
This document was created from the closed caption transcript of the February 9, 2021, City Council Work Study Meeting and has not been checked for completeness or accuracy of content.

A copy of the agenda for this meeting, including a summary of the action taken on each agenda item, is available online at:

<https://www.scottsdaleaz.gov/Assets/ScottsdaleAZ/Council/current-agendas-minutes/2021-agendas/02-09-21-work-study-agenda.pdf>

An unedited digital video recording of the meeting, which can be used in conjunction with the transcript, is available online at:

<https://www.scottsdaleaz.gov/scottsdale-video-network/council-video-archives/2021-archives>

For ease of reference, included throughout the transcript are bracketed “time stamps” [Time: 00:00:00] that correspond to digital video recording time.

For more information about this transcript, please contact the City Clerk’s Office at 480-312-2411.

CALL TO ORDER

[Time: 00:00:04]

Mayor Ortega: Good afternoon. I call the February 9th, 2021 city council work study session to order. Deputy Clerk Cathie Butteweg, will you please conduct the roll call.

ROLL CALL

[Time: 00:00:23]

Deputy City Clerk Cathie Butteweg: Mayor David Ortega.

Mayor Ortega: Present.

Deputy City Clerk Cathie Butteweg: Vice Mayor Betty Janik.

Vice Mayor Janik: Present.

Deputy City Clerk Cathie Butteweg: Councilmembers Tammy Caputi.

Councilmember Caputi: Here.

Deputy City Clerk Cathie Butteweg: Tom Durham.

Councilmember Durham: Here.

Deputy City Clerk Cathie Butteweg: Kathy Littlefield.

Councilmember Littlefield: Here.

Deputy City Clerk Cathie Butteweg: Linda Milhaven.

Councilmember Milhaven: Here.

Deputy City Clerk Cathie Butteweg: Solange Whitehead.

Councilmember Whitehead: Here.

Deputy City Clerk Cathie Butteweg: City Manager Jim Thompson.

City Manager Jim Thompson: Here.

Deputy City Clerk Cathie Butteweg: City Attorney Sherry Scott.

City Attorney Sherry Scott: Here.

Deputy City Clerk Cathie Butteweg: Acting City Treasurer Judy Doyle.

Acting City Treasurer Judy Doyle: Here.

Deputy City Clerk Cathie Butteweg: City Auditor Sharron Walker.

City Auditor Sharron Walker: Here.

Deputy City Clerk Cathie Butteweg: And City Clerk Carolyn Jagger.

City Clerk Carolyn Jagger: Present.

Deputy City Clerk Cathie Butteweg: She is online.

Mayor Ortega: Very good. we have police officer Tony Wells in the chamber, as well as firefighter Kevin Hubbard. If anyone requires assistance.

PRESENTATION/INFORMATION UPDATES

[Time: 00:01:19]

Mayor Ortega: We will now turn to a presentation by the health director, information officer. It will be regarding the COVID-19 pandemic. And the response to date. We will not be debating this presentation, but please continue. Michelle Pabis with Honor Health is the vice president and government and community affairs.

[Time: 00:01:49]

Michelle Pabis with Honor Health, Vice President, Government and Community Affairs: Thank you so much, Mayor Ortega, members of the council. Can you hear me okay?

Mayor Ortega: Yes.

Michelle Pabis: Perfect. I appreciate the opportunity to be with you tonight, and as you said, give you a brief overview about where we have been, where we are going, and where we are at currently.

I would be remiss if I really didn't start with a thank you, a heartfelt thank you to the city of Scottsdale from city manager Jim Thompson who has been here and been a true partner every step of the way, not only as we navigated this vaccine effort, but also throughout the pandemic and handling hospital capacity.

Also Scottsdale fire department, Tom Shannon and the emergency management and Bill and -- Bill Murphy and Greg Bastien from human services. It's really been a partnership with the city of Scottsdale that we are so appreciative of and speaks to the success that I'm hoping I can share with you tonight. Next slide.

It's been quite the year, Honor Health has been on the front line, not only in the healthcare response, but also recognizing vaccination was the best step forward and making sure our community could recover. In August of 2020, under Stephanie Jackson, a multidisciplinary team was formed to be because we understood all the different aspects that were going to be involved with vaccinations but as we talked about in the past, it was like planning a wedding, but not knowing who the groom was going to be or what day the wedding was going to be.

Agility and flexibility and responding to constantly changing information and conditions was how we started and still continues to be the case today. In October of 2020, we realized the professional expertise of the city of Scottsdale especially when it came to emergency management and large events.

We had decided the best way to start the vaccination effort would be through a drive thru mass vaccination event, recognizing the talents of city of Scottsdale emergency manager and Scottsdale fire, we invited them to be a part of our planning teams and they were helpful in site locations and site logistics and we realized that ultra low temp freezers as I called it freezer Gate 2020 as we chased the

ultra low freezers throughout the country, hoping to get them into our possession, knowing that Pfizer was ultimately going to be probably the first vaccine available and coming to market.

I appreciate the city manager to bring low temp freezers it brought a tear to our eye the day that they were there, realizing that the Pfizer vaccine was approved by the FDA under an emergency use authorization on December 11th.

[Time: 00:04:43]

Michelle Pabis: Those vaccines were in a freezer by December 14th and we were one of the first sites to go live with vaccination on December 17th. Let that set in for a moment. December 11th approved by the FDA and in our freezers by December 14th. Ready to go live December 17th.

The amount of teamwork and partnership both at Honor Health, as well as with the city of Scottsdale and Mayo clinic to stand up that site is truly commendable. We began phase 1a with healthcare workers and first responders and completed over 41,000 vaccinations for approximately 20,000 individuals in the northeast valley.

And currently we are in phase 1b prioritized and have completed nearly 17,000 vaccine doses, that include law enforcement, school childcare personnel, and adults age 75 plus. Today was actually our last first day of first doses for those phase 1b prioritized and we start on second doses next week.

There's a lot of questions and confusion about how vaccines are prioritized. I want to share this information with you. It's really a multilevel process in which the federal government under A.S.I.C. makes Recommendations to the Centers for Disease Control about how to prioritize populations.

Those groups are made up of public healthcare providers and other subject matter experts and really the job at federal, state and county level, how do you prioritize, while maximizing the benefit of vaccines and making the biggest impact in preventing COVID with limited vaccine supply.

You will hear me continually say tonight, limited vaccine supply. Because that is the reality of what we are dealing with at the federal state and ultimately county level, they set the guidelines at which they must follow that prioritization process and administering vaccines.

Where are we at today? Honor Health is a pod. There are five PODs under Maricopa County, each anchored by a large healthcare system, Honor Health anchors the northeast valley. Additionally, there are two state sites you might be familiar with, which is state farm stadium and the stadium in Tempe. Again, healthcare workers in EMS were done in phase 1a and long-term facility staff and residents were vaccinated.

