Draft Action/Summary Minutes
City of Sedona
Planning & Zoning Commission Meeting
City Council Chambers, Sedona City Hall, Sedona, AZ
Tuesday, May 18, 2010 - 3:30 p.m.

(15 minutes 5:30-5:45 for agenda items 1-5)

1. **Verification of Notice, Call to Order, Pledge of Allegiance and Roll Call.**
Chairman Gillon called the meeting to order at 3:30 p.m.

Roll Call:
Planning & Zoning Commissioners: Chairman Alex Gillon, Vice Chairman John Griffin, and Commissioners James Eaton, Michael Hadley, Marty Losoff, Alain Soutenet and Norm Taylor

Staff: Audree Juhlin, John O'Brien, Donna Puckett, Mike Raber and Ron Ramsey

2. **Commission/Staff announcements and summary of current events by Chairman/staff.**

There were no announcements.

3. **Approval of minutes for the following meetings:**
Tuesday, April 20, 2010 (R), Thursday, April 29, 2010 (WS)

Chairman Gillon indicated this item is for the approval of the minutes of April 20th and April 29th.

MOTION: Commissioner Losoff so moved. Commissioner Eaton seconded the motion. VOTE: Motion carried seven (7) for and zero (0) opposed.

4. **Public Forum – for items not listed on the agenda within the jurisdiction of the Planning and Zoning Commission – limit of three minutes per presentation. (Note that the Commission may not discuss or make any decisions on any matter brought forward by a member of the public).**

The Chairman opened the public forum and having no requests to speak, closed the public forum.

5. **Discussion regarding the Update of the Sedona Community Plan and reports from Working Teams.**

PRESENTATION, Mike Raber: Explained how the Commission packets were assembled, including a memorandum for agenda item 7. On the Community Plan Update, one of the things staff heard in the last meeting was that we needed to provide more of the big picture, so he will try to bring things together for where we are in the process, and then cover the working teams and some of the impressions from the community meetings held last week.

As far as the big picture, the first three pages of the memorandum describes that, but essentially since January, we have completed some of the background work, as far as the data

needed; developed a general planning process; formed working teams; began the community outreach process, and started to identify some of the issues.

We have already handed out some of the background work, including some facts about our growth; the plan amendment history; a little about the plan elements; some overview of the Land Use, Circulation and Grow Area Elements; some of the things accomplished in those elements, plus some potential items for future discussion.

In our community outreach, we have done a number of meetings, several information/notification items, as far as beginning our outreach, and this is from March through this month. This is the fifth meeting with the Commission since January, our working teams have met four and five times, and we have conducted five meetings with other commissions and committees, eleven meetings with community organizations, and three community-wide meetings were conducted last week. We have been getting information out through the media, our citywide newsletter, our website, and today we improved the access from our homepage, so it will appear in the number one position under "News and Updates" and will be right on that front page. We are also setting up an online submittal for comments as well, and then we have our plan exhibits set up.

Now that we have begun the community outreach and have started to identify issues, what's next and where are we headed with the plan update? The first thing to note is we may be changing the management of the update process, to include greater citizen participation and we will discuss that in agenda item 7. We want to focus more on education over the next few months, more about the history of the existing plan and how that relates to zoning, what is in the plan and what has been accomplished, and what the answers are to the questions that we have been hearing, so we want to do a lot more education in the next part of our outreach. Also, we want to look at other ways to get the community involved and get input, and we will discuss additional issues with the Planning Commission and other commissions from their perspective, as well as staff's perspective, now that we are starting to hear from the public. Eventually, we will be feeding that back to the community and the goal of the next big step is to get to that point.

Regarding the working teams, on pages 4 and 5 of the memorandum, we describe a draft template for a new Community Plan format that the Format Working Team has been looking at, and if the Commission is in general agreement, the working team will test a rewrite of the Land Use Element using that new outline, to see how that works, so we may want to see if there is a general consensus on that tonight, before having the working team do that. It is more of an experimental process at this point. Some highlights on the template include removing some elements, putting more detail in appendices and more accountability in implementation, and then the full outline is attached as well.

Mike explained that he is not going to cover the Public Participation and 89A working teams, but he did want to comment on the Sustainability Working Team on pages 7 and 8, and that is basically reviewing the current plan to identify sustainability principles, identify what is needed, research how other cities have integrated sustainability into their plans, and continue to gather baseline data on land use, air quality, water and energy consumption.

Basically, that is the big picture of where we are and a little on where the working teams are, but he would like to hear some discussion on the template of how we might redraft the plan, although that may be affected by the discussion in agenda item 7. Following this discussion, he would also like to go over some of the impressions from the community meetings held last week.

SUMMARY DISCUSSION:
Commissioner Taylor indicated he had no major concerns, but he has a different opinion. He went through the first part of the Community Plan and he would choose to first have a one-page preface to state that the plan is a state requirement and how it also functions as a community document, and he would list the past plans and supplemental plans, like the 1994 plan that was prepared by the architects and the road study that was done. Then, item two would be the Acknowledgements listing all of the people who participated. He doesn't know if the state has something to say about that, but he looked through the plan and couldn't find it, and he thinks it should be there. Mike agreed that should be included.

Commissioner Taylor indicated that item three would be labeled something like "Sedona" or "About Sedona" and it would contain the vision for the City, the history starting with the formation of the red rocks, in a couple of paragraphs, and the character of the City with all the references to character pulled together that are in the Land Use Element and other sections. It is such an important topic to many people, he would identify it upfront and deal with it. Then, item four would be the elements and he would start with the state-required elements as one category, and under those elements, he would have the vision, goals, objectives, policies and actions first, and then the key issues and the overview, so a person interested in Land Use could see what the visions are, and then depending on the individual's interest, more detail would follow, and a lot of that detailed information should be in an appendix, so that is the way he would structure the document.

Commissioner Losoff indicated that he liked what you did and how we came up with the reorganization; particularly, he is a strong proponent of Chapter 3, because that constitutes what we have talked about as the Executive Summary, and it could almost be in a separate binder for use by anybody, as a quick and efficient way to see what the Community Plan is, without going through a lot of details. The details are necessary, and whether they are in an appendix or in different chapters is incidental. When it is all said and done and we come up with an Executive Summary as described, Chapter 3 will be way ahead of where we are today. Right now, it is burdensome and even if we take out a lot of the duplication, we are still going to have a difficult body of work to go through for somebody to find what they are looking for. Chapter 3's vision, goals, objectives, etc., could end up being a neat Executive Summary. The rest to him is a matter of wordsmithing and how we come up with all of it, but more importantly, it is avoiding the duplication we have throughout the book.

Commissioner Soutenet indicated that he didn't have any particular issues on the format proposed, as long as we are going in the direction of streamlining the document. He has never seen the actual state statute that pertains to the update of the plan and how it pertains to the information gathering and hierarchy by which the information is being organized, so he would like to understand that a little better, because the working teams are gathering information,

and hopefully, it all comes from the public. It also needs to be organized and put in a form that can then be integrated, so he would like to have better clarity on how that information is being gathered, organized, and what the processes are for that information to be applied.

Mike Raber explained that the statutes are very general about the process you use; they are more specific about what is in the elements, but he will send a copy of the statutes to the Commission. Ron Ramsey created a good summary of the statutory language, but the language, as far as the process, is that it is early and continuous public participation, and how that is done is up to each community. We have a public participation process in the appendix of our existing plan that is fairly detailed, possibly more detailed than it should be, and we may want to revisit that, to give us a little more latitude. Basically, it outlines the general steps. The Commissioner asked how all of the input from the public meetings, organization meetings, and questions in one of the documents provided is organized and collected in a systematic way. Mike explained that he doesn't know that there is one particular way to do that, unless you have suggestions about that. In the past, we have coupled that with survey results, which are easier to quantify, as well as the meeting results, and then you start to put together a picture of what is important to people. He doesn't know that staff has been able to quantify absolutely everything that we have gotten in the way of input. You basically end up with something that everyone agrees are the issues and you don't hear any objection from the community, when you feed that back to them.

Commissioner Soutenet indicated that if he understands it, the City collects and organizes the information and gives it back to us. Chairman Gillon asked how the information is being captured and where we can look at it. Mike indicated that Donna Puckett is putting together the transcripts of the meetings, and then organizing that by subject matter, so it will be easier to look something up. We can post that, so it is easy for everyone to see what was in the meetings. For the organization meetings, Kathy has been including a running list of the questions and comments received, and you have been getting updates on that with your packets, but we can also post that. As far as how we are compiling that, we have just begun to look at that. We can start putting that together, as soon as you think it is a good idea to post it or staff feels comfortable with what we have put together. He wanted to ensure that we are getting all of the input from the other sources before any conclusions are drawn about it. The Commissioner agreed, he doesn't mean to draw conclusions, he means to integrate the input into the work that the working teams are doing, especially on the sustainability issues. For example, if we start working on the Land Use Element, we need to start inputting sustainability issues in that element as well, so where does that come from?

Mike Raber explained that first we need to identify the priorities of some of those issues before we start going too far toward solutions, and that is a little ways off yet, but we can start putting the information from the public in whatever format you want, as quickly as we can if you think that would be helpful now. The Commissioner indicated yes, it would be. Mike asked if there were any suggestions about what would be easiest for the Commissioners. Chairman Gillon referenced the effort underway to take a first stab at putting things together by categories, and Mike explained that Donna Puckett is pulling the detail together from those public meetings, and when we get that, we will make sure the Commission sees that and we can probably post that.

