or whatever, not to mention that Marty would go through

the roof, because that is a list on steroids, but we can work it this way and he thinks we are actually doing really well here. This is very helpful and we have really good ideas, from Barbara's comments especially, as to what the issue level is and what are possible solutions, etc., and when we get to that, we can tackle those, but he would like to spend a couple of more minutes to ensure he has heard from everyone on the idea of talking about values, as opposed to starting right in with issues.

The Chairman then indicated that his thoughts are that it would be worthwhile spending at least 20 minutes on those values, we have the ones that Elemer came up with, to say if those include all of the ones we heard or are there others or do we disagree with them or should they be better organized or whatever? Unless we have a good sense of what the community values are and have agreement on them, once we start digging into those specific issues, we could wind up still being in conflict, so he would vote for that being a good thing to start with, and then get into the issues.

Mike Bower indicated that as long as we all see the difference, it is going to intermingle in the discussion and actually be valuable not to be totally in a box, but allow some discussion on values, even though we are supposed to be on the other, and slide it up or test if we are modifying what we have already done, because the diversity of stuff we have to tackle is comprehensive and we are going to hit techniques, issues and values all the time while we are talking. What we have done here is also positive, so he would spend some time on values as well.

Gerhard Mayer indicated that he would like to see quality up there; quality of everything -- quality of life; quality in the values; that is a value. To him, it is a value to have something of quality; it is a standard, which could be applied to projects. It is an important factor in our life here and in everything we do. It should be geared toward quality rather than quantity. It is an adjective, but it is a valuable thing to have quality.

Marty Losoff indicated that is why he is not excited about talking about values. If he was teaching his class in Management Development, he would say quality is a value and if you are going to take tourism, it should be quality tourism and that is our value, so again we get hung up on all of these words. Quality is a value. We just open an argument for each of these things and it is not right or wrong, it is just there. Chairman Thompson clarified that he is not talking about spending a couple of meetings debating values; he is saying that we have a list of four that Elemer thought through and put up there, and he doesn't think we need to define what is a value. Just look at these four; we can spend 15 minutes looking at these four and say if we agree that is the right list. He knows one thing he already wants to discuss about it, and he is sure other people might have things too, but if we can get that down and set it aside, we can come back to it later as we talk about the issues as needed, but that is the starting point.

Elemer Magaziner explained that the way he came up with those was by going through all of the comments again, pre-ETC and post-ETC, and he tried to find what they point at, so what people are trying to get at, and he said they want to experience certain things, and those are the four he came up with. No matter what comment he saw, whether it was on Barbara's list from last time or anywhere, that is how he came up with them and that was his reasoning for doing it. If we follow what Mike is saying, we end up talking about a particular topic or issue and we could say it doesn't fit anywhere up there, so we need to modify the list, so he would agree that jumping around is more brainstorming than trying to pin anyone down completely, because that is just his interpretation of what people want to experience when they visit or live here.

Mike Raber indicated that might be a good point, and Elemer added that it is just one way to look at all of the data. Mike Raber then pointed out that by jumping in, you may be able to test the values as you go and Elemer stated that is the point.

Chairman Thompson then asked if the Committee wants to just jump in, and Jim Eaton stated that we have essentially been shuffling the same deck of cards for 2½ years now and there have been very few surprises. We've held 20 public meetings and had really very few surprises; we haven't

seen more than a handful of new cards in the deck. Elemer has done what he (Jim) was going to suggest as the first thing to do; go through all of these cards, look at them, and find out there are four suits, and that gives you some kind of form, but sooner or later to play the game, you have to deal the cards. You don't know if you have a flush or a straight until you deal the cards, so we've just got to start doing something, and he has an idea for this. We've got two points of view and people say we ought to have a creek walk and people say we ought to keep people away from the creek, we've either got to make a decision on what the Plan is going to say or find a way to serve both masters. We've got to look into some details like this -- how do you do both things? How do you get people to enjoy the creek without ruining it? There may be a way, but we haven't done any of that. We just listed these same cards -- creek access or keep them away. Another is the "String of Pearls" versus one town center. We've got to find out how these things work; maybe a town center like it was suggested a while ago is a big pearl in the string, but we've got to start defining these things.