As we look towards the future, there is -- as you might recall, the state is vaccinating at their two sites adults 65 and holder but Maricopa County has not moved to that age group yet given the lack seen supply. There's an expectation that there could be they move to that. There's conversation around other central workers being in this group as well. Next slide, please.

[Time: 00:07:57]

Michelle Pabis: So as I mentioned Maricopa County divided the county into five different regions. Honor Health was the anchor for the northeast region. We were assigned 10 hospitals in that region to vaccinate all employees.

So, again, it wasn't just Honor Health employees but we also had Mayo employees and other hospitals. We had ten fire EMS agencies to be responsible for, Scottsdale fire being the main anchor. Troy was the outreach to the other nine EMS fire departments, and very much a valued team member. And then we were also responsible for all of the healthcare workers and outpatient clinics, pharmacies, et cetera, both paid and unpaid who worked in the healthcare setting.

Again, very pleased to have vaccinated over 20,000 individuals, 41,000 doses delivered to date. Next slide, please.

As you saw, phase 1b prioritized include law enforcement personnel and school personnel. We worked with Scottsdale P.D. I want to thank the chief and Joe bane who was my go-to person. They provided lists of people who were eligible based on the Maricopa County guidelines and any Scottsdale police officer that wanted a vaccine could get a vaccine, and we were scheduling down to the wire today. We are proud to say that we served probably over 285 police department personnel. We also knew our schools were an important partner. We have been offering supports to our school districts and charter and private schools as they navigated this pandemic.

We knew the vaccines were important to them and started early conversations. As part of our contract with Maricopa County Department of Health, Scottsdale unified, Cave Creek unified and Fountain Hills were a part of our service area. We're pleased to announce again that we delivered over 2100 vaccines to Scottsdale unified school district. 2800 to Paradise Valley unified school district and 500 to Cave Creek.

Any school personnel who was eligible and wanted a vaccine we were able to schedule, working directly with the superintendents and support staff at each of those schools. I will just share we did have a blitz weekend January 22nd through the 24th, where we had Paradise Valley and Scottsdale unified school teachers coming through as a blitz event. We had the Superintendent Menzell working the front office -- I called him the bouncer as he checked the names and we had school nurses to help us vaccinate.

It was truly a partnership effort in that the excitement it brought to our own staff to know that they were making a difference with school personnel was some of the most rewarding that we have had as part of this experience. Next slide, please.

Phase 1b prioritized adults age 75 plus. This will be an interesting population to deal with. We know that seniors, age 75 plus may not be as technology savvy or be able to navigate those websites. So we had a different approach than what you saw with some of the other PODs. We have an Honor Health my chart account that allows tore direct scheduling. So those patients that did

have Honor Health my chart we sent direct messages to and allowed them to schedule.

[Time: 00:11:09]

Michelle Pabis: We also realized maybe they weren't as comfortable navigating the scheduling online. So we started a phone banking with all of our Honor Health volunteers that were willing to do that direct outreach. For those Honor Health agents that were 75 plus.

We also realized that for several vulnerable populations we wanted to make sure we did direct outreach to this includes NOAA. You may be familiar with the federally qualified health center that sends to serve underserved communities they have two locations in Scottsdale and eight others throughout the valley. They are currently serving 75 plus through a drive thru operation as well.

And then there's desert mission. What you see there is our adult day healthcare we were able to vaccinate over 50 caregivers and clients who might not otherwise have been able to navigate a drive thru scenario. And now we are doing the same with the city of Scottsdale.

Greg Bastien and Jean changed their staff in how to navigate my chart for those who received the desert mission brown bags to schedule appointments. We will be on site tomorrow at the granite reef senior center offering vaccinations for over 63 individuals who would not have been able to access through the drive thru service.

Again, the partnership and realizing what we needed to do to reach those vulnerable populations has been impactful. Next slide.

So looking ahead. This is where we're at. Where are we going? As I like to start and end our presentation, this is what I know as of February 19th at 4:13 p.m. The information continues to evolve and change again based on vaccine supply.

You have probably seen in the news that there has been a real push to try and get more vaccines from the federal government, but to date we are still at the same supply and if anything, there's increased demand as we expand to groups.

So in the last two weeks, Maricopa County has received zero Pfizer doses, but we continue at the PODs to be able to operate and use the vaccine supply and honor all appointments we have on the book through the end of the month.

So the other questions I get, well, why can't we have more vaccine sites? Why didn't we be in all places of the city to make it easier. I will just share that vaccine providers is not like anything else, when it comes to COVID.

They have to go through an arduous onboarding process through the Arizona Department of Health services. It requires a medical director, and if using the Pfizer product, it really requires a pharmacy team at our POD we have a five-person pharmacy team producing that vaccine. As you may recall, it's very

fragile. Once it's only reconstituted, you only have six hours to use it. Every drop of that vaccine is precious.

[Time: 00:14:08]

Michelle Pabis: At Honor Health, we are very pleased to say that no usable dose has been ever gone to waste. You may have seen in the news questions about what happens -- what are wasted doses. Wasted doses are usually a part of the vaccination process. There are issues, as it's manufactured. There could be particles in the vial or unusable vials.

It could be during the evaluation process, there was a syringe that got stuck or a needle that got broke, you wouldn't use those. But every single dose has been used at the Honor Health POD. More access points are coming from federally qualified community health centers to pharmacies. You will see a list on the Maricopa County Department of Health website of current pharmacies serving the prioritized populations, and there's a federal program starting February 11th, that will expand that to Fry's, Safeway and Albertson's.

So be sure to look for more information ash that and then our physician offices are targeted as well and small and large events as necessary to meet the demands.

So my final thought and really advice to you, as I know you are getting a lot of questions from your constituents and everybody is anxious to get their turn, but we have to be patient and allow the process to work. This' a prioritization -- there's a prioritization process in place for the reason. It's due to the limited vaccine supply.

You have public health and medical experts that are part of these committees, determining how you prioritize and make the biggest impact. And as if you are a Hamilton fan, I keep saying, "I'm Not Giving away My Shot." So when it is your turn, we are happy to say, it's a safe vaccine. We recommend it as your community healthcare provider and when you have an opportunity, no matter the site, you should take that option, and schedule your appointment and go for that vaccination. With that, I'm happy to answer any questions for you.

Mayor Ortega: Well, thank you very much, for your presentation, Ms. Pabis. And I don't see any questions, but we definitely appreciate the update and we will look for others to follow.

PUBLIC COMMENT

[Time: 00:16:22]

So moving along, at this point, we would have public comment. However, we did not get any requests for public comment. Therefore, I will open and close public comment and move on with our work study program.