Commissioner Losoff noted that we may be getting ahead of ourselves, because we are still in the information-gathering process, but he was going to suggest that perhaps the Public Participation Working Team take on some of that responsibility of gathering, sorting and prioritizing. It is too early now and we have to be careful that we don't react to something just because it was said, but staff is shorthanded, so perhaps as the public participation continues, we can convene to help staff sort some of that out, or when we get to agenda item 7, there is some help we can provide to prioritize and categorize and bring back, so everybody knows what is going on. Mike indicated he is open to that, but he also cautioned the Commission not to get too far ahead in terms of prioritizing, until we go back to the community. It is fair to prioritize what we have heard, in terms of what seems to be at the top of the list, but when we feed that back to the community, we want to be sure that we not try to second guess that too much. The last time, we kept that pretty open, until we asked the community to review that and tell us what they thought were the most important things.

Commissioner Soutenet agreed and explained his purpose was to see how we gather that information and organize it. Mike explained that staff is still open to suggestions on organizing it, but we are starting to do that. Chairman Gillon added that we need to start somewhere, so if we can get a look at the first stab being taken, we can make some constructive suggestions.

Mike indicated that it is important to continue with the education component, because what we have heard in some of the meetings tells us more about where we need to focus that information for the public. Once we have had a chance to do more of that, we may get additional input from the community, after they understand the plan a little better. The Commissioner then asked about the public participation and the way the process is being made available to the public; one item he hasn't seen that would be helpful is a public forum for residents to give input, instead of limiting the context to meetings, like on the website or he has heard of a separate website that was going to be constructed for the Community Plan Update. Mike explained that we are starting the ability for people to respond directly to the questionnaire on the website and that will be one step in that direction.

Vice Chairman Griffin indicated there are some things in the draft template that he really likes; he possibly would like to see the implementation for the different elements. As a general comment, the Community Plan is not a novel and we aren't going to read it cover to cover, so when we talk about redundancies in different elements, he might have some concerns about that. He supports trying to cut it down, but when he uses it, he is looking at one element, so not having the information together in that element is a fine line for him. When we talk about duplications, just because something is mentioned somewhere else, a person may not have read that, so he has a little concern about trying to make it lean and mean. It is used differently than a document that you read cover to cover. He would like to explore some examples to make sure that we aren't leaving something out or having to go through pages and pages to find information that relates what you are trying to find in an element. He doesn't like having to look in four or five different places to find information, but he likes the idea of revisiting this; it is time to do that, and definitely implementation. The elements that are left now that we haven't achieved are basically the tough ones, and we need

to get that support from the community, in order to address them, so he supports putting in the implementation that everyone agrees we should do on the different elements.

Mike pointed out that statutes don't in every case require an implementation section, but all Community Plans typically include that and our discussion has been that we need to closely look at whether or not an action item is something that can be followed-through in a meaningful way, which will vastly reduce the number of action items by testing the viability of those. Additionally regarding your concern about appendices, that is where references in the plan document will be really important, if there is more detail in a separate document.

Vice Chairman Griffin asked if those appendices would be in sections that would strictly relate to that element; that is the thing that bothers him. When you say redundancy, just because it is in one of the other elements, will you have to go to several elements to get all of the information you need about one element. There is a fine line about how you get there and what is important, and if it is justifiable to not have it readily available in that one element. Mike explained that context is going to be really important and that is why doing a trial rewrite on one element will tell us a lot more about that. The Vice Chairman indicated that his test would be to read that one element alone, to ensure you can gather enough information. He likes the Executive Summary and this is long overdue, so he applauds the working team that is working on this; he just wants to be a little cautious about butchering.

Commissioner Hadley indicated he also is looking very favorably at the draft; it is a good step in the right direction. He also is very supportive of the elements being considered for removal and they can successfully be combined with other things. He is highly supportive of the Executive Summary concept. In a past life, he wrote a lot of reports on the conditions of existing buildings and sometimes they were 100 pages thick, and the only thing that ever got read was the Executive Summary and the cost estimate; that doesn't mean that you shouldn't have the detail for people that want to read it, but the summary is very important and a great idea. Also, he would like to see the trial rewrite of an element and as a member of the Sustainability Working Team, he is wondering if that should be a separate element. When you begin to have bits and pieces in each element, you sometimes lose the punch of what is going on, so he is thinking sustainability should be a separate element added here. Mike indicated that it was noted that we want to keep a placeholder for that, depending on what the Sustainability Working Team comes up with.

Commissioner Eaton indicated he wants to do further study on the draft template, but it is very important that each element stand on its own and be self-contained, because that is largely the way it will be used. Having said that, Chapter 21 or 24 or whatever, at the end, has to do something to tie them together. There are going to be some conflicts possibly between things like Economic Development and Environmental Planning that have to be considered, and there could be some conflicts in execution between these elements. Somewhere at the end of this, there has to be an overall statement of how these things can fit together, but not too rigidly. It also is going to be very important to make it user-friendly, so it doesn't sound like it was written by government and it can be understood by the man on the street, because that is who uses it the most.

Commissioner Losoff indicated that the Format Working Team talked a lot about accountability; however, he didn't see that in the template. We discussed that for each element, if we have goals and objectives, those should be measurable and there should be some accounting at the end of six months or a year, so the Commission can tell the City Council what we are doing. We also came up with some formatting ideas for that. It is early, but we did discuss how important accountability would be. Mike indicated that it is discussed and listed in one of the criterion. The Commissioner suggested that, in the next working team meeting, perhaps they can bring that forward a little more, and Mike agreed that it can be highlighted again, and in our next meeting, we are going to talk more about implementation.

Mike Raber clarified that we have talked about elements, but we are proposing that Regional Coordination, Community Facilities & Services, Tourism and Economic Development be removed from the plan, because all of those can be integrated into other elements fairly easily, and then the only ones remaining that are not required by statute would be Housing, Historic Preservation and Arts & Culture.

Commissioner Eaton asked why Historic Preservation and Arts & Culture were put in the same paragraph on page 2; they really are not related, although we have heard comments that maybe they could be combined. Mike agreed and indicated that staff is not proposing to combine them.

Mike summarized that he is hearing that there is general agreement that we should go ahead and do a test based on that general outline, and he will look at some of Commissioner Taylor's comments. He would agree that we would include acknowledgements and some of the things in the preface of the existing plan, and we possibly will discuss some of the other items brought up.

Commissioner Taylor pointed out that redundancy is a bad word in architectural and engineering offices, so you have to be careful when you get into redundancy, because sometimes you inadvertently say something different in two different places, and some people are fast to point that out. Commissioner Hadley's comment that people only read the summary is really important; they don't read all of the in-between and that is one of the problems in the plan now. You go paragraph to paragraph and there are numbers, etc., and it is really difficult reading. His thought is in the beginning, when you say what Sedona is and describe it, you give the population now and some current figures, but you don't go into the growth and where it came from, that would be in the appendix or somewhere else. Mike indicated that he would agree with most of that.

Mike explained that he wanted to give his perceptions from the public meetings held last week; there were about a total of 85 public attendees, without counting staff, Council and Commission members -- a little less than the last time we did this. A couple of the meetings had about the same number, but one meeting had quite a bit less people. A few different categories that he saw emerging from the feedback were under Transportation, Land Use, Plan Document and Implementation, Sustainability and Environment, and especially Community Outreach, where we heard more comments than any other category. In terms of

Transportation, he primarily heard comments about transit and that it should be encouraged, but be focused more on residents' needs, including the West 89A corridor.

Under Land Use, he was getting that we need to look at a few key parcels and what the plan currently designates them as and revisit some of that. Since it was all over the board, it was really anything that is undeveloped and has potential for redevelopment, and to look at how our plan is addressing that and if we need to rethink some of those things. In terms of just a broad issue, we may want to look at what our plan says about some of the key parcels. Some of the parcels mentioned were the cultural park; however, that has a land use designation that we recently went through, and things like the Cor D' Amor subdivision, Real Estate Central, which is in a Special Planning Area, and the Payne Place area, so we may want to have some discussion on some of those areas.

As far as the Plan Document and Implementation, we are hearing agreement that we need to have a more user-friendly and condensed document, and we need to rethink our strategy for implementation. One idea was cost benefit to residents; he is not quite sure how we do that in the Community Plan, but that is something we might want to explore. Another is the need to show an interrelationship of issues and elements, so how these different issues and elements relate to each other; there may be a way to demonstrate that in the plan. One very important comment was that somehow we need to prioritize our community benefits; we have community benefits listed in our Special Planning Areas and you could say the same about things like Focused Activity Centers and elsewhere, but there is no sense of priority to that, and that has been an issue with the Special Planning Areas in the past.

Sustainability and Environment included everything from community gardens to a need for more ordinance-related control on water conservation and building codes, etc., and to have more locally-generated power to have a more locally-secured water supply, but the overall theme was that we need to pay more attention to a locally-driven system and getting input from people on the importance of the regional area to sustainability.

We heard way more on the last item. Just as general comments on Community Outreach, we need to explore more ways to involve more of the community and that may mean going into neighborhoods more proactively, not just meetings, but using many different approaches, and feeding back to residents how their input is addressed is essential. We did a pretty good job in the last update on that, but we need to pay attention to that. More community education on the history of the plan and how it relates to zoning, and then on Major Amendments, we heard several comments about if there is a way to involve citizens more in that process. We didn't receive any Major Amendments this year, but one suggestion was letting them have input at P&Z work sessions or is there a way for Major Amendments to be voted on. The statutes are pretty clear that Major Amendments are not voted on, but is there a way for us to rethink our Major Amendment criteria, so it may be more of a big deal when those come up. There seems to be a feeling that if everybody is voting on the plan update, why can't citizens vote on something that is a major amendment to the plan? He doesn’t have an answer, but one of the suggestions was maybe doing some kind of non-binding advisory vote during the process to try to take the pulse of the community, while considering an amendment; however, he doesn't

know if that is workable. Those were some of the bigger issues, but it will take a closer look at the notes from those meetings to come down to something more specific.