Chairman Thompson indicated that he is hearing a consensus or majority saying to jump in, so do we want to just jump in on the whole Community one? Several Committee Members stated yes, and Mike Bower stated that he is just going to jump in on the creek access thing as he is reading Elemer's breakdown of the four things. Elemer put a few points under each one, and access to nature was a way he addressed inspiration and renewal in Sedona's natural environment. He (Mike) wrote access to nature under unique character also, because part of what is being eroded, as it came out in the discussion of trailheads today is closure or access that we used to have freely is now being contended. The character is eroding a little, so it is also under character as well. It used to be the permeability of getting anywhere in town into nature was such a desirable thing; it is what makes Sedona special and it has eroded in the 35 years he has spent accessing nature here, and it is now a little more difficult. Another factor that goes with that is, he went out to hike on Dry Creek Road Sunday and the trailhead spillover with vehicles was phenomenal from Enchantment to Fay Canyon trailhead, with cars parked along the edge and all the trailheads full, so creek access is one thing and access to nature is a higher thing. Creek access is a goal; solutions might be a creek walk or a creek park or easements, etc., so as we talk about these things, if we keep thinking about what we are really writing there -- creek access, that is kind of a goal that falls under the character of the town and the inspiration of its nature, but the solutions that would then come under creek access could be many -- creek walk, creek park, easement, and that will help us start getting our mind squared away.

Chairman Thompson stated that when the Committee tackles the big topic, we should at the beginning ask if this is the right level -- are we high enough. In other words, we can talk about creek access or talk about access to nature. Mike Bower stated that it is always the right level; it is just one level, and then you have to make sure you see the other levels. Elemer Magaziner added that those four are interrelated, so when you draw the topology of that, you notice that creek access would fall under the character of the town, but also under nature, so those aren't a list; they are more a network of ideas.

Cynthia indicated that we are on the right track now and she has been taking notes, and if she has this correct, the idea is that staff would like to say on the next agenda, or even today, is talk about access to nature and that might include a laundry list of things -- creek walk, trail easements, etc., so that is one thing. It could be an hour or two-hour discussion on that issue. Then, another example that she got is how we build community; the concept of community that we are hearing in the comments, and Barbara had mentioned that "String of Pearls" is one piece of that, so maybe we have an entire meeting that talks about Community Building and within that, we talk about central gathering places, "String of Pearls", town center, etc. Cynthia then explained that is kind of what she and Mike are trying to get at -- what does the Committee want to spend an hour discussion on, and that is just two examples.

Chairman Thompson asked if anything was pulled from the other two things on the list, like when we had circulation up there, were you able to pull something relevant to that or is that tied into everything else. Cynthia explained that one needs to be more specific, but it might come out of

these other discussions. Mike Raber then asked what it means to be a more walkable community; however, Chairman Thompson asked if that is part of Community Building -- that is the question, and Mike Raber stated that it can be.

Marty Losoff indicated that circulation is an issue unto itself and in every meeting we have had walk downtown, walk in the neighborhood, walk to Safeway, meaning we are talking about traffic, talking about circulation and circulation needs to be a major topic, whether it is congestion or circulation, and under that all of the things we hear about. Whether we end up putting that under X or Y is another issue, but the issue of circulation is a major one. Secondly, if we are talking about values, one of the basic values for Sedona is to preserve our natural resources -- that is a value. It is a strong value; we hear that all the time and he would say that is not a technique or an issue, but a value that we want to preserve our natural resources. Everything we come up with could be measured against that as opposed to the other way around, so he would use that as one of the values. We have pretty broad descriptions up there, but he would use preserve natural resources, either as an additional one or in place of perhaps unity. He is not sure what unity means, in his neighborhood, people want to be united within a neighborhood, and they are fine with that and don't want to go outside of the neighborhood, so he doesn't know what unity means. These people are very supportive of Sedona; they are very conscientious of Sedona, but they like their neighborhood and they don't see reaching out into someplace three miles away; they would like to see a community center, but that doesn't mean . . . He doesn't know what unity means, but again natural resources, and he would probably stop there and just see what else comes in.

Jim Eaton indicated that the Committee has let some of these buzz words run away with us -- walkability, everybody has decided walkability is good, but why do they want to walk and where do they want to walk to -- we have no idea. Do they want to walk for exercise or because it is fun, do they want to walk to get somewhere? We don't know. How are we going to write a Plan with walkability, if we don't know where to put more paths? We really need to get some detail behind these things, because we just keep parroting the same buzz words over and over without knowing what we mean by them.