ITEM NO. 1 – DRAFT GENERAL PLAN 2035 UPDATE (1-GP-2021)

[Time: 00:16:43]

Mayor Ortega: Well, the purpose of this work study is to provide a less formal setting for the mayor and the council to discuss specific topics with each other and staff and provide staff with an opportunity to receive direction from the council. Our topic will be the general plan, and I will ask Ms. Perreault to begin the staff presentation for the draft general plan 2035 update.

Planning and Development Area Director Erin Perreault: Thank you, mayor and council. Tonight we are going to discuss case 1-GP-2021, which is the draft general plan 2035. Next slide, please.

In terms of our recommended approach evening, we will be publicly reviewing sections of the plan and public comments that we have received to date. And when I say to date, that's through the end of December 2020 at this point.

We will also be looking for direction from city council at kind of a higher level because we are starting our public outreach process with the community on the plan as well. So we will need some direction from you this evening on what portions or additions or things that we have heard from the public outreach you would like to take back out and test with the rest of the community. Next slide, please.

In terms of tonight, as of last week, we had three work study sessions scheduled with the council and you can see those highlighted in green on the slide. In addition, the clerk's office has provided two additional dates for you. And the only decision that staff and I believe the clerk's office will need from council is to know if you want to change any of the work study formats into special meetings to allow for additional public input as most work studies are limited to public input. Next slide, please.

So mostly for the community but also just as a reminder for the mayor and council, we are required to update our general plan every ten years. That update could be sending our existing general plan to the voters to reapprove or reverify it. We have gone through an extensive outreach process and we have a new plan to send to the voters. Next slide, please.

We have tried to update our general plan a couple of times now. The first effort was between 2009 and 2011. That process went all the way to council adoption, and then it was sent to the voters, but not ratified by the voters. Next slide.

Had we then per council direction did another two-year stint on a general plan update process. That draft general plan was released in November of 2014 to the community and did go through public outreach process, but did not go through the planning commission, city council adoption, or voter ratification pieces that are required by state statute. We are using that base plan that was created by the task force in 2014 as our base plan moving forward with this general plan update today. Next slide.

In terms of process and timeline for the current update that we're in, we have gone through -- it began in 2020, we have gone through first three phases that you can see on the slide, and as I mentioned, we

are going to embark on the public outreach on the draft plan now, and, of course, we are having these city council meetings. We are also going to be starting our planning commission meetings as required by state statute. Next slide.

[Time: 00:20:57]

So diving into the plan now, are for discussion this evening, the plan is set up into three sections. It has eight chapters and those chapters are the ones that organize what you will often hear as general plan elements. Currently we have 23 drafted elements in this draft general plan. 17 of those were required to have in the plan per state statute. Six of them now are communicate created or created and important to our citizens. Three of those were already existing in our 2001 general plan and you can see that those are character and design, community involvement and economic vitality.

Two others were added during the 2014 task force process and that was arts, culture and creative community, as well as healthy community. The Citizen Review Committee that just wrapped up in December decided to add a final one, which is tourism. So that's new since 2014. Next slide, please.

Just to orient you to how the plan is set up, each chapter has an introduction process that introduces also the elements that will be discussed in that chapter. Next slide.

What we do have on the left is something new to the plan that we don't have in 2001, and it's because some of the criticism that we heard of the 2001 plan is it's hard to find the content in the 2001 plan quickly and easily. So what you see in each of the chapters in the draft plan is this cheat sheet on the major goals of each of those sections and so you can see that on the left. Each element has an introductory page to it, which you can see a sample of in the middle of the slide and next slide, please. On the left of the slide, you can also see some numbering. And why is that important in the goals are numbered in the 2001 plan, but they are not numbered -- the policies under those goals that support the goals, are not numbered and, again, it's difficult to find the content in the plan as it currently exists. So goals in policies have been numbered for quick reference and easy use. Next slide.

So getting into tonight's discussion, I will be focused mostly on the public comments matrix that you have received. In my presentation, I will present sort of a rolled up version of those public comments and highlight the big ideas as well as the ones that are repeated most often. And then also I will focus on the tracked edits plan version, just because it's easy to see where the suggestions are coming from. Next slide.

So what I have done here is summarized to date we've had almost 400 comments on the draft general plan. That has been between 2014 and 2020 on the task force plan, as well as everything that we have collected through 2020 and the Citizen Review Committee process. As you can see, the land use element is the one that we have received the most comments on to date, followed by the character and the design element. And also, the glossary. When I went back and looked at that, the Citizen Review Committee did address a lot of the public comments that came in on the glossary and we'll get to that portion in a future meeting. Next slide.

The plan is -- does have track changes and this is a little cheat sheet not only for the mayor and the council to follow, but the community as well. This is online. The Citizen Review Committee comments are light blue. Anything suggested by a technical advisory team from across the city organization has been highlighted in green text. And then any citizen outreach comments that have made it into the plan per the Citizen Review Committee are in red. The new notation means that's content that you cannot find carried over from the 2001 general plan. So it's absolutely new to the document. If it doesn't have new designated next to it, you can find that content in the 2001 general plan. And then we have notated the state required content. That's typically next to the goal or the policy number. Next slide.

[Time: 00:25:37]

The first part in some repeated public comments that we have heard is that the plan is too long. It takes too long to get into the actual body of the plan. And so staff does have some suggestions this evening and we are looking for council feedback on those suggestions, but there's an executive summary, a pro log, and then some historical pieces to the front part of the plan as well as a community profile. And so what staff is suggesting is we could make the executive summary, which is 14 pages a companion piece to the plan to lighten that -- the number of pages before you get into the actual plan itself and that number is 42 pages right now. The prologue is a one-page really aspirational page that our citizens wrote. We recommend keeping that one page at the beginning of the plan. The CRC -- the Citizen Review Commission made no changes to that.

In terms of the foundation for the vision, in the piece of the community profile that has historical pieces to it, we recommend that we could move those to the appendices. They are still important to our citizens but they don't have to be up front in the plan. And then finally, there's a section called the purpose of the general plan. We do recommend keeping that because it tells any kind of user the purpose of the plan and also how to use the plan, how it's set up. And then finally, there is a section on retaining -- or the place that Scottsdale plays in the region and demographics, we recommend keeping that at the front of the plan as well to give context to the general plan in the region. So we will hold off on making any kind of executive summary content changes until the very end of the process. Obviously if we make plan changes, we will change the executive summary to reflect those plan changes. Next slide, please.

In terms of the draft plan language that we did hear from public comments, that during the CRC process, the staff and the Citizen Review Committee really worked and made a concerted effort to make a distinction between the policy document which is what the general plan is and any regulatory document language is, like shall or must, which you would find in an ordinance. And so we had some more internal consultation to that. We probably can't go as far as shall or must but we can probably restore some of those should and wills and we will go back on looking at doing that based on what we heard from council. Next slide, please.