We also got some general impressions about the West 89A discussion too; there were some common themes, such as a pedestrian-focused main street; pedestrian crossings are very important, and we heard that several times along with viewshed retention, but how we do that varied. One suggestion was to look at three-story options on the south side of the highway and one-story only on the north, and another suggestion was the only time you would have a two-story option would be if you separated it from the street by a wide enough distance to retain that view, including putting the building behind the parking, which is the opposite of what has been discussed in the past, but the viewshed retention is a big concern. The influence of the residential neighborhoods is very important and probably one of the biggest concerns raised. When we are looking at the corridor, we need to be looking at the orientation to active use by people that live there and not approach it as a tourist area; focus on residentially-oriented businesses and we may have some limitations with that, but that is the idea. Redevelopment needs to minimize traffic impact to residential streets, as we see development changing, we need to be cognizant of that, and then corridor values should reflect the qualities that make the area livable, where residents would want to walk, spend time and enjoy their surroundings, as opposed to thinking only about the visitors' perspective, and that is a fair assessment for us to think seriously about as we go forward -- that value from the perspective from the people that live along the corridor, because as was brought up, many of them are one block away, so how do you deal with that.

We did get suggestions regarding 17 other communities that we should look at, plus Tlaquepaque and Uptown. Vice Chairman Griffin brought up a good observation about the Uptown situation; it is a very walkable place, but it wouldn't meet our standards and you wouldn't get away with the parking scheme, but that is what makes it walkable, but those are his observations and we will get a lot more information out to you.

Commissioner Soutenet asked how that information will be conveyed to the Commission and Mike explained that we are going to wait until Donna Puckett compiles the other two; she finished one meeting, but she is working on the other two and we will copy the Commission, plus maybe some of staff's impressions based on that.

Commissioner Eaton indicated that there were some interesting points-of-view there that need to be considered. It is interesting to hear people defending the parking of cars in front of businesses, in order to set the businesses further back, so we don't develop canyons -- that is interesting.

Commissioner Hadley referenced the comparison of this update to the prior one and what the public response has been to date and asked Mike if he could elaborate on that. Mike explained that his first impression is that he didn't hear the big issues he heard last time. He hears some concerns, and it looks like people are interested in what happens on West 89A and in being a part of that planning process, but he is not hearing anything really major emerging. What he is hearing is that we probably need to do a better job of communicating; that seems to be coming through, and that is something we can work on, but as far as big issue topics, the

last time we had major concerns with 179, the timeshare and lodging situation, so there were some big issues that were easy to pinpoint and tough to deal with, but he is not sensing that as much yet.

Vice Chairman Griffin indicated that he was pleased with the comments about looking at 89A and trying to do some reconfiguration and face-lifting, etc. The toughest thing is, when there are comments about citizen and pedestrian-friendly areas compared to tourist areas, those are times the facilitator needs to pull a little more out. Those are needed to make anything economically viable, so there are some things that need to be pulled out. From the Form-Based seminars and the way they do visual drawings and street façades, he sees where it would be useful to take it to a level that in some way promotes that the process for what we are trying to create needs to have that type of presentation in the Community Plan, because it is a way to get everybody on the same page. Comments are great, but people are visual and they can comment much better by seeing something. There is concern about change, because it isn't predictable. If you can have predictable change, people can agree to it, but he agrees that there weren't major huge issues, and we can move along and make progress on this.

Commissioner Soutenet asked if it was correct that staff was supportive of a form-based code application for the 89A corridor and Mike explained that staff spent a couple of years looking at this and some type of code that brings that predictability. There are all kinds of different form-based; some are a mix of form-based and traditional, but staff is supportive of having some type of code that brings that predictability to development for that corridor. How you get there and what kind of code specifically is still up in the air, but that is much preferable over the type of code we have now. The Commissioner indicated that would fit very well into bringing a visionary aspect to the process, because the initiative isn't going to come from the public, so it has to come from the Commission or staff or from specialists in urban development, to come up with something the public can respond to, as opposed to waiting for the public to come with some ideas. Mike agreed and indicated that even at the Community Plan level, people need to be able to visualize change, so we are going to have to address that to some degree in the plan. He would be hesitant to get too detailed in what goes in the plan for that corridor, because you want a separate very focused process to deal with that. You don't want to end up with things in the plan that are so detailed you are going back and redoing things later.

Commissioner Soutenet indicated that along that line of thought, he has always wondered about the level of initiative that the Commission should initiate for the other elements, and that applies to Sustainability, and it has to do with education. As you listen to public input, a level of education, especially on sustainability, sounds like a very valuable tool to get the right input, and we spent most of our time in the first couple of meetings trying to define sustainability, so that is another application where getting input and working solely on the input is extremely valuable and gives a sense of direction, but it should not be everything in the process. Mike agreed that we are going to get to a point where we will need to go back with something that people can look at, and it covers more than one issue. We can have more discussion about how we do that, especially on the West 89A topic, and we are going to need some venues that are focused solely on that or on some area. One of the comments that didn't come through the public meetings was that maybe we should take on the Heart of Sedona, if

we are going to get into a full specific plan, because it wouldn't be as costly to get into, and we possibly could utilize local talent better than on something as significant as West Sedona, so that is possibly something to discuss in future meetings. It doesn't mean we would ignore West Sedona in the Community Plan, but in terms of priority on how we proceed in a specific plan, we may want to look at things that are more doable from a cost perspective.

Commissioner Losoff agreed with Vice Chairman Griffin that it is unfortunate that we don't have the resources to get into a real visioning process. If we want to establish the 89A corridor as something truly visionary, we aren't going to do it in the process we are having now. He wishes there was some way to really stimulate the kind of far-reaching futuristic thinking that we should have, if we are going out 10 years on this Community Plan. Right now, he senses that we are doing a lot of maintenance and we are going to end up with a lot of maintenance in the plan by avoiding duplications, restructuring some of the chapters and getting into the combination of some elements, etc., but in terms of looking into the future, what are we going to see and are we doing the right things? We might be doing things right, but are they the right things for the next 10 - 15 years? He is disappointed that we couldn't get into the visioning process, because of the resource problem. We don't have the budget for it, but if there is some way going forward, to come up with a sum of money to get a true visionary approach, we selected the 89A corridor as something we want to do, but is that the right thing? There are some other issues that we should also be looking at as a big picture, so he is concerned that we aren't quite getting to that overall visionary prospect.

Mike indicated that there could be more discussion with the working team on what resources we do have and what we could do with what we have. We could probably do something different than just doing community meetings with the staff we have. We did that in the last plan update; there was a series of open houses, when we were responding to the community and there was more visually to look at; he isn't saying to do it just like that again, but there are things we can do other than just community meetings. It sometimes becomes a time issue, as well as a manpower issue; it just depends on what we try to do, but if we discuss that in more detail, we may come up with something that is doable.

Commissioner Losoff indicated that even if we restructure our committees or use a modified approach, we are still doing a lot of maintenance, and in terms of vision, what about technology? Do we want to be a wireless community? We haven't even talked about that; we are talking about sustainability, but what about some of the other aspects of it? It is early on and we are all chomping at the bit to get someplace, but it has only been a couple of months since we started the process, and the more we discuss it, the more we will be able to get a broader picture.

Commissioner Taylor indicated that he heard at the meeting much of what Mike did, but he also heard quite a few people emphasize that they wanted a town for Sedona people and in West Sedona, which goes against the idea of trying to make one central place, such as down by the "Y". The other thing is that if we could formulate some structural ideas of what West Sedona might look like, for example, if all of the storefronts were right along the road on the sidewalk or set back behind parking lots, or a mix, then maybe we could find people to make some graphic presentations for us from a certain vantage point. We have a lot of visual

people in this town and lot of painters. Mike indicated that is worth looking at; can we at least conceptualize some of these things to the point that people could visualize it, without getting into the detail of a given intersection, etc., but in terms of concept with the views in the background.

Chairman Gillon indicated that when we talked about the character of West Sedona or redevelopment, we set as an informal objective for the Commission to get into the Community Plan some notion of a process that we would follow to deal with that issue, rather than trying to deal with the issue specifically in the Community Plan, and that is still a good strategy, but it may be wise in some areas to give the public a broader exposure, so they can get behind the idea of doing something later on. Maybe if we had a public open house or meeting dedicated to just that topic and go through an overview of what a form-based or predictable design could get us, and then get the public knowledgeable about what it would take to get to that step, that would build some support for a process that we would then include in the Community Plan. The same thing may also be true of sustainability; there may need to be more public education and exposure than actually gets into the plan, just for the sake of getting the public comfortable with what does go into the plan.

The Chairman referenced the meetings with the community organizations and asked if staff heard the same things from the organizations as we heard from the public meetings. Mike indicated that he hesitated to answer that, because he would have to go back and look through all that, but we want to bring all of that to the Commission. Chairman Gillon asked if there would be some indicators, so when the Commission starts to see all of the information, they will know which is which and Mike said yes.

Vice Chairman Griffin indicated that we are all rallying around the fact that we know how the system works and for anybody to change anything in this community, they have to have the support of the Community Plan, and if the plan isn't visionary and doesn't allow visionary-type people to create visionary things, then it won't happen. The problem is that unless the public is exposed to some of these visionary opportunities, they won't support the kind of changes we need in the Community Plan. We really need to seize this opportunity; we have this economic downturn that would allow some people to do some things in this community, but they are looking at the existing zoning and what they have to go through to change it and they won't go through those hoops, because it is the three rings of fire and we are one of them, so they won't do it without having some visionary support. When we attended the field trip in Form-Based Codes 101 with other people, we basically did some simple sketches to show what could be done, and it was incredible. It is a disservice, if we don't go through this process and create something that allows a vision to happen over the next 10 years. If the community says that is too much, that is fine, but we are the Planning & Zoning Commission and the planning staff, and we need to take it to the next level. When people say they want to preserve the view corridors, if we explained that with what is in place, this is what the person can do, they would see that they don't want that, and then they will ask what their option is, which is to run a parallel zoning code to allow for predictability, and we can create an incentive for those developers, but if the Community Plan doesn't support it, it will be extremely difficult to do that.