Elemer Magaziner stated that he has lived here for 26 years and he has been walking or riding his bike constantly, so it is already walkable. The point is what is the goal for the walkability idea? He does it now, but the experience is lacking for various reasons, so we need to define -- it is already walkable and . . . Marty Losoff interjected no, it is not for a large segment of the population; it is not. People can't ride their bikes up and down the hills. A 65 or 70 or 85-year-old wants flat roads to ride their bikes; they can't walk where there is a lot of traffic, so for you it is okay. Elemer Magaziner clarified that is exactly his point; we need to improve the walkability.

Chairman Thompson indicated that gets into the discussion on circulation, and we are all agreeing we need a topic on circulation. Gerhard Mayer stated that walkability is basically walking to neighbors within the neighborhood, but you are not going to walk to the grocery store and schlep your groceries back home.

The Chairman suggested saving that for the discussion on . . . Mike Bower interjected that he disagrees strongly. If we keep putting it off, we are just always in this frustrated mode and Jim frustrated us by starting to say we don't know what we are doing and we're just using buzz words, but he is going to read the Community "Y" area thing.

"Oak Creek is the centerpiece of this exciting urban neighborhood. A mix of uses allows residents to shop, live and work all within this riparian area. Urban gardens or live-work homes up Schnebly Hill, terraced lofts on the slopes above the Garland Building and apartments above many of the shops combine with age-in-place and affordable housing to ensure a diverse population. Many of the shops focus on the needs of residents, who gather informally in the small plazas or at the creek-side park. The school facility at Brewer has come to life . . ."

Mike then stated that when you talk about walkable neighborhoods, we've already gone through a number of descriptions of those, so he disagrees. We all know what it means and as a big issue in the Plan. The challenge is to decide how we are going to apply it physically in Sedona. Where and why people want to walk is hard to see in today's suburban pattern. This is a strip commercial thing and we drive everywhere, so it is a difficult concept for most of us. Every community is pursuing walkable mixed-use environments. Transit-based development is the only thing that is really happening in urban areas. Around every transit stop, smart developers have bought all of that land and they are creating walkable neighborhoods that are mixed-use, so people do walk for groceries, but they do it on an urban daily basis. It is great to stay focused on walkability for awhile, because it is one of the big things that bleeds over into central gathering spaces, neighborhoods with a neighborhood center, and instead of being as intense about it, we really have to get team-oriented and psyche up and realize we are going to get this done and we're going to do it very positively, because this is all about presenting a positive vision -- not saying no to things, and we need to just relax and take the time to have the dialogue, and even if we stuck with walkability today, it is progress.

Jim Eaton agreed it needs to be explored and that was his point. Donna Puckett noted that even on walkability, it would be an interesting discussion on the level that falls in, because while Committee Members talk about the more holistic desire for exercise, health, etc., she hears a lot of people say they want you to walk to get your car off of the highway, so it will be less congested, which ties back into the traffic and congestion, so is that a solution or a value, and . . . Barbara Litrell indicated that doesn't matter and Donna agreed; does that matter?

Chairman Thompson asked if the Committee wanted to continue on the discussion of circulation and Barbara indicated she thought we were staying on community; walkability is community also.

Marty Losoff indicated that going forward, whether we put one or two of the listed items on the meeting agendas, that is what we should do and not get off on if we are talking about values, etc. Jim Eaton had brought up a point that he (Marty) doesn't agree with, but it was a good point that we haven't talked about it. If we follow this new approach and use that kind of agenda-setting with half on one subject and half on the other, then we will talk about these things and we should not finish our discussion unless we as a team, in consensus, agree to it -- we know what we are talking about for walkability or circulation, whatever those topics are.

Chairman Thompson stated that everyone -- we are agreed on that, so we don't have to discuss whether we are going to do that or not. His question now is, we have 30 minutes, so what do we want to talk about? Do we want to talk about the first item on the list, which was community? We are already talking about walkability, so let's just keep going.