In terms the community profile section, there were a number of comments about a target population number. The general plan nor the city has ever set a target population number. What that number actually is, there's some confusion it seems to be around it, but it's really a buildout projected number based on the types of land uses and the amount of those types of land uses that we have. So per state

statute, we are supposed to provide a population number that we think will have that buildout in the plan.

[Time: 00:29:00]

And so in 2001, that buildout projection was 300,000 for year 2020. The population of Scottsdale was somewhat close to, it not that far off, but less than what that projection was. For the draft 2035 plan, because we're not proposing to change the mix or types of land uses that we have the current plan our buildout population is estimated to be about 317. And that's by 2055. Not surprising, because we don't have a lot of developable land left. So again, it's not a target population that's established in there. It's just a population projection based on our land use mix. Next slide, please.

We will move into the vision statement portion of the plan. Next slide. In general, vision statements are meant to be ambitious and inspirational. With the city reaching buildout, we don't anticipate having our vision statement changed dramatically. What we do find and what we have heard is that it's more about maintaining enhancing what is so special about Scottsdale. And vision statements are not state mandated, although we have yet to find a general plan or comprehensive plan that doesn't have a vision statement in it. Next slide.

We have a few samplings of vision statements just to give you an idea. You should have also received in your supplemental packet a variety of other communities around the valley so you have an idea of the different types of vision statements that are out there in general plans. Carefree, it's rather lengthy in terms of the vision statement. It contains a lot of details and steps and a lot about their background and history. It's really not until the end that you get to the future forward looking portion of their vision statement. Next slide.

Phoenix tends to -- is definitely more succinct and future forward looking and motivational, inspirational. Next slide.

And then the town of Gilbert has chosen to be future towards definitely much more succinct. It's the small paragraph in the blue box, but it does incorporate their shared values as part of this irrelevant vision statement. So -- of their vision statements. So the vision statements run the gamut. Next slide.

In terms of the vision statement that you have in your plan to date, there's quite a bit of history, although it's succinct and it doesn't look like it has a long history. 100 citizens participated in a three half day town hall event to craft a consensus vision statement as part of -- as the beginning of really the last general plan update process and then that vision statement we took out to the general public to provide feedback on it as well and that feedback was then fed to the task force who ultimately were the ones that called down the larger vision statement into what you see in the plan today. Next slide.

This is the town hall vision statement that came out of that three half day event and what we heard when we took it out to the general public was that it was way too lengthy and it was too repetitive. Next slide.

So the work that the task force did on this vision statement, they set up some goals for how they wanted to craft it. They wanted it to be future tense, short and memorable and create as a visual vision statement. It's actually sometimes people have a hard time finding it in the 2001 general plan currently. They wanted to remove the redundancy in the town hall vision statement but keep the integrity of the content. And they wanted it, of course to apply to the entire city. Next slide.

So the work they did, you can see here this is a working slide put the orange text is from the town hall vision and values. And it's woven into the vision and the aspirations because they are one package. They are not separate. The intent was the vision could be succinct but supported by the three aspirations.

[Time: 00:33:45]

What you see on the left is the task force 2014 vision statement. The Citizen Review Committee made some minimal adjustments or suggestions for adjustments to that vision statement. They feel like the outstanding livability portion should come first.

So they moved first sentence, which is focused on tourism to the last to make that the last sentence and then they did add some language about educated citizenry, but very minor changes. With you see on the page is out of the 2001 general plan. And then you see the vision statement that we have today and the citizen review vision statement that I just mentioned. Next slide.

That's what the vision statement looks like in the plan today, certainly much easier than the vision statement in the 2001 plan. Next slide.

Vice Mayor Janik has also provided a draft vision statement for the mayor and the council to consider and not only is it on the slide but it is provided to you in a handout for your discussion purposes when we get to that point in the meeting. And then also for it to be hopefully easier for you to read. Next slide, please.

In terms of the community aspirations, next slide. They went through a very similar process. They came out of the town hall process. They were then more further refined not only by public comment but also by the task force. Next slide.

And as I said, they are companion piece to the vision statement. What you are seeing on the right in the light blue text is the minimum -- or minimal changes that the Citizen Review Committee made to those three community aspirations. And in terms of public outreach so far, we had a lot of support for those three community aspirations as written. Next slide please. Community values is the next portion of this section of the plan. Next slide.

The values also came out of that town hall process, as you can see, there were quite a few of them and they were quite wordy. We took those out for public comment. Next slide.

They were culled down through public comment and given to the task force again for the task force to refine them. Next slide.

What you see in the plan is a combination of what the task force refined and ended up being seven value statements total. And then there are some suggestions up there from the Citizen Review Committee, from the public which are in red, and from city staff as well, to those seven original ones created by the task force and that's what's in the plan in front of you this evening. We have also received a lot of community support for these values. We haven't heard anything different so far. Next slide, please.

So that concludes my -- that portion of the presentation for tonight. And as I said, we are looking for some council direction on culling down the first part of the plan to make it easier to get into the plan content. Based on those suggestions I mentioned earlier. We are looking at reinstating some of the shoulds and wills that we can for you into the plan. The vision statement obviously we anticipate a lot of discussion around the vision statement and community aspirations. What staff is recommending is that we test the 2001, the 2014, and the Citizen Review Committee 2020 review, when we take the vision statement out to the public and/or any other things that the council might have for us to test with the public.

In terms of the community values, staff is recommending based on what we heard so far to retain those because there's been support for those so far. Thank you.

[Time: 00:38:05]

Mayor Ortega: Well, thank you -- thank you very much. And as you know, we will continue the public comment and the outreach. So that's a direction that I believe that council has reviewed and wants to encourage. You know our -- we are going to be looking at this piece by piece, and beginning with the vision statement, which, of course, represents our ideals and aspirations and really to make the world a better place. Beginning here in Scottsdale.

I would like to start by just calling on members for two rounds. The first round would have to do with any questions you might have or clarifications from staff, and so -- and then second round will be more directive and go that way. So we will start with Vice Mayor Janik if you have any questions or to staff.

[Off microphone comments]

Vice Mayor Janik: I push this? Yes, I was. Sorry. I guess it didn't come through. And hold it down, correct? Or just -- just leave it.

Mayor Ortega: Push it once.

Vice Mayor Janik: The vision statement sets the stage for the general plan. It's part of the general plan that most people read, which is important. So we need to make sure it covers most of the detail that we feel is significant. It just express our vision, the citizen's vision for the future of our city and when you

take that in combination with the three main community aspirations, which we saw on the screen, exceptional experience, outstanding livability, and community prosperity, we are framing the future.