Commissioner Taylor indicated that Vice Chairman Griffin makes it sound so radical, but he feels that the West Sedona corridor could be made really quite nice and much more workable for the people, without having to think in those tough terms. The opportunity is there to do something, whether we change the code or not.

Commissioner Losoff pointed out again that a lot of time has been spent on the 89A West Sedona corridor, but is that really the priority? We haven't visualized where we want to go in the future, looking at Uptown, 179, etc., and to say which one deserves the highest priority and should Uptown be retained as retail, etc., and we are talking about the West Sedona corridor as for citizens or a community shop and buy, etc., and not make that a commercial corridor. We have had a lot of projects come in and if they were held to what they were saying and didn't have financial problems, they would be building a lot of things other than what we are envisioning, so we need to step back a little and determine what we want to see for the City, not just the West Sedona corridor, but that is for another day.

Commissioner Eaton indicated that some pretty specific strategies have been discussed, which don't belong in a Community Plan; a Community Plan is visions with a structure and guidelines, but it is not specific strategies -- they don't belong it in, because things change. There was a comment about how people can get more involved in Major Amendments, and sometimes in the past, we have tried to handle Major Amendments in one meeting, and that is too fast, because people don't find out about things like that until it is too late. A little longer timeframe with more notice might be an answer. Thinking about the formation of our first Community Plan, we had a lot of big public meetings that were very well attended and professionally facilitated and we ended up with a prize-winning plan that has been amended, but is still good and that process is what made it.

No legal action was taken.

6. Public comment regarding the Update of the Sedona Community Plan.

The Chairman noted that the intent of item 6 is to allow the public to comment and Mike clarified that it would be on anything we have talked about or anything related to the Community Plan in general.

Dennis Rayner, Sedona, AZ: Indicated that one thing that bothers him about the discussion he has heard here, with this whole idea of vision, is that he sat in on two of those meetings, one at the high school and one as KSB, and there were some very clear vision statements made that he heard. It depends on how you look at it, but one of those clear vision statements deals with 89A redevelopment. Let's face it, the majority of the residents live along 89A, so it is not surprising that the majority of the comments were made on 89A redevelopment. The one thing he heard was the people along 89A look at 89A as a residential street, not a commercial corridor or strip. Most of them dislike that terminology of commercial strip; yes, there are businesses along 89A, but as was said, people live one block off of 89A, so to him that is a clear cut vision. They do not visualize 89A as a commercial corridor. Number two, what he heard over and over again was that the majority of people were saying that their vision of 89A was that it would be a green community, an environmental community, a

sustainable community; they wanted overall Sedona to be a green city. If those aren't visions, he doesn't know what visions are -- that is what he heard.

Marlene Rayner, Sedona, AZ: Indicated that she only wanted to make one comment that has to do with the City's population and the distribution of that population. You have to realize that 179 has approximately 2,200 people, Uptown has 1,200 and West Sedona has 7,900, so you know where the people are.

Having no additional requests to speak, the Chairman continued to agenda item 7.

7. Discussion/possible action on formation of advisory committee for the Update of the Sedona Community Plan.

PRESENTATION, Mike Raber: Referenced the memorandum plus the process outline for this agenda item and explained that Paul Chevalier has requested that the Council consider a Council-appointed advisory committee for the Community Plan Update, and that would also change how the process is managed, from one that is staff and Commission-driven to a committee and citizen-driven process. Earlier we discussed if there is a way to involve more citizens in the process and this proposed approach would be one way to do that. The purpose of the advisory committee and this committee-driven process would be to get more citizen involvement in all aspects of the update and place less emphasis on staff's role in managing that process and drafting the plan, so the Planning Commission, staff and public would work collaboratively in those two areas, and not only on the process, but also in drafting the plan.

We have used advisory committees on past projects, like the Growth Committee that was an advisory committee. It was a working committee that spent about a year coming up with recommendations on future growth, which was then looked at for our Community Plan. The outline and flowchart shows what the proposed process would be, but essentially, there would be a nine-member advisory committee that would have the Planning & Zoning Commission Chair, Community Development Director, Senior Planner and six citizen members. It would be a working committee and there would be quite a bit of time devoted, so you would have to have members that were willing to work. There would be three subcommittees appointed by that advisory committee -- one would look at formatting the plan, another would look at public participation and another would look at research and actual plan drafting. Each of those subcommittees would have five members, one P&Z Commission member, three members from the advisory committee and one citizen member that is not on the advisory committee.

The Research and Drafting Subcommittee would essentially be engaged in the details of the Land Use Element and the other required elements, working closely with the Sustainability and 89A Working Teams that would still be there working with this subcommittee. The Public Participation and the Format Working Teams would no longer be there; you would have the Planning & Zoning Commission representation on those two subcommittees, instead of those being separate working teams, so you would still have Commission representation there, but you would also have citizens and advisory committee members involved in those two areas.

Ultimately, the draft Community Plan would then be transmitted to the Planning & Zoning Commission at the end of the process, before we start the public hearing process, and that is the 60-day review, and then hearings with the Commission and Council, and that is essentially what the Growth Committee did at the end of their process. They came up with a report, if you essentially substitute Community Plan, then that report was forwarded to the Commission and Council at that point. The advisory committee would be selected by the Council from a pool of interested citizens that would submit their names to be considered. We would do an ad through the media to advertise for people to volunteer for that, very much like we did with the Growth Committee. The only other step in the Growth Committee's process was that we also had Council members come up with names too, but that seemed redundant, so we would just leave that as an open process for people to submit their names, and then ultimately, three members of the Council would make a recommendation to the full Council and they would appoint six people to be on that advisory committee.

Tonight, the Commission has the option of providing comments, making recommendations and you can make a formal motion, if you want, because this item is going on Council's June 8th agenda, so we wanted to ensure we got the Commission's input on this idea. Staff is supportive of this approach, but we will need to be careful that we don't over complicate the process and negatively impact staff resources. Whenever you get committees, there is sometimes an issue with that. Paul Chevalier had the initial idea about this and he has talked with several of the Council members, so he might be able to share any other input on this with you.

Paul Chevalier, Sedona, AZ: Indicated that if he were sitting in the Commissioners' seat, his first question would be why? Why change the process management, because they are only talking about process management. Still the end game is the same, it has to come back to P&Z for comments and approval, then go to the City Council for comments and approval, and then it has to go to a vote of the public. As he listened to the process today and to what Mike presented, everything that is going on track so far is pretty well on track with this, because they are in the initial stages and could easily be put into these subcommittees, so he doesn't think that anything that is done is going to be a major undo, including this trial format on the Land Use Element. He doesn't think any of that is inconsistent, if this transition is made, and if it is made, it would happen in July, so everything would just continue in process, until the transition is made, if the Council decides to make the transition. As he listened to all of the comments today, a couple of thoughts were that when talking about the research, design and redesign of all of the elements of the Community Plan, except perhaps for Arts & Culture and Historic Preservation, P&Z and staff have the most expertise to do that, and he would see, under this process, that you are the heart in the research and drafting of those elements, but there are a couple of areas where you don't have expertise.

One area is public participation. There were 85 people that came to those three meetings; there needs to be a process that gets thousands of people involved in the community and it can be done, if the Internet is harnessed; if there is more media exposure with people writing articles, etc.; if it goes much further into the community for meetings than in the past, and if the meetings are redesigned. The meetings held now are fine, because they are just having people give off steam about what they think is wrong and what they would like to see as right.

As it gets into more detail, you cannot have a meeting where you present people an hour's worth of reading and presentation, and then say for the next hour vote on it, and that is kind of the process that was used the last time. Information has to get out early, in little bits and pieces, particularly through the Internet. This kind of advisory committee can bring in experts for free from the community that can do that far better than if you continue down this route.

Secondly on formatting, he heard from just about everybody some displeasure with the current formatting. In the past, not enough time and expertise has been put into formatting. There are different elements of the plan that have different formatting. Commissioner Eaton's comments particularly struck home, because he agrees on how the plan ought to end up being formatted. You can't have too much steel, but you have to have enough structure to do it. If there are people totally focused on this as a major subcommittee, they can get a much better format that is going to be user-friendly and do most of the things you want done, and it is going to be a lot smaller. The management process going to this advisory committee is going to end up with something better. There is also another reason to do this; you all followed the last election, and it became clear that the will of the people became a very major issue in this election, and the new Council, as they come in, have all committed themselves to focusing on informing the public, and that means well informing the public, listening to the public and taking advice from the public, and finally on major issues, following the will of the public.

By setting up the Citizens' Advisory Committee at the top, it shows you are putting in place the form to really listen to the will of the people, and of course, the substance has to follow. He is not suggesting that you wouldn't follow the substance, but this is a much better form to show the public that they are getting what they have been committed by this new Council. It is a very different era right now, in terms of the public's demands and insistence on how things are done; not just what is done, so you are being asked to agree to give up control of the process management -- still be very much involved; still be continually updated, because this advisory committee would be foolish not to make sure that Planning & Zoning is going to support this plan. You will not only be involved in writing it and designing it, but you need to be involved as a body, to make sure that the right pieces are being connected, and if the advisory committee finds that it is doing something you don't like, it has to find a new way to do it, because realistically at the end game, the committee wants a vote, whoever is on the advisory committee, and he is going to apply. The committee wants to have Planning & Zoning and the Council support it, so they are going to be keeping Council updated all along too, if this approach goes forward -- so the end games are exactly the same. The difference is the Commission will not be driving the process management; you will be parts of it. The advisory committee will be driving it, of which Mike Raber, John O'Brien and Chairman Gillon are members.