Angela LeFevre indicated that an important point to make is that there are different reasons, not just one or the other, and in her neighborhood, she and her husband walk a lot and there are other people in their neighborhood that walk too, and she would like to see more walking, so whatever we can do to encourage that would be great -- just for exercise, and that is the big deal with walking, because you are in a place that is so beautiful, it encourages walking because you enjoy it. She had some points about going to the grocery store and having an area where you could do everything in your area, and that would be nice. In England, that is what we used to do. We had a grocery store on the corner of the road and we never used cars to get groceries, but every community is different. We have to realize that people walk for different reasons, and looking at the different reasons, we should get a picture of the kind of place we want when we walk, so we can enjoy it.

Barbara Litrell stated that with reference to walkability, or any one of these other subjects, she would hate to see us exhaust walkability today, because it is a future agenda. We can all do a little homework on other cities and walkability. There is a book called the *Walkable City* that someone recommended and it is not a big one, but it talks about the trends and some of the ways people are doing it. If we know the subjects, then we certainly know what the residents of Sedona said they

want; they don't always come up with the way to get there and maybe there is an opportunity to do some additional work on that as well, so we have ideas for walkability.

Chairman Thompson suggested the Committee keep going to see how much can be done, and maybe the Committee will decide that a short session needs to be scheduled on it for later. Marty Losoff agreed and stated that the subject is such an important one that it is not just walkability, and he hopes that we are not just talking about walkability, but circulation or congestion, because walking from here to there could affect the cars or trams, or whatever we are going to put in, in 20 years; that is the other issue we have to look at. There is an article he brought to Mike about the City of Phoenix that is paying consultants big bucks to come up with a walkable city concept, so this is an important subject; not just walkability, but circulation, so for today, he would challenge all of the Committee to look at the ideas. What does it mean to be walkable, less congested, how can we relieve traffic flow, should we be thinking about doing some things with back roads? There were some drawings from 10 to 20 years ago showing roads on the back side parallel to SR 89A. Mike Bower stated that it has been proposed over the years, but he didn't have any . . . Marty Losoff stated no, there was a picture, but things like that, and should we be looking at alternative streets to keep SR 89A as a thoroughfare and have side streets developed, etc. We should be looking at the big picture point-of-view.

Barbara Litrell added that there is a national program called *Complete Streets* out of the U.S. Department of Transportation, and it is being adopted by lots of cities that want a Complete Streets Program, which means that we all share the streets, whether it is bikes, pedestrians, seniors or cars and how you complete a Complete Streets city. ADOT is kind of on board, at least Phoenix and some of the other cities are talking to ADOT about how to implement Complete Streets. Lots of cities across the country have done resolutions to pursue a Complete Streets Program. It has all of the characteristics, so it has what to do. The question is if Sedona wants to be a Complete Streets city, and if so, what would that involve and what would the benefits be? We all need to look at Complete Streets.

Gerhard Mayer asked where we could do that; he knows the shared concept. It is in Europe and you slow the traffic; otherwise, you would have a mess there, but where are you going to do that? Barbara indicated that she would send him some of that information. Gerhard then stated that Uptown would be a possibility; however, Barbara indicated that it is possible on SR 89A and Gerhard stated not unless we change SR 89A.

Mike Raber indicated that one of the things that is different is the way you look at it, whether more traffic is an inconvenience or not, because in our traditional system, we have whether traffic is at capacity or not or reaching capacity and you grade a street that way. With Complete Streets, you might look differently on that, in how it is meeting those different goals of the different users. It is a different way of looking at whether things are congested or not.

Jim Eaton stated that it is a very complex subject, because we had one urban planner expert here tell us that people don't even like to walk on sidewalks beside a highway, because the cars are whizzing by and they don't like to be that close to the highway. Yet, we have people walking in the streets parallel to a nice path on Soldier Pass Road that the City built, sparing no expense, and people walk in the street rather than on that path. That tells him that we are doing something wrong; we're not accommodating people, who want to walk, in the right way. Why do people walk on Jordan Road in the street right beside the sidewalk? These are mysteries to him and tell him that something is wrong.