And if we follow this plan, what follows is should not be difficult to chief because we already made our main statement. I think this is a great place to start. What I would ask is if we could see the three vision statements from '01, '12 and 2020 side by side. Kind of as a comparison to see how we all feel about those statements and perhaps indicate which one represents our wishes more completely. Would that --

[Time: 00:41:01]

Erin Perrault: I'm not sure we can technically do that on the screen. Let me --

Mayor Ortega: I think at this point, I hear you that comparison might be in order.

Vice Mayor Janik: Yes.

Mayor Ortega: And, however, we'll get to a preference round next. At this point, we will just go through our questions to staff or clarifications and whether or not the evolution of those changes is shown, we'll see how we can put that together. So next, I would go to Councilwoman Caputi, please.

Councilmember Caputi: I don't have any questions right at this moment. Thanks.

Mayor Ortega: Okay. Councilmember Durham.

Councilmember Durham: Thank you, Mayor Ortega. My first point is I'm strongly in favor of restoring enthusiasm and will language as much as we can to the plan, because that was one of my major problems with the plan, is the elimination of that type of language, sort of removed it as a goal-oriented document.

And if it's going to be a goal-oriented document, then it needs to state that we should do certain things and encourage other things and consider other things. So that was one of my biggest problems with this draft and I think that's important.

I think we need to drastically shorten the preface and one of the ways of doing that is removing some or much of the material in putting it into an appendix, such as the history of the general plan, the community profile.

There's some other things, I think, in that front that interfere with getting to the meat of the plan. So I would be in favor of putting a fair amount of that into the appendix. My last point is made by mayor Janik, Vice Mayor Janik and that is that maybe I was being a little dense, but I didn't understand necessarily the aspirations as being part of the vision. And I think there's kind of a global comment throughout the document that we need to, I think capitalize vision when we are using that as, you know, the vision. And the same thing with community aspirations. And I'm looking at page Roman numeral VI of the marked draft. And below the kind of greenish box. It says framing the future.

Our visions and values and I think that really ought to say community aspirations. And in the second paragraph down there, within the vision without the aspiration, to make this clearer, I think we should capitalize things like vision and add the word "community" in there. And so that it would read community aspirations. And then when it comes back later to the values, which are on page 12, I think, do the same thing with values that words like vision are capitalized, referring to the vision, community aspirations, the same thing. And values, the same thing, because at least for me, it sort of makes it clearer what this tripartite organization is. I think it's important that we have that the community aspirations are explicitly part of the vision and I think that would help clarify a lot of things for me. Thank you.

Mayor Ortega: Yes. Councilwoman Littlefield.

[Time: 00:45:20]

Councilmember Littlefield: Thank you, mayor. I agree with what the Vice Mayor and councilman have said. I think clarity is something that really is needed on this plan. And it does need to be shortened also. I was -- I still want to thank the Citizen Review Committee for what they did. They did a tremendous job and I know they worked hard, and a lot of what they did, I firmly like, and want to keep in there. But this is the guiding document. The main guiding document for the city. For the government and for the development of this city going forward, it has to be a forward-looking document. It defines us as a city. It gives guidance as to who we are and what we want to be there's no penalty of financial problems for the city taking time to produce an update that truly reflects the desires of the city and the citizens, and I think we need to make sure we get it right, and not just put something together and -- and hope that it works. [Chuckles]

That said, I do want to get it completed and I want to get it out to the citizens for a vote. I believe that every one of us up here wants it. The plan to be successful at the ballot box, it needs to offer guidance and protections for Scottsdale high quality of life for all citizens who live here, work here, or own property here. And I think that was one of the biggest concerns I had when I first went through this plan was the might, could, maybe, instead of we will. We can. And we will.

It needs to be a controlling document not -- not a document that someone can say, well, I looked at it. I will thought maybe we could do, it but we decided not to. So now I'm in compliance with the general plan and I don't need to do anything else. No. That's not how this is supposed to work.

I think as written right now, as what I have, original write-up, this proposed update, weakened those protections to our citizens and to our city and I don't think that as such it will pass the citizen vote. There are two major parts to the general plan that are supposed to offer concrete direction to the city going forward. The first is the vision statement, which we talked about a little bit already.

At the very beginning of the plan, and the second is the matrix which displays what the major and minor land use plan is. Both of these are critical in this land use update. Both need crystal clear. And what we want to do with their land, with their city.

The general plan is a controlling document and as we move forward to our future, we need to make sure that the language in that proposal update is suggest instead -- is not suggestive, instead of controlling. A bad general plan update is worse than none at all because it gives the excuse to people to do something that is not good for Scottsdale. And although it is not a zoning document it needs to work in tandem with our zoning code.

I would support working with both to ensure that the zoning codes conform to the vision for Scottsdale as described in what the final version of this general plan will be. So that it's smooth and it transitions well. Frankly, if this update is not strengthened before it goes to the public vote, I predict that the update will suffer the same fate as last one and I for one could not support what it is right now. But I will start with some specific thoughts of my own.

The general plan's vision statement should guide the development of the city to achieve the citizen's vision on how the city moves forward into the future. This has to be -- there has to be a path to get there. And that path should be broadly defined in the vision statement. The vision statement does not do that. There's no path as to where we're going and the vision statement should consider the steps that we need to achieve that vision. There are no steps.

And I'm sorry, Randy, I think there should be a path and a way to get to where we want to go. And that vision statement says what that is. The vision statement in the proposed update reads, Scottsdale's diverse neighborhoods will foster outstanding liability throughout connected healthy and sustainability communities.

It's -- it's like everybody else. We need something that's uniquely Scottsdale. There's nothing bad in it. There's nothing that's evil. But it says nothing other than what we know we already are. Where is the future vision for Scottsdale? That's my big concern. I have a copy of a vision statement that was written in 2012.

Very similar to what Vice Mayor Janik has, and it was put together by the visioning process task force, during the visioning process by members of that task force. Those members were Ned O'Hern, Howard Myers and Sonnie Kirtley. This is what the citizens committed to during this task force process. They, Ned, Howard and Sonnie completed the final editing of it before presentation. And I have a copy of it here. And I'm very happy to make other copies of it and hand it out to you.

It's very much like Betty Janik's and it says much the same. I will read just a little bit of it. With an international reputation as one of the most desirable places to live and visit in the United States, Scottsdale enjoys a singular position in the valley of the sun. Scottsdale is a vibrant city with a charm, look and feel of a much smaller community. Favorably situated in a lush western desert setting, Scottsdale has unique downtown, lively shopping and resorts and exceptional outdoor recreational activities.

The city's appeal as a tourist destination and its economic viability are intrinsically linked to preserving and enhancing these natural and created amenities. Scottsdale embraces the arts, not only by offering

diverse culture venues and events. The city's rich western heritage remains evident in the ongoing ranch life which is celebrated in old town and through special events and festivals. It gives a path. A way to achieve to what we want to get to and where we want to go. So that's -- I can maybe copies of it. I can make sure everybody gets a copy of it. It was done at the same time as, I think, the other one because it was done by much of the same people in that area.