SUMMARY DISCUSSION:
Commissioner Taylor indicated it is a great idea to have more citizens' input and he likes the idea of having people in the community working in all facets of the process; that is the right thing. We were into tapping people that had special abilities a while ago, and it got messed up back there, but there is no doubt a lot of talent in town that could help us with different aspects of the plan. The thing that he doesn't know if he doesn't like it or thinks it could be improved is he wishes we could have a Citizens' Advisory Committee appointed by the

Council that was only citizens. His bias comes from his disgust with Congress, which is shared by many people in this country, and government in general, so he can't help bringing it with him, everywhere he goes. It is a two-handed baggage, but he would like to see a group of citizens, as a separate group, running the meetings with the public in a way that could be like a panel debate, where all nine people are citizens of the community, not employees, Commissioners, etc., and they are seated at a table having a discussion. A lot of people said things at the meetings that really needed to be discussed, like the person that said one-story buildings on one side and three stories on the other side, that could have discussed, and like the person that talked about bicycle riding and paths. He is a bicycle rider and the gung-ho riders want a bike lane on the road, but most of the people in this community are too old for that or too young; they need asphalt bike paths among the homes and through the community, not on the roads. Maybe with citizens in more of a participatory part of this, as an advisory committee functioning as a group in these meetings, they may be able to draw out more than we can. The planners are really good at what they do and people probably feel free to speak, but you still work for the government and you are still employees of the City, and he would like to see the citizens batting these things around among themselves, where we can listen and hear what they say. In summary, he doesn't have a problem with what is proposed, it is fine, but he wonders if there might not be better ways to have the citizens participate.

Commissioner Losoff indicated that this is a significant process and he is not sure we should vote on it today; maybe we should have another meeting to discuss this, because there may be some other ways to get more participation. It seems that there are two issues; process management and more participation, and he is not sure the process management outlined is going to give more participation. He likes the idea of charrettes, more facilitating of the visioning-type meetings, and he doesn't know that this is going to give it to us. Looking at this organizational chart, and with all due respect a lot of us have expertise in this area, but it seems that we are just creating another layer that could muddy the water. He sees the Citizens' Advisory Committee more effective if it was taken out of this context and put into the participation mode, where it could stimulate more people coming to meetings, getting out the message, doing the Internet thing, getting thousands of people to show up at various meetings; that is where he could see the committee being very effective. From a process management point-of-view, frankly and it is not self-serving, he sees the Commission as the citizens' advisory group. City Council is newly elected, and he thinks we would be abdicating our responsibility, if we had another layer set up to do what we are doing. He could see where we could take each of the five committees and add citizens to these committees, bring in more professional people for each committee and more advisory citizens, but to add another layer on top of the City Council and Planning & Zoning may be a burden, and it is not going to give the kind of participation from the community that we want, so he would suggest using a Citizens' Advisory Committee not for process management, but for stimulating various workshops, forums, focus group meetings, etc., to bring in more people.

Commissioner Soutenet indicated that from a process management point-of-view, the flowchart is not convincing; there should be a circle somewhere, but there is not -- everything goes back and forth. The Commissioner asked if it is correct that, generally, the Research Community Plan Draft Subcommittee is then subdivided into sub-subcommittees and Mike indicated no, what we're trying to signify is that they would be working closely with those two

working teams; they wouldn't be further subdivided. Commissioner Soutenet asked why we don't keep the existing format of the current working teams and eliminate that big box in the middle. Mike explained that the purpose of the subcommittee is that is where the citizens and advisory committee members are involved. The two working teams would be the same as they are now, under that central box. The Commissioner asked who is on the Sustainability Working Team in the new format and Mike indicated it would be the same as it is now, so as far as this process is concerned, it would be you and Commissioner Hadley; we aren't proposing a change to that for the Sustainability and 89A teams.

Commissioner Soutenet indicated that the worth of the proposal is in bringing more public participation and expert participation, and Paul Chevalier stated that is a big part of it, yes. The Commissioner indicated that if expert participation is a big factor, which he thinks is the missing link in his working team; he has been asking for expert participation, and that is very valuable input, but he doesn't see how that is being translated for the Sustainability Working Team in that format. Paul Chevalier explained that in terms of the two working teams, there is no suggestion that more people couldn't be brought in to work with the people on it. What it basically says is that it is starting with those teams, but if you want some expertise from the community to be part of that team, that would be a goal and something that the committee would work with you to get. The Commissioner indicated that he would think that would be a prerequisite to be a member of the advisory committee.

Paul Chevalier clarified that person wouldn't be a member of the advisory committee necessarily, it could be somebody else. The advisory committee is at the top with nine people, but as you go to each subcommittee, there are five people in each subcommittee; three comes from the Citizens' Advisory Committee, one comes from P&Z, exclusive of the Chair who would also be in one of the subcommittees, and there would be an additional citizen, who is not a member of the advisory committee. There may be citizens out there who are willing to work at the subcommittee level, but they don't want to take on the additional time to work at the advisory committee level. The idea is to get people involved, who are going to have something to offer other than just an opinion -- some background, knowledge, expertise that is going to be helpful. This outline is a work in progress, so that doesn't mean that if the advisory committee thinks it should be modified that it won't be. The advisory committee concept is to have a group of nine people working together, not a political thing, sitting around a table and working together to figure out how to do it, and then going down into the subcommittees and spending most of their time in the subcommittees. The heart of this thing is going to be the subcommittees, but this is meant to be an efficient and effective way to get everyone working together hard driving each of these issues. Each subcommittee will have a Chair and they will be back and forth to ensure they are connecting on these issues, so it doesn't happen by just attending meetings of the advisory committee. This will be working to do the best possible job on a community plan, using the advantage that we have so many citizens that can be helpful.

Chairman Gillon indicated that the whole tenor of this is to get more community participation, so it is reasonable to expect that even if we maintain the two existing working teams, we would probably expand the membership to include citizens that have specific qualifications to be on that team, and that is the expertise Commissioner Soutenet is talking about. It is not a

specific part of this proposal, but the way it is going, that should be expected. Additionally, the Research and Community Plan Draft Subcommittee is meant to be the workhorse subcommittee, that is the central point where the actual drafting and editing of the Community Plan takes place, and there might be many more subcommittees off of that to deal with specific parts of the Community Plan, that again, report back to that central point.

Commissioner Soutenet pointed out that he doesn't see any link between the working teams and different subcommittees. Paul Chevalier indicated that the three Chairs would be continually interacting and Mike explained that it was trying to show the communication between the subcommittees and advisory committee, but yes that wasn't shown. The Commissioner repeated that the flowchart is not compelling; otherwise, he is supportive of the conceptual idea of the advisory committee provided it supports the working teams, and he thinks it does.

Chairman Gillon pointed out that we shouldn't look at this as a flowchart, but more as an organization chart. Mike indicated the Commissioner is saying that it needs to be connected horizontally, and he thinks that was in the initial draft.

Vice Chairman Griffin indicated that he has been involved in citizen-based committees and they certainly are useful; the learning curve is the issue we always seem to deal with. When an expert comes in, that input is important to bring into the picture, but the thing that is missing, compared to the existing working teams, is that when they are basically P&Z and staff, we understand the process, so the learning curve is the thing that concerns him. The Community Plan Update is a very comprehensive, multi-layered thing, it isn't just one element. There are a lot of elements to be discussed and issues to be addressed. As far as the heads of the subcommittees getting together, we can certainly increase our citizen participation in the current process and possibly bring more into the working teams. When we did the Environmentally Sensitive Land Ordinance, we had the heads of all of the different organizations like KSB, Sierra Club, realtors, etc., and we tried to educate them, so they could go back to their organizations and understand more about it. This City is famous for the whisper around the corner and by the time you get around the circle, there is an elephant in the room, so there are ways to incorporate this. Workshops might be a little better way to set around a table, once you have something to discuss. Open discussions, like at the public meetings, are very interesting, but until you follow-through and understand what that person meant, like when Dennis Rayner indicated that they want shops, but not a commercial corridor, he needs more explanation of that, because you already have a commercial corridor there with the existing zoning, and that is where workshops would be extremely useful. Part of this is education and the learning curve is an issue that would be a hurdle to go over.

The Vice Chairman indicated that the Commission's working teams come back to the body of seven Commissioners, and you might think from tonight's discussion that we are all over the place, but we are still working on it and we have the years of experience. Let's face it, the basis for the Community Plan is a planning-based process, and we are the Planning & Zoning Commission, so hopefully, some of that experience is useful. When you say that the end game stays the same, not really, when we get the final draft and all we are basically doing is working on that. We have changed our work session process, as an example, to have pre-

work sessions with developers when they are first coming in, so we can give them input at an early stage and by the time they get to us, it isn't so far along that it is difficult to do any manipulating. We have been involved in the planning process and know that we want more community participation, but that is going to come from workshops or other ways. He doesn't see this system doing that, other than having a few more bodies in the group, and the learning curve is going to be such that the productivity is going to be hampered. He also has some issue with creating another layer, and what happens if we don't like it -- then, it becomes an issue that P&Z isn't listening to the people. There is a huge amount of citizen participation in this, and you know that process. The outreach that staff is doing is phenomenal; they are talking to as many people as they can, so he has issues with what we are really going to gain, or is there another way to do it, and several good ideas have been brought up today.

Mike Raber clarified that we would continue to have those monthly P&Z meetings, so there always would be some feedback loop going back to an advisory committee from the Commission, and the Commission stays involved all the way through. The Vice Chairman asked who would be reporting back, just the one P&Z person on the committee, and Mike explained that it would be the three in the subcommittees. Paul stated that the idea is to make the process smooth, so for example, if format was a major issue, and the format group comes up with ideas for the format, before they are finalized, they would want to make sure P&Z is happy with that, so if that was the issue of the day, there would be a presentation on format. If there was some other issue of the day, some of you would know about it before it got to the Commission, because you would be part of that committee. He doesn’t think this adds another layer; this makes it smoother. You could argue that there is another layer, because there is an advisory committee before you and you could see yourselves as the advisory committee, but this is just taking you out of the loop as the advisory committee, while keeping you and the Council advised of the progress and getting input. Also, these are public meetings, so you can come to the meetings. Commissioner Losoff asked how that is different from what we are doing now.