Gerhard Mayer indicated that in order to create the environment to have a walkable city in certain areas, we ought to get the traffic reduced. Traffic reduction means gateway areas where we would see a park and ride, not at the entry of Sedona; he would like to see a park and ride in Cottonwood, so there would be a transit system from Cottonwood to Sedona. He experienced the traffic at Cultural Park Road and SR 89A. There are 250 cars from 6:00 a.m. to about 8:30 a.m. every day; he counted it. Then, we have the rush hour around school, when school buses are there. Those

are times we have a lot of traffic, and in order to reduce it, there is parking, pay for park houses, parking outside, electric cars, commuter transit to come into the City for the tourists, and maybe vignettes for the cars to have a car-free day per week program, etc. You have to give incentives in order to make people go for it.

Mike Bower referenced a "Community Plan high-level direction rough outline" from the last meeting, and indicated that seven things were bullet-pointed, but somebody's comment was missed about enacting a comprehensive program to combine parking and transit solutions. It was a whole transportation item that is not on the list, so he would like to offer that everything on the list is good and should be on the board, if we are going to now turn to our flipchart for topics, but you definitely need to heed Marty's circulation comment, and if he went deeper into solutions, he would heed John Sather's comment that wasn't recorded, and you could find that in our minutes or in his notes, but John essentially said to enact a comprehensive program that combined public transit, parking, fees, etc. He was going pretty holistic about a solution, so as we think about our levels that is something we can throw on the wall.

Marty Losoff indicated that he would suggest for future meetings, we follow this kind of dialogue and also have research. If the topic is circulation, we don't have to reinvent the wheel on some of these things, for example, the book on walkable cities and other things about streets, and just like we talked about Zoning Codes and Land Development Code -- Form-based Codes is a big idea. It doesn't mean we have to adopt Form-based Codes; we could adopt a hybrid of it, just like some of the concepts on walkability, it doesn't mean that we have to do what others are doing, but we can use that as a model, so he would hope for a format as we have these subjects, there is some research available to us that we take advantage of or staff provides us, so we don't just shoot from the hip. We have some background and material, and he would look to Mike Bower and John Sather -- they are experts in the field and see what is going on, and just because it is coming from one or two people doesn't mean that we can't hear what they are saying. He would like to think we stay on target, use some research and not finish a topic until we finalize it either that day or in the following meeting. Even today, we are all over the board now and we need to stay on target.

Mike Bower pointed out the white (papered) wall that he did a month or so ago and explained that under the line he wrote "research" and above it he wrote "content", and the thinking was that we would create some vertical columns also, and they can change, but eventually he is hoping they will be our chapters, and at that point, the research is probably frittering away and the content is coming to the fore of it. He taped up some of his research; as an example, "Encourages sprawl - maximum roadway capacity and speed, generous parking supply, low-road user charges, no fuel taxes, poor walking and cycling conditions, inferior public transit and high public transit fares. Encourages smart growth - transit service improvements, more affordable public transit fares, pedestrian and cycling improvements, reduced parking supply with parking management, road and parking pricing, traffic calming and speed reductions."

Mike then indicated that there is a bunch of research up here and your suggestion is great, but after Cynthia and Mike boil out a few topics, we can make some temporary topic headings and keep building our data. If we do it together, everybody is going to be on top of it when they get a writing task. He found somebody's research that is very anti to what he just read, and it says more than \$300 billion in public subsidies have been expended to support transit. This amount rivals what was spent to build the entire interstate highway, and he wrote which one. It doesn't tell you where it came from, so you can find a lot of weird research out there, and that is a debate in here, if one of us brought that in and we are thinking transit is not an answer; we need to debate. Mike Raber noted that one of the topics will have to be transit.

Chairman Thompson referenced the walkability issue and indicated that it seems like it will to some extent take care of itself, when we talk about the community, if we are of the opinion that Sedona wants and needs neighborhood identities and that we are a big enough City that we are going to identify the West Sedona people by the Medical Center and the people in the Chapel area, and they have their centers, whether it is a "String of Pearls" or whatever, and we focus on things they

can do there to form a sense of community. Those ideas and the development that is spawned from them will make it walkable. When he first heard "a walkable community", he thought that he could walk from one place to another in Sedona, and you are right, no one is going to carry their groceries everywhere. The way we shop is not the way they do in Europe; we shop for a week at a time and they go, fill up the cart and come back, they don't want to have to think about it. We probably shouldn't try to solve that problem in his opinion, but if we have neighborhoods where there are places where you can get a quart of milk or coffee or there is a little park where you can meet the kids from the neighborhood, then people will walk there, especially if there is a transit stop there. They may walk there and ride to another one where there is shopping, and then ride back, so it will kind of take care of itself and feel like a walkable community, because when you get off of a transit stop you walk. Therefore, he doesn't think we need to spend as much time talking about walkability as we need to talk about the community gathering places concept.