So I think -- this is how a vision statement should retain its meaning and direction going forward towards the life span general plan. The one I read it's a little dated, but it's ten years old. The plan should have been passed on to the next plan. But it -- it leads through the life of the general plan. So it does achieve what that vision should be for the next ten years. This is a vision statement that the citizens want for their city. That's the first imperative. And the one being presented tonight, lacks the cohesiveness and that detail. On page 14, which is xiv in the book. I like the inclusion of a tourism element into the general plan.

I think that the commission did a very good job with that and tourism will remain a major part of Scottsdale's economy for the foreseeable future and it should be recognized as such. This edition or update is a positive and something that is needed for quite a while. Moving into the body the general plan, page four needs to be rewritten. As I have already stated. I know there are other vision statements out there, but we -- we have all read them and they should give a strong lasting vision of where we are going and how we are going to get there.

I would like to hear the thoughts of other members of the council, and certainly open to more discussion on this issue because we need to get it right. I believe as we look through this plan, we need to go page by page, and step by step. If we do not, we will overlook something that will cause the public to say no. The language needs to be stronger, direction needs to be stronger. That is one reason why I want to read all the input from the citizens as it comes in and I have created that it will be hitting us very soon, a new whole set of citizen input. And I want to read it, because I want us as a council to be able to be proactive and take proactive measures to change or amend the parts of this plan that the citizens don't want or that may just need reworking and clarification. Some of that. I want this to pass and I want it to pass with our citizens' blessing. And with that mayor, I will conclude my remarks.

Mayor Ortega: Thank you very much. Councilmember Milhaven. We will head to the first part.

[Time: 00:56:00]

Councilmember Milhaven: So in terms of Erin's recommendations, they are all certainly agreeable to me. One other idea I would add about shortening it is whether we really need the implementation steps but I suppose that will be for future comment. However, since folks have taken liberty to make broad comments, I think I will too. The sky is not falling.

And some of the tone that I heard in the remarks of my colleagues start to be -- seems to me to be kicking this off in a sort of -- in a mildly confrontational, mildly adversarial tone to use comments like this threatens our community and it's weakening the safeguards of our community.

They are not striking the tone of collaboration that I thought we were working so hard to get to. So certainly, this is a world-class community. We are proud. We are all here because we love our city and we want it to be wonderful.

I think, that you know, the plan we have now has served us well to get us to where we are today. There may be things we want differently in the plan, but it doesn't change the fact that we think this is an amazing community and we want it to continue to be amazing. Councilwoman Littlefield, it states what we already are. I think we need to remember what got us where we are, so we don't lose track and certainly we may want to add some things about what the future looks like but let's not -- let's not get -- what is it dance with the girl that brought you.

Let's remember what got us to where we are to create this world-class community. I don't want to leave that behind. I want to make a comment, I have a great deal of respect for the three and four public groups that have done, the three visioning committees and the one visioning town hall, and the work that went into all of that. I have an enormous respect for the amount of time those folks spent and I know I attended many, many, many meetings over the course of several of these different updates and have profound respect for the time and the commitment that people put into that and so I'm inclined even if I don't agree with some of what is in there to listen to the citizens that participated in this process.

Having said that, since folks spent a lot of time on the vision statement, I -- I am inclined to support the vision statement that came out of the task group but in as much as I have no objection to any of the other vision statements that were said, I think in my opinion, too much weight is being put on the power and the impact of the vision statement.

They were all essentially saying the same thing. While my inclination is to defer to the work of the Citizen Review Committee. In the interest of collaboration and team work, I will defer to whatever vision statement my colleagues would like to see in the plan. Thank you.

Mayor Ortega: Thank you, Councilwoman Milhaven. Again, we're looking at any questions to staff or clarifications of the presentation that will help us, you know, guide us up to this point. And later we will be adding into our own preferences. So proceed Councilwoman Whitehead.

[Time: 00:59:24]

Councilmember Whitehead: Well, I'm hoping I did write notes on this first section. So I hope I can go ahead and say those now. You tell me if I'm -- if I'm going into too much of a detail. Because we are talking about how staff will proceed, I agree with most of your recommendations. I would say that the -- what a general plan is, while it is really important, the type of person who will want to know will happily go to an appendix.

So I would -- my preference is to go ahead and put that in. And I -- I respectfully disagree that -- I haven't felt this as confrontational. I have concerns about the document as a whole even though I'm thrilled to

have all of those people have spent all of those hours giving me something to edit. It's always easier to edit than to sit there with a blank page. We although that only committees can do so much.

We should give credit to our staff because sitting through months and months of 20 people. There's a lot no like and I have some shared concerns S. it appropriate for me to bring those up.

Mayor Ortega: Any concerns or questions regarding the presentation at this point, no proposals because that will be the next round. Okay?

Councilmember Whitehead: No proposals.

Mayor Ortega: If you want to lead to a proposal, but we're just taking comments on where -- what was presented and whether it's useful for the whole conversation then to stage from that.

Councilmember Whitehead: Okay. Well, I will keep it high level and then get into more detail because I think like a lot of us, I have spent many weekends on this. But -- so the words I'm hearing -- so before I even get to the vision statement, the words I keep hearing and I agree is that we are -- this is forward looking.

This is aspirational and we'll reach -- we are not, you know -- we are not settling here with our general plan and we're building on a very successful city. So that's always nice. So with that in mind, on the exceptional experience -- actually, I agree with Councilman Durham. I had a couple of words. So I think I would like legal to double check.

This is -- we have -- this is a document with goals and policies, and so therefore, we cannot undermine those goals and policy giving somebody an applicant whether it be a developer or even a city project an out. So we're here to -- these are our goals and these are the policies that uphold those goals. So we need words that match with that. So I had a couple of examples. So -- and I think councilman Durham said some of those. So I would like to see words that are optional, such as is typically encouraged, promote, replace with, should, or require or must. So -- because if we have goals and policies, then either we require those or we don't and how we require those, that's where you go to the zoning ordinances and such but it still doesn't mean, well, you don't have to do this.

Then throughout the document, the word "must" and I think that was part of what Aaron was saying. I would like that relooked at. I would just like a search and replace, any place must was deleted, must goes back in. Because then that tells everybody only the best applicants apply, because we must do these things because these are our goals and aspirations.

There was another word, I will throw it out there, but academic implies like an educational institution, college, or -- I didn't think that -- I don't think -- I think we have awesome public education programs but I don't know that I would call them academic. I will thought maybe we should switch academic to, I don't know, something else. That's sort of an overview, based on -- and then now into the actual chapter.

So I guess Roman numeral IX you list all of the elements or you start listing. I just think that in some of

those elements, we are -- you know, headlines are saying that Phoenix will not be livable in this century. You know, we are seeing some pretty nasty headlines. I think it's a good chance here to acknowledge climate action and resiliency.