Commissioner Hadley indicated that government by the people is what we are all about, so more participation from the general public is great, but he echoes some of Vice Chairman Griffin's concerns. By trying to take some of the burden off of staff and P&Z, it might be creating a burden, so the trick is to get the input, which we all want, but not to make it so much more complicated that it becomes a lot more work for everybody.

Commissioner Eaton indicated his first question was why; this would definitely add another layer to an already complicated process, which takes a great deal of staff time. He really doesn't see it functioning efficiently to add another layer, and a layer of people without the experience to manage the process; it unnecessarily complicates it. The objective is to get more public participation and you use the words "Citizens' Advisory Committee"; he likes that -- citizens advising on the process, but he can't see such a committee, which has some baggage already, taking over the management of the process. You have to understand that all of these meetings are subject to the Arizona Open Meeting Law, which also complicates the issue to some extent. He sees a committee of citizens, which doesn't require staff time, considering these ideas, getting more people involved, getting the input and reporting back would be very useful, but to take over the management of the process, he doesn't see working

at all. It is definitely another layer that requires more staff time, more cost and we can't afford that at this time.

Paul Chevalier stated that he senses that it is hard to be asked to give up control of the management of this process; Commissioner Eaton stated no. Paul continued to say, not because of personal pride, but because you feel you have the expertise to do it well and you are doing it well. There are a lot of citizens in this community, with all due respect Commissioner Eaton, that has the expertise to manage processes. Commissioner Eaton asked why it is then so difficult to get them to apply for a position on the Commission and Paul indicated that is a whole different subject, but there are people in the community who would be interested in this process and would do an excellent job of managing a couple of the subcommittees -- the Research and Community Plan Draft Subcommittee obviously needs to be managed by Mike Raber, and that subcommittee will pretty much be under the management of people from Community Development and P&Z, because that is your expertise and background, but when you get into public participation and formatting, there are people out there who have more background than staff or P&Z.

Paul indicated that there is another larger issue to keep in mind, and that is that the Community Plan is a plan that the community should feel it put together, and the best way to do that is if the management process is driven by a committee where the majority are private citizens and not part of Planning & Zoning. This process will end up with a plan that is better than the one you have now. It is a collaborative effort between staff, P&Z and the citizens, and the wise thing is to have the citizens on the top of it, but he recognizes and respects that you don't want to give up control of it.

Mike Raber indicated that he obviously senses a couple of different viewpoints; one is some general agreement with the approach, and the other is that there is concern about a citizens committee that is managing the process or has a big part in that, as adding another layer, and he doesn't have a good way to address that, other than one of the things you want to try to avoid is overcomplicating the process. He thinks it can work, but he understands those viewpoints.

Chairman Gillon indicated that there is value to having a citizens' committee and to having the public perceive that this process is being managed by a committee that is not just City staff, Commissions and Council. To make that statement true; however, the public has to perceive that there is a good cross section of the public as a part of those members on the committee, and as a rhetorical question, how can we be sure that the Council isn't going to pick all of their friends, and therefore, we get a fairly restricted point-of-view. It would be nice to find some process where the Council works hard to get a wide range of perspectives in that six-member committee, so we get some good debate about what is right for the community.

Commissioner Eaton assured Paul that he is not motivated by a desire to protect his job; he is looking forward to this November, because this is his swan song on this Commission and he is looking forward to giving up this job, but with it has gone a responsibility and he doesn't see that this further complication of the issue is going to function more efficiently. There are better ways to get more citizen participation.

Commissioner Hadley indicated he has no problem giving up responsibility; if somebody else brought us a wonderful document to vote on, that would be great.

Vice Chairman Griffin indicated that he enjoys the extra overtime hours he gives to P&Z, but the goal of this should be to get more citizen participation, and he would suggest workshops, etc. We have started looking at things that we, as the Planning Commission and also as citizens, feel are important to address. They are stumbling blocks and we want to be able to proceed. There are planning issues that you heard tonight and maybe we didn't all agree on a vision, but that isn't ours to create. The process will create the vision, but it is our job to mold the Community Plan, so those things can evolve, and that is the expertise we have. We have training to do that, so we can create what we are trying to achieve and what the community wants to happen in this Community Plan Update. He agrees with Commissioner Eaton about saying this is not creating another layer, and even if it did, if he thought it was a useful layer -- but he feels we are going to be in a situation where if we don't agree with everything, then we are just P&Z and they don't want to give up their power and you can say whatever you want. We have a passion for what we are trying to do and we may not always agree, but we are the Planning & Zoning Commission and this is part of what we do. When you read our job description, this is what we do, and we should be allowed to do it. We are changing some formatting and adding some things that are important to the community, but it is not giving up the power, it is giving up what we have been trained and appointed to do, and the terms are staggered so we aren't a political base. We are appointed at different times, so we come from different groups, and as Chairman Gillon pointed out, it is one Council choosing all of the people on there and that isn't really right. It needs to be a good cross section, and we are a good cross section that argues all the time, but that is what makes us a good Commission. If your goal is to get more citizen participation, bring something to us that outlines that, but he doesn’t think to do a new layer and start again is useful.

Commissioner Soutenet indicated that the Community Plan Update process should be all-inclusive and he would welcome a structure that would not burden the existing processes, and what he would look at primarily is a selection process, which should focus on expertise, and the communication process between the different parts of the system, which goes back to the flowchart, which is non-existent. Once we have a clear job description and a clear flowchart we can work with that would demonstrate that there is no added burden to the processes, he would be supportive of that initiative.

Commissioner Losoff indicated that he doesn’t think any of us would mind giving up responsibility, that just is not us, and to say that is kind of an insult. Paul Chevalier stated that he apologizes. The Commissioner continued to say that secondly, the issue is twofold -- process management and participation. We could do all kinds of things to stimulate participation, and the Commission and staff would welcome all kinds of citizen advisory groups to stimulate more activity in the forums, meetings, and various public meetings. In terms of the process, it is an added layer and we are the Citizens' Advisory Committee and represent a good cross section. For years, as a Planning & Zoning Commission, we have been frustrated that we are spending a lot of time on zoning and very little time on planning, and a couple of members have resigned, because they weren't involved in planning, and we were appointed, not because of expertise in any given field, but because they thought we had a

good sense of what planning & zoning is all about, so he thinks we are the experts -- are we the most expert of the experts -- no, but if we use this modification by eliminating the top Citizens' Advisory Committee, we could use the working teams we have now and add citizens to them and we have all indicated we were going to do that more, as we get going, and that is how we could accomplish what is being suggested, without that additional layer. We could modify the boxes and bring in more people, but have the City Council and Planning & Zoning as the key elements. The City Council is newly elected and they represent a large group of the community, but they are not representing the only community; there is a cross section and we have to be careful that we don't take over everything. The new Council, which he is very supportive of, also represents the portion of the community that didn't vote for them, and there are a lot of people that have opinions on what they are saying, so you want to be careful that you don't all of a sudden shut out that other element. Politically, he thinks there are some issues that have to be addressed as well, so he is strongly against the layer called the Citizens' Advisory Committee. He has no problem using the boxes below that and increasing participation, but he agrees that he doesn't see what this is going to add. We could do everything you want it to accomplish with what is in place, and just tweak it by adding more people to the committees; having said that, he would strongly encourage that other element of getting citizens more involved and bringing more citizens to the meetings. You could have a Citizens' Advisory Committee, so when staff posts public meetings, that group could go out as a cadre to ensure we get all kinds of people at the meetings -- that is where a Citizens' Advisory Committee would be very helpful, by going into the neighborhoods to stimulate more discussions in the neighborhoods, and like when you are running for election, have the coffee klatches, etc.; that is where a group of citizens can really participate and get a cross section of all of us into the participation mode. The management of the process is never going to be perfect, but he would be concerned if we are adding another layer and causing concerns; it is just another burden.

Commissioner Taylor indicated he could only echo what everyone is saying. He still feels it would be better to have citizen involvement as a side committee that runs open meetings in a dialogue fashion, and at the same time, add members of the public to the various committees. There are the Format and Character of West Sedona Working Teams, etc., so put as many people on as can be found that would want to do the work. He doesn’t see the point to this complexity. What really complicates it for him is the line coming down the center to Research the Community Plan, and then it subdivides into the Character of West Sedona and Sustainability. It makes it feel that the people on the Sustainability Working Team does work, but if they have differences of opinion, they go to the Research people, and now you are meeting with people on the Citizens' Advisory Committee and they debate it, and then this committee makes some kind of decision that goes to the Citizens' Advisory Committee, so it is a complicated process. If that center box, Research & Community Plan Draft Subcommittee was removed and another box was added for the people who actually draft the plan, if you can find members of the public that want to do that job, have five boxes and increase the advisory committee, so the CAC numbers divide up evenly. As it is now, it looks really complex and something that looks complex will be complex.

Mike Raber clarified that on the relationship between that Research/Community Plan Draft Subcommittee and the two working teams, the assumption is that those two bodies work

together until they have something to take to the advisory committee, so you don't have conflict between the working teams and the advisory committee. The idea is that the working teams are funneling information to that subcommittee and they are working with the working teams to get a product that they can take to the advisory committee. He doesn't think there is the problem of those working teams having a different opinion going to the advisory committee, more than the subcommittee would have. Commissioner Taylor explained that he still doesn't see why the Research & Community Plan Draft Subcommittee has to be there.

Paul Chevalier stated to Commissioners Losoff and Eaton that he certainly meant no insult by his comment; he did not mean that you personally wanted the work. He meant that he felt that you felt you could do the job better for whatever reason, and that is what he meant by his comment -- not that you would not want to give it up.