Gerhard Mayer indicated that an incentive for walkability would be to create a few centers in a neighborhood rather than one big center -- maybe have one big center and smaller ones, so you can walk to the small center where there is a small grocery store. We have to create the environment for people to make it worth walking to it.

Jim Eaton indicated that the Committee is at the point that we have to get down to some tangible ideas instead of shuffling the same deck of cards, and he gave an example in the first tabloid of George's Front Porch. He lived in a neighborhood where George retired and had a closed in front porch and kept a few groceries -- some milk and bread and stuff like that, and people in the neighborhood could walk to George's Front Porch and buy their goods. You can't do that in Sedona, because the zoning doesn't permit it, so that is what we can do to enable George's Front Porch. Mike Raber commented that the concept of neighborhood centers is a huge issue as far as pro and con. It is sort of an offshoot of community gathering places, but also whether or not you establish centers in neighborhoods that have some commercial components to them.

Barbara Litrell indicated it comes back to "String of Pearls" and the question is that we all agree that Sedona wants community gathering places, but what do those gathering places have to look like? Are we going to come up with what they should look like -- maybe four of them should have commercial and three of them shouldn't, who knows, but that sounds like the discussion we need to have. Jim Eaton asked what they want to gather; he envisions gaily-clad peasants dancing on the village green, so is that what you mean by neighborhood center or is that a community center? Mike Raber asked if that is different than on SR 89A on the corridor or somewhere, and Barbara Litrell asked what people are doing now. When you go to the corner of Dry Creek Road and SR 89A, you've got a community gathering place that has sprung up between the bookstore and the pizza shop, so what do people do there? They eat, read, talk, listen to music, hang out, and kids go there, etc., and kids have accounts at the Euro Deli for their food, because parents have set up the opportunity for accounts, so you have a very natural community center there that could grow nicely, but the question is if that is what we think a community center should look like, or might there be a few other things like shopping, etc., so that is the discussion we have to have.

Mike Bower indicated that regarding that location, in the current Community Plan, there are FACs and they are described to some extent, and not unlike what we are talking about when we talk about "String of Pearls". They need more description, but we should all read those two pages on FACs. There is one at Dry Creek, but as we found with the recent rezone request, it is really a circle drawn around a strip commercial, which is not capable of creating the depth and walkability and mix of uses that a FAC or pearl needs, so we are going to say we aren't really changing the Community Plan; we are modifying it and evolving and growing that concept, but what would really make Dry Creek a gathering place like we are talking about, which is a little patio, would be if he could walk back and had the library, a charter school and a nice start to a mix of uses, but it needs some cohesive thinking to maximize its potential, and that might be an example of one of the things we want to do a scenario for, and the Plan has never inserted an area-wide site plan before. We're talking about the sketches we made, so we will have to be careful to indicate they are non-binding

and exemplary only. There can be many solutions, but in general, this is what a Focused Activity Center could feel like from a site-planning standpoint, and then you give a description.

Marty Losoff stated that the Committee has talked a lot about walkability, but the issue is circulation. Walkability is part of circulation; you mentioned meeting places and the issue is community and do we want a meeting place or meeting places. Somebody has to keep us on track; these are healthy conversations, and if we continue with one or two specific concepts, we will do fine if we stay on message. Chairman Thompson asked if Marty heard him say that we agreed to do that. We are making a good head start on circulation with the walkability part of that, and we will have another one on circulation. Marty indicated that he doesn't see this as a discussion on circulation today; this is like a BS program on what we think. Chairman Thompson disagreed that this is BS; this was a conscious effort to tackle one subset topic - walkability, which is a subset of circulation. Marty Losoff pointed out that the Committee didn't look at any books on the subject or at what other cities are doing, and the Chairman noted that the Committee can still do that. He is not saying we are done with walkability, but we got a start on it.