So I would like to see that talked about in this section and then further down. Speaking of aspirational. I thought the circulation element on 12 -- Roman numeral XII wasn't aspirational. So what I cause compare to. There are so many different kinds of vehicles, you could never see in a European general plan, cars or bicycles because there are so many different vehicles. So I think this should be a little bit more inclusive and more strongly worded.

I would certainly like to see that automobiles will be the predominant transportation removed. That might be true and some sections of the city it might not be true in other sections of the city. So let's see. And I think -- okay. Now I will go to the vision and then I will stop and hit some other stuff on the next round. So the vision. I confess that this vision statement looks like a committee of 20 people did it. It's really good. It's anywhere U.S.A. but it's because if you have 20 people, then if everybody pulls out the one word that they don't like, you end up with something pretty plain, vanilla. And it doesn't capitalize on who we are. My goodness.

I have had so many different people, again in my limited travels. I was in a place where nobody spoke English. I said Scottsdale and they said Taliesin. So the first sentence of what Councilwoman Littlefield said, I agree with. Now, I'm aware if she reread the sentence. I thought I printed it out. It's a great first sentence but at the very end of the sentence, it implies we are better than everybody else. And so maybe we pull that out.

So we don't want to be saying something negative. We want -- but I think we absolutely must capitalize on who we are. I don't want to start with the diverse neighborhoods. Our strength is everybody in the world seems to know who we are, what we are, and that's something I would like to see capitalize. I liked the original one. I liked the more aspirational nature of some of the elements of what -- I'm also open minded like Councilwoman Milhaven. There's just certain parts that we can boast a little bit about who we are. I would like to see that and then aspire to be -- continue to be that and more so and expand, expand would we are.

And I don't think the notion of us acknowledging that we are a wealthy or that we attract luxury -- the luxury tourism destination. It doesn't take away from the fact that we are and we want to be and we want to expand to be a place everybody lives. But we allow our luxury tourists to pay for that. And so I think there's a way to get everybody's -- I'm very open minded and I do think that the vision statement matters and I will stop there.

[Time: 01:07:45]

Mayor Ortega: So you have the first turn on the second round. So get ready. As far as the comments of what was presented, I agree that the appendix and other historical information could be pushed to the back and the -- and the front statements that we're concentrating on now will be, you know, more obvious. I would also say that I believe that the vision statement again has our ideals, as well as our

aspirations.

So I did see a slide which showed the vision statement paragraph and then the three aspirations. So I believe that would embody as you -- as maybe staff looks for that, it shows the -- the aspirations as to outstanding livability. It mentions our events and so forth.

So it's the three pages after the vision statement. And in the index, it says vision statement and aspirations. I believe that they can and should be shown on one page. And that will embody our special events and our other character areas of our livable self. The vision statement that I like is the one from 2014 that led off with Scottsdale -- and I will add a word here, Scottsdale will continue to be an exception Sonoran desert experience and the premier southwest tourist destination. And I added the word will continue.

Well, we will continue what got us here and keep us going. What I like about that, a vision statement has a sense of place. So having a sense of place and knowing -- and then the commitment to preserve and so forth roll out in the aspirations aspect which -- which I believe should be bundled together, not separated as though one paragraph would define this completely and we don't have to go far to see other examples with other municipalities.

They might have too many bullets or whatever, but I like those which are now displayed and those were in our -- in our handouts as subsequent pages with a lot of photographs and by the time you take the photographs away, I think it's -- it's pretty outstanding for our overall -- overall goals.

The next step to that is what is guiding principles. So the guiding principles are the ways of affecting and protecting the areas that I believe will guide us as we enact our vision or those who follow us, right? We are hoping that we'll get buy live in from fellow citizens and clear understanding and if there's more to add to these, those would be added on to in our community values.

So that's -- right after aspirations, which I think should be consolidated, we have the opportunity with community values and I will, you know, comment on some -- perhaps additional direction to that. I say that because one of the pages of community values is right behind one of the pretty pictures of the aspirations which I'm looking for. So here I found it.

So I believe that as we get into the issues such as respecting the character and culture, that's the community values section. I believe as we look at conserving and preserve the environment, those solid principles we call them -- 20 years ago they were our guiding principles and it seem to be pretty clear that way for people to know where we were coming from.

The connectivity, of course, sometimes that gets to be -- it could be expanded. It could be -- people may think of that as transportation needs or neighborhood needs. But I believe that that could also be delving into diversity, people -- Scottsdale is a crossroads of culture and other aspects.

So I think the way this is rolled out overall, I like that. My main criticism would be that previous slide with the consolidating that is really the -- the inspiration that's going to lead us forward. It brought us

here, I believe too. It brought us to where we are at and we're going to continue that and carry it forward.

So at this point, without going into the other preferences now, I will -- we're going to be hitting by the way, land use element in the next presentation. So we're going to just take these pieces and then come back again with two rounds. So if you have a preference within the subject land use. We will start off with Councilwoman Whitehead.

[Time: 01:13:21]

Councilmember Whitehead: I do have a lot to say in land use. But I have a couple more comments in this first section. I will go through those quickly if that is okay. I think once we get these sections, the first two sections where we are all comfortable with the sections and I think we all represent a lot of different people in this community, then think I we will be representative of the community as well. Then I think the last part will go easier and that's where we help Erin. So we will help you. Okay.

This is just before land use. I think the desert and mountain preservation efforts that just needs to be, I would say, it looks like it was just kind of added on and it's not up to date. I will gladly help if the council is okay with that. I would say we could shorten that to two paragraphs. We could make it really short. I want to ensure completeness.

So I think that, for instance, one point that is missing that should be included, the preserve boundary has acres that have not yet been acquired or protected. So that should be spelled out in one sentence. And an update from prop 420, that obviously was pretty monumental in that it changed the city charter. So those two items and then I can -- I would be very happy to volunteer to shorten that.

This is -- I have three kids. I have gone through so many term papers. I will be happy to help with that.

[Off microphone comment]

Councilmember Whitehead: I would suggest we shorten it and the preserve boundary and the land acquisition are not yet the same. There's still acres in the preserve boundary that have not been acquired and protected, and that we have the 2018 city charter about what is and is not allowed to be done in the preserve and how that is spent. So those are the shortened and add those two items.

Mayor Ortega: And I think with this process, as we give guidance or suggestions, we will go through all seven of us and then we'll give staff to restate it clearly so that after that, we can look for consensus on any of the points that might be made and certainly if one of us has brought something forward that was open your list as well, we can skip over and go on to the other points as well. So the. In person would be Councilmember Milhaven.

Councilmember Milhaven: As I said earlier, I respect the work of the task force. So I have no recommended changes. Thank you.