The Chairman opened the public comment period at this time.

Barbara Litrell, Sedona, AZ: Indicated that she wanted to make five points as she was listening to the conversation. One is that with the election, there is a new energy in Sedona and a new expectation of public involvement. The people want to be involved, and Commissioner Eaton said where are they; they aren't stepping up, but she thinks that a lot of people were demotivated and didn't think that they could get involved, and with what happened with the Mayor's Committees, a lot of people were turned off, so we have to capitalize on the fact that there is a new feeling and desire on the part of the public to be involved. Second, there is a difference between citizen participation and citizen leadership, and when we look at that, if we have a lot of different forums where the public participates and gives input, we've got citizen participation; if we have them as part of the Citizens' Advisory Committee, we have citizen leadership, and we need to be encouraging that in Sedona, because they are the future P&Z Commissioners and Council members, but if we don't give them an opportunity to lead, as well as participate, then we lose and you will be in the job for another 40 years. It is really important for us to give people the opportunity to lead and not just participate. Third, yes you do have the major part of the expertise as it relates to the planning element and P&Z and all of those areas and that is really important, and once citizens and the leadership of this advisory committee brings ideas to P&Z, staff and Council, it is our responsibility to help the community figure out how to do what the community wants to do, because that is our job. This is a Community Plan, so it is not to say that we know better, it is not to say no we can't do it, but how can we do it? What do we have to do to realize this, if at the end of all of this, we agree that there are some really new big visions for the future of Sedona? And, that is what the people seem to want from what she heard at the two public meetings she attended. They are looking for something new, something special and our job is to not to say we can't do it, because the rules don't apply, but what do we have to do as public servants to be able to do it. Fourth, we can't just do a public process for the sake of saying we did it. ADOT did that with the lights and they didn't care what the people thought; they were just going to proceed with what they intended to do. We have to make sure it is really valuable, and because of that, the citizen leadership is also important. At the end of this process, it has to be the citizens of Sedona who are the heroes of this Community Plan, not the staff, Council or P&Z Commission, so she hopes we can endorse this kind of

opportunity. Mr. Chevalier has come forward and has been interested in doing this and if we recognize leadership, we should seize the opportunity.

Dennis Rayner, Sedona, AZ: Indicated that he was waiting to let Barbara Litrell speak to hear what she said, and he wanted to echo everything she said; it is really right on, but he has a couple of other points to expand on. Number one, he really likes what Commissioner Taylor said at the beginning -- to try to get these processes out of the hands of the government. The more you can do that, the better off this Community Plan process is going to be. Clearly, he thinks we all agree that we want more community involvement; there is no question about that, so we are on the same wavelength there. Regarding the comment about the learning curve, he understands what learning curve means, and if he were to walk into Safeway and grab five or six people and put them on a Citizens' Advisory Committee, yes, the learning curve would be very slow, but if this process goes through, it is going to depend on the chosen citizens and their interest, and don't underestimate the public's expertise. A Community Plan to him is a strategy and you want the strategy, since it is a Community Plan and a community vision, coming from the community, so when he looks at the strategy, that is the vision. Tactically, when it gets to the things that are going to happen under the Community Plan, yes, Planning & Zoning Commissioners are the experts, but it is in a strategy phase and he separates strategies from tactics, they are really different things. You are the tactical experts, but the community is needed for the strategy.

Having no additional requests to speak, the public comment period was closed.

Commissioner Losoff indicated he doesn't argue with anything anybody said, except that he doesn't see how this organizational chart is going to accomplish more participation. We want more people showing up to these things, but this isn't going to do it. This is going to manage the process, and once we get the participation and the various community groups to comment, then we go back and manage what they talked about, so this outline does not provide more participation in the community. Certainly we could and should add more citizens to these working teams; he is just concerned though, because if we have a couple of members of the Council here now, if this is a done deal, why are we talking about it? If we are going back to where it was last year under the old Council, it sounds like we are getting lobbied by the City Council, and he isn't sure that is appropriate at this stage of the game. As much as he likes the people who were voted in, he has a little concern now that. . .

Vice Chairman Griffin asked Paul Chevalier if he is willing to modify this based on some of the things you have heard today, and try to take some of the Commission's concerns and give the Commission an option, or is this basically a take it or leave it proposition as Commissioner Losoff just mentioned. Paul stated that he doesn't believe in take it or leave it; he thinks the best solutions usually have some compromise in them. Obviously, you can't compromise on everything. The concept of a Citizens' Advisory Committee with the majority of the people being citizens outside of P&Z is the heart of this, so he doesn’t see how to modify that, beyond that, yeah, of course. Everything has to get people's input and then you change to make it better, so if there are some specific ideas on modifying this, sure. The Vice Chairman asked Paul if he is saying that the Citizens' Advisory Committee is the heart of it, why not leave it as the heart and allow the process to continue with increased citizen

participation with what we have in place now. Paul explained that when he said Citizens' Advisory Committee, he is talking about the leadership of this. This committee would be the leadership of the process and that is the heart of this proposal -- that they not just be participants, but they lead the process. Vice Chairman Griffin asked if they are going to create a new process that we are going to follow to do this, and Paul stated yes. This proposal is trying to come up with a process, which obviously is going to need some tweaking, and part of it was already suggested with the horizontal line going back and forth on those committees. It is to come up with the best process to get the best plan; that is the goal, but the thought is that since this is the Community Plan, the citizens should be leading this, and he is saying citizens outside of P&Z, but P&Z has a critical part to play. Can this be modified to make more sense and make it better, absolutely, it should be.

Commissioner Losoff stated not if you are just going to move lines around; if you are not going to eliminate that top box, to him that is not a compromise. One possibility would be to have five committees and appoint a citizen as Chairman of each of those committees and not have the Citizens' Advisory Committee. The second thing he would be looking for is what the criteria for appointing are, and who is going to appoint? Paul explained that the City Council is going to choose them. Mike Raber explained that the idea would be that we would put out an ad in the paper and solicit residents to submit their names. Commissioner Losoff added that they would be interviewed by the City Council; Mike clarified that the way the process works now is the Council would appoint three Council members to interview, and then they would make a recommendation to the full Council, and the full Council would appoint the members. Commissioner Losoff indicated that he would recommend that we create the five committees there now, call them committees instead of working teams, and ask a citizen to be Chairman of each of those committees and not have the added layer of the Citizens' Advisory Committee, if that is going to give us more participation; he doesn't think it will, but it may be more of a compromise, if we are looking to get the leadership out of the hands of government. He doesn't see himself as government; he sees himself as a citizen, but if it is perceived that we aren't in that mode, then have a citizen chair it that could be selected through some process.

Commissioner Taylor indicated the way he feels personally is that he is being turned into a laborer, where before he had some enthusiasm for the way we were participating. Now, he is losing that, so he might as well just be fulfilling his role on Planning & Zoning, and when this plan is finally put together and comes to us, he will listen to it and comment fairly and express his opinion, but that is kind of what he feels and he is kind of disappointed that he should feel that way. He is disappointed in himself and in this whole thing; that is why he is having real trouble with what you propose -- not with citizen involvement, but with the format for it.

Commissioner Soutenet indicated that he doesn’t know if we are getting to the point that we are able to come up with a clear proposal, each of us, to move the process forward, because we could be discussing this. . . (Tape inaudible)

Chairman Gillon asked if we use the electronic media as we are proposing, we could do a turn-around on this, if staff wants to take our comments and take another stab at that and get it to us electronically. We could agendize it for June 1st. John O'Brien indicated that it is a big

agenda, but it could be added to the end of the agenda. The Chairman indicated it would give us one more chance to look at another iteration of this proposal, and he then asked the Commissioners if that made sense.

Commissioner Eaton indicated no, and Commissioner Losoff stated that he isn't sure that he agrees with that either. Chairman Gillon asked if he had an alternate proposal and Commissioner Losoff repeated that he would eliminate the top line and appoint a citizen to Chair each of the subcommittees. The Chairman asked from a process standpoint, if the proposal is that we sit here tonight and get it resolved.

Vice Chairman Griffin stated that this is way to important, if we are thinking of changing the process we have had in place, without understanding and even Paul admitting that this needs to be looked at and tweaked. He thinks it is too important for us to sit here and, like with a project we don't like, to try to redesign it at the dais; that isn't the way it should operate. Paul is the one that put it together, so he should take our comments and try to work something out and explain it a little better, and discuss our issues with how this is going to have more citizen participation. The assumption that you are going to have citizens leading this and that it is going to make it feel that it is more citizen-driven, he doesn't know; he thinks he and Chairman Gillon were appointed the Chair of this Commission because of their experience and Councilors because of their experience. You need someone guiding this that has the knowledge and direction to make it work. The most important thing is to get the citizen participation, to come up with the direction of what the citizens want, and we create that and the amendments to it. The original process was an amazing process. It was facilitated, but the citizens created it, so let's try to recreate that in some way other than turning the process totally upside down and adding another layer that we are going to have real trouble trying to integrate into the procedure, which is P&Z recommends to City Council. There is a process in place, and we were going to run into a problem trying to mend this new thing in without butting heads, and maybe getting the other side, even though they are in the minority, thinking that they aren't heard either. It is the whole community that needs to give input and that is what our process does. Last time, it was unbelievable how many hearings we had on this; John O'Brien indicated that in 1998 it was in the 30s and Mike added that he didn't think we had that many last time.

John O'Brien indicated that it sounds like the management of the plan is an issue and obviously the citizen participation is the thing you all agree on, but it is the management of the advisory committee that has a lot of the heartburn for the Commission, and it is a concern of his as well. The complexity of adding another layer and the tentacles of this is a concern of staff as expressed. The 1998 plan worked well; we had the Growth Committee, which was an advisory committee of all citizens, except the Vice Mayor led the committee with the Chairman, a member of P&Z, and a broad cross section of the citizens; it was 11 members. Mike agreed it was 11 members and ended up with 10. John O'Brien explained that it worked well; they didn't manage the planning process, but they were a sounding board for the public, the public attended those meetings, and that group developed the ideas and a lot of the issues, and put it out to the public, and it seemed to work well. If this could be tailored in that way, it would be very successful, rather than manage the process and create this complexity.