Mike Bower indicated that he agrees with Marty, but he is not worried about it; his sense is that he just accepted what you said and he is thinking the same way, but he is not letting it bother him right now, because we're moving in that direction and we're going to hit public transit and the debate of does it make sense to build new roads in Sedona or take existing quiet streets and make them into collector streets. We are going to hit that debate, so it doesn't mean that by discussing walkability we are ignoring that, but in general, all of us recognize what Marty brought to our attention, but he (Mike) is sure we will get to it.

Gerhard Mayer indicated that he walks at Dry Creek and there are a few things that you can take care of, but he has seen that at around 5:00 p.m. or 6:00 p.m., everything is dead, and he would like to see in the community centers a little more liveliness going on, which means housing where people actually live there, so they can walk there and be part of it and there are people there. That needs to be part of the zoning change that would allow a second story on commercial buildings. Mike Raber noted that they are allowed; however, Gerhard added that it should be encouraged within that area.

**5. Discussion regarding future meeting dates and future agenda items. Meeting: Tuesday, March 19, 2013. (10 minutes – 4:50 – 5:00 p.m.)**

Barbara Litrell asked about the topic for the next meeting and Mike Raber pointed out that the ongoing process is displayed on the wall; we won't discuss it in our meetings, but it will be here and it is reiterating staff's role in trying to keep the pieces together and the role of the Committee, and the other big part would be outreach that we didn't talk about, such as what do we do with the ETC comments and how we are going to go back out to the community with that, so he would like for the Committee to be okay with staff taking care of that with the Outreach Team and moving forward with that, and if the Committee is okay with that, staff will take that approach.

Chairman Thompson asked if there was any objection to that and no objection was expressed. The Chairman then asked which topic the Committee wanted to tackle next week, and the Committee can take two big topics with about 45 or 50 minutes for each, with the idea that we will cover what we need to, get some research ideas ahead of time, and if we need to keep the first one going longer, we will postpone the second one until the next meeting.

Vice Chairman Robson stated that since we started with walkability, it should lead into traffic -- circulation. Mike Raber indicated that staff would say that of all the things that we need to deal with, that is probably the biggest, because it is the one that we really haven't dealt with as much as the others and it is the one we heard the most concern from the community about.

Chairman Thompson asked for all in favor of starting with circulation and the Committee Members stated yes; there was no objection. Marty Losoff then stated that *Walkable Cities* is a good book and people should look at it.

Mike Raber asked if the Chairman wanted staff to break that down into a couple of sub-topics that we kind of focus on in the meeting and the Chairman indicated that would be great. Mike indicated that traffic is probably one of them, but there is a whole bunch. Mike then asked if the Committee wanted to consider the walkability discussion as central to that and Mike Bower stated no; we should consider congestion and traffic as the main focus. Chairman Thompson then added that it is circulation more from the transportation standpoint. Mike Raber pointed out that if you start with traffic and congestion that is where all of these other potential solutions kind of slid in.

The Chairman then asked about the second topic and it was determined that the whole meeting would be on congestion and traffic -- circulation. Marty Losoff asked if all of the areas of circulation should be listed, such as transit, traffic, congestion, foot traffic, etc., so the Committee would have that subject outline to know all of the components. Mike Raber pointed out that one of Mike Bower's points was that if you start with the problem, the others are all potential solutions; however, Marty stated they should just be listed, so we know they are there. Jim Eaton then suggested that Marty make a list.

Mike Bower stated that one of the main things to focus on is the whole debate between the private automobile for our own and our visitors getting around, or for the future, how we plan for providing good alternatives and options. It doesn't mean that you close the town to cars; it just means that you provide attractive options, and he wants to have that debate, because if we write strongly about that and identify a phased priority to head in that direction, we will be doing the town a great service. If we don't, it will roll into more and more two hour waits, etc. A big part of the next meeting could be debating that issue and we definitely need a broad range of solutions to counter vehicular movement. Walking and biking are minimal flies in the ointment and so is transit, so he would just as soon get on to that.

Chairman Thompson indicated that the next meeting is March 19th and the Committee Members should start thinking about the three Tuesdays in April and whether we want to just stay with two meetings that month or stick a third meeting in there.

## **6. Adjournment**

The meeting ended at 5:00 p.m., without objection.

I certify that the above is a true and correct summary of the meeting of the Citizens Steering Committee held on March 5, 2013.

---

Donna A. S. Puckett, *Recording Secretary*

---

Date