Commissioner Eaton pointed out that was also a fact-finding committee; we had guest experts at every meeting on specific issues, so it was not just a listening committee, it was also a fact-finding committee and it worked quite well.

Mike Raber clarified that we kept hearing that the purpose was to get more public involvement and Chairman Gillon stated it very well, that the other purpose hits on the perception of where staff is involved in running the process, interpreting the data and pulling the public information together, and if there are additional citizens on that advisory committee, it takes some of that perception away, and that is another purpose here; it does become more citizen-driven in that way, and that is part of the concern, but also one of the purposes.

Chairman Gillon asked the Commissioners what they want to do next and Commissioner Losoff indicated that following-up on John O'Brien's comment, he likes the idea of getting a group of citizens, whether you call them advisory or a sounding board, etc., and they manage the ideas and stimulate discussion and maybe get some visionary elements, and leave the management. He doesn't think management of the process has been an issue until today. John O'Brien agreed and indicated it has worked well in the past; we have won two awards from the state for public participation and the management was left to the staff, Planning Commission and Council, and that committee was a fact-finding committee that identified issues and brought in experts. They were citizen-based and recommended back to the Planning Commission and City Council, and we could do a similar thing here and it could work well. Commissioner Losoff indicated that in that situation, it is okay, he doesn't see any issues, so he would rather see us spend the time and energy getting citizens stimulating, fostering and facilitating ideas, thoughts, concerns and issues and not necessarily tie us up with the management of it. It is not personal; he doesn't think any of us would not give it up in a minute, if we thought it would be better, but he doesn't see it being better.

John O'Brien added that in the 1998 Growth Committee, staff was not on the committee; we were the resource and did a lot of the legwork for that committee, but we were not on the committee; he thinks it was the Vice Chairman of P&Z, and the Vice Mayor was the Chairman. Commissioner Losoff added that you can get a lot of leadership in that capacity, with good solid citizens in those groups and you would get the kind of leadership and participation that you are looking for -- probably more than by getting tied up in the technicalities.

Commissioner Eaton pointed out there is one advantage to this system, it shares the risk.

Chairman Gillon indicated that his sense is that there is going to be a proposal that goes to the City Council on the 8th of June, and the question is if we want to have one more look at this before that happens or just leave our comments with the people that are working on the proposal. Mike Raber agreed that is the question. The Chairman added that if we don't want to burden the June 1st agenda, just get the revised proposal to the Commission and Commissioners can give staff their email responses. Commissioner Losoff indicated it is too important for that. Process-wise, if there is a proposal, he gathers there is a consensus that we are not approving this proposal, if you are looking for action today, and if there is going to be

a second proposal, it should come back to debate again for final action. The Chairman asked if the consensus is that we would like to talk about it again.

John O'Brien noted that the next work session had been canceled, so this could be the only topic, unless you just want it on June 1st. We have two introductory work session items, the charter school renewal, a farmer's market in Uptown, the time extension for the Falls at Oak Creek, and staff is giving a presentation on the Development Review process, which could be deferred. The Chairman indicated to put it on June 1st and defer the presentation.

Commissioner Losoff asked to be clear as to if the Commissioners are going to get a revised proposal on increasing more public participation or a revised proposal on the management of the process. Mike Raber agreed that is the question; a key part of what Paul is suggesting is the Citizens' Advisory Committee having that number of citizens on it, as driving the process. Commissioner Losoff pointed out that it is loud and clear that it would be voted down, if that comes back. Chairman Gillon pointed out that there could be a Citizens' Advisory Committee that is formatted like that, but is indeed an advisory committee, with some other process to manage the nuts and bolts of getting the Community Plan out.

Paul Chevalier indicated he is perfectly amenable to modifications, because no matter what you present, it can be done better, but the heart of this is that the Citizens' Advisory Committee would be the process managers and the majority of people on that committee would be citizens who are not on staff or members of P&Z -- take that out and the rest of it is a totally different thing. That is one part he personally is not willing to take out. Commissioner Losoff indicated that he is all for citizen participation, but given that, he doesn't see us wasting any more time on June 1st. Commissioner Eaton agreed that is where he is too; we aren't being listened to, so. . .

MOTION: Commissioner Losoff moved that we leave the process as it is and not accept the proposal before us. Commissioner Eaton seconded the motion.

Commissioner Taylor suggested that you make the same proposal, but leave Planning & Zoning out of it and if the Council so wishes, they can ask members of P&Z if they would like to participate in any of the committees, and then we are participating as citizens, and not as P&Z.

Vice Chairman Griffin commented that if this committee is going to drive the whole process with no staff; however, Mike Raber clarified that staff is represented on the advisory committee, as well as P&Z, the only difference is you have more citizens than staff or P&Z. Commissioner Eaton asked if staff can vote and Mike Raber explained that they talked about it being a working committee that might operate under consensus, the way the Growth Committee did and that would be his preference, if he was on it, and the committee could waive Robert's Rules like the Growth Committee did, so they could operate in a work session format. The only difference in the make-up is that you have more citizens on it than staff and Commission.

Vice Chairman Griffin pointed out that the only problem with voting this down right now is there won't be any changes; it will just continue on. If Paul is going to listen to what we talked about and he said that every proposal can be improved, then if he does improve it, what is sent on may have some things that we brought up today. If it is sent on, he doesn't think things will be worked out and there are a huge number of things that need to be addressed.

Commissioner Losoff explained that normally, he would agree, but he is hearing all of this discussion about public participation, communication, hearing from the people, and you are hearing from at least six or seven of us that we don't like that line, and you are saying you are not going to take it out, so why waste any more time? We could change our own process; the Chairman could tell us that we could modify our working teams and add more citizens; we could do what we want to do and accomplish what is being suggested, but why waste time debating this, if he is not changing it. It is just a waste of time, if we are going to get this fed back again.

Chairman Gillon indicated he disagreed; even if we get it fed back again with that committee at the top, there may be other things that are better, and if that is the result, then it is not a waste of time for him. Vice Chairman Griffin agreed and that is the only reason, he would vote not to vote it down right now. It needs to come back to us; if we can't change the top line, maybe something else, because he has a feeling that it is very possible that this is going to. . .

Commissioner Eaton stated with that in mind, he will withdraw the second if we really feel that it can be improved. Vice Chairman Griffin indicated if it isn't improved and it comes back the same, then he will vote it down. Chairman Gillon added that we can see pretty quickly on the 1st whether or not it has been changed substantially.

WITHDRAWAL OF SECOND: Commissioner Eaton withdrew the second with that in mind.

Commissioner Soutenet indicated that he wished we had come to more of a meeting with the proposal than what has been presented now, and he thinks that would be a responsibility to come one step forward, because after all, if it is a done deal, the way it sounds like it is, let's find a way to work with that proposal in a way that our concerns have been addressed, and that is an important step that we should take.

Paul Chevalier asked that to be sure that he has all of your concerns, and he is dealing below the top line, could those specifics be emailed to Mike Raber as soon as possible, so they can try to come back with the rest of it that the Commission is going to be more comfortable with. Commissioner Soutenet pointed out that they are going to be in the minutes. Paul stated that it helps if you have . . . He doesn't want to miss anything, if there are any specifics on format, research, etc. Commissioner Losoff asked why not the top line, and Paul stated he is not willing to move on the top line; he is trying to say that as plainly as possible. He sees this as a community-driven process management, but he is amenable to anything below that, that will make better sense and get the job done better, but it is important to this community that this be citizen-driven and leadership, with key parts played by staff and Planning & Zoning.

Chairman Gillon requested that Mike Raber send a request for any feedback beyond what is in the minutes to the Commissioners, so we can individually respond. Paul added or even what is in the minutes. John O'Brien explained that it may take a while to get the minutes to you; they would be done by Friday; however, when you email your thoughts do not copy any other Commissioners, just send your response directly to Mike Raber. The Chairman suggested emailing to the Commissioners as blind copies, and Mike suggested that they go ahead and email him your thoughts. Chairman Gillon indicated that anybody that has anything to add to what is in the minutes or reiterate what they said in the meeting, please email it to Mike Raber.

The Chairman stated that there is no second for the motion that is on the table and asked if anyone wanted to second it.

Mike Raber stated that Paul asked that the Commissioners reiterate whatever the Commissioners feel is important and don't leave out what is in the minutes, because we may not get those for a while, so it would be more productive if you send all of your concerns. Commissioner Soutenet asked if we can wait until the minutes have been published and Chairman Gillon said no, that is the point. Commissioner Losoff asked if the Commission was sure they didn't want to just drop it today. Chairman Gillon indicated that those that want can just drop it, but he for one, wants to see the next iteration of the proposal. Commissioner Hadley agreed.

The Chairman stated that the motion dies for lack of a second.

8. Discussion/possible action regarding future meeting dates and agenda items: Tuesday, June 1, 2010 (R), Tuesday, June 15, 2010 (R)

John O'Brien indicated that on June 1st you have the Falls at Oak Creek Time Extension and introductory work sessions for the charter school's Conditional Use Permit renewal and for a jeep tour staging office and a small farmer's market in Uptown across from Tlaquepaque. The overview of the Development Review process will be removed and tonight's previous item will be added, and that meeting is at 5:30 p.m. The June 15th meeting is at 3:30 p.m.

9. Adjournment

Chairman Gillon called for adjournment at 6:25 p.m., without objection.

I certify that the above is a true and correct summary of the meeting of the Planning & Zoning Commission held on May 18, 2010.

_____ _____

Donna A. S. Puckett, *Recording Secretary* Date