Mayor Ortega: Okay. Councilwoman Littlefield. Any particular bias or, you know, where you think a change or two would be useful?

[Off microphone comment]

Mayor Ortega: I'm sorry. I thought you were --

Councilmember Whitehead: I will make up for Councilwoman Milhaven's brevity.

Mayor Ortega: Please continue.

Councilmember Whitehead: Okay, well, if you would like me, I will move into land use if you would like me to otherwise we can go around the room and do land use next.

Mayor Ortega: We have to have the presentation on land use.

Councilmember Whitehead: Then I will stop right here.

Mayor Ortega: Go ahead councilwoman.

[Time: 01:17:07]

Councilmember Littlefield: I had one of the same questions that Councilwoman Whitehead had. We haven't bought all the land in the boundary of the preserve. I'm not sure that we plan on buying it, that's something else and by omitting that land out of the context of the general plan, it kind of gives the impression that we don't plan on buying it or don't plan on using it. I don't think that decision has been made permanently yet by council or anyone else.

So I think putting that back in as a possible future action or option would not be amiss. I think that's a good idea and I kind of had noticed that also that it had -- that it was kind of a misspeak there.

[Off microphone comment]

Councilmember Milhaven: Do you want to say that we may or may not buy additional land.

Councilmember Littlefield: Yes, in the preserve boundary as stated -- as it was set up originally. Yeah.

Mayor Ortega: I want to make sure, can staff answer that question. Is that just somewhat unknown. Help me with that too, just to -- if it helps all of us understand whether that's an open ended point or continue if you would, please just to help me with that.

Erin Perrault: I personally don't have the answer for you this evening, because we work with preserve staff. So they went through the text on that page. And we updated it with preserve staff. We can

certainly get that answer for you.

Mayor Ortega: Okay. Well, then to backtrack a little bit. Let me ask Councilwoman Whitehead.

[Time: 01:19:00]

Councilmember Whitehead: So I know that we are actively -- the staff is in -- and the commission is actively looking. There's limited uses of the tax dollars and there are some pretty high priority land. And the process is the voters decide. If we run out of money, it is not our decision as a council to not buy any more land. We can propose an extended tax, a new tax. It's up to the voters to tell us when we are done buying land. So I think it absolutely has to be in there and I do know that the staff is working on it.

Mayor Ortega: Okay. Did you have a follow on that? Because I will go to Councilwoman Caputi.

Councilmember Littlefield: No, that's basically where I looked at that one page and saw the -- it just -- what? Wait a minute. Did we buy this and I didn't know it? Yeah, I think it needs to be an option. I'm not saying we will run out and do it. We don't have the money for it in the preserve funds right now. So Councilwoman Whitehead is correct. I think it should be an option.

Mayor Ortega: Thank you, Councilwoman Caputi, please.

Councilmember Caputi: I want to circle back a little bit. I'm open as well to collaboration on the vision statement. I think we all have to come up with something to great that we can agree with. I want to point out that mission statements and vision statements are simply vision statements. They are not novels. They are not descriptions. They are not steps. They are not a plan on how we get somewhere.

It's a vision that someone has to read and quickly identify with councilwoman whitehead even gave that cute example of being in a different country and saying Taliesin. I agree with what the mayor was taking. The vision can have after it sort of our secondary goals but a vision statement is just simply that. It should be aspirational.

It should be short and sweet Sean it should just be something that everyone can complete a and quickly identify with as Scottsdale. Plans and steps and descriptions come later. I thought that the vision statement that Councilwoman Littlefield read sounded like a description of our city as opposed to our vision for the future. And a few times it's been said in our meeting so far that the general plan should be a controlling document. Oh, that hurts. The language of controlling makes me cringe a little bit. Again, I think a general plan is visionary. It's aspirational. It's a way for us to talk about what we want the future to look like.

We certainly don't want to cross every T. and dot every I. This is my perspective, and we will collaborate and make it so difficult to maneuver. This is a 20-year document. It's like writing the U.S. constitution 200 years ago and then forcing everyone to fit into a little narrow box of something. It's got to evolve. It's got to be a living, breathing document that can move and change as we move and change as a community.

So I'm not sure it should be a controlling document. I think we need flexibility in our general plan moving forward and I want to put that out there as a philosophy, a way of thinking. I don't like that word "controlling." Of course we want to say what we want for our city and we want to be specific. But handcuffing everyone into a controlling document, that I definitely wouldn't necessarily agree with. Okay. Thank you.

Mayor Ortega: Thank you had. Councilman Durham, please.

[Time: 01:23:09]

Councilmember Durham: I had just a couple of miscellaneous comments concerning items other councilmember and the mayor have raised. One is on 36, in reference to Councilmember Whitehead's statement. It's a little bit confusing because on page 36, it talks about purchasing 34,000 acres and on the next page, it says that we have protected 30,000 acres. I think it would be very useful to -- it's not a discrepancy if you understand the difference.

It's very clear what the difference between 34 and 30,000 are, and I think that needs explanation. The second item is with reference to something Mayor Ortega raised and I think if we create the longer vision statement that we are thinking of, I think we ought to delete or incorporate what we now list as the community aspirations because I think this vision -- much of what is in the community aspirations, I think would wind up in a vision statement, and I think it would be more sensible and easier to deal with if we have one vision statement that includes much of what councilmember Littlefield suggested in what is in our community aspirations instead of have we I have a vision and aspirations and values and other things.

Mayor Ortega: Thank you, vice mayor Janik, please.

Vice Mayor Janik: I agree with most of the comments that have been made. I feel that the organization for me, was confusing as I went through it. And especially with respect to what Councilmember Durham said. I think we can combine our vision with the other elements that we're interested in and have one cohesive statement and keep it shorter, maybe one page, maybe just a little bit over, and I do have a question for Erin.

You made suggestions in the beginning. Of ways we can shorten the document. If we make those changes how much shorter will the document be?

Erin Perrault: So with regard to the executive summary prologue and the purpose of the community plan, that's 42 pages right now. The suggestions I made would reduce it down by 28 pages. So you would retain about 14. At the beginning.

Vice Mayor Janik: Okay. That sounds very good. And then the other thing in general that I kind of noticed is that as you read through it, there were examples of the point that was trying to be made, and I think it's not a bad idea to try to incorporate some of those examples so we have a better

understanding of what we are talking about. And I just had one and then I lost the page while I was paging through. But I know it was in the character and culture, which I think was okay if we jump to character and culture. Yeah.

It's character types where we have examples of each on page 50. And I don't necessarily say you have to include all of them, but maybe one or two would help with the understanding. Under urban character types, examples include downtown, old town Scottsdale, a mixed use center. I think that helps with the understanding. Thank you. Are.

[Time: 01:27:19]

Mayor Ortega: Okay. I would suggest again that the 2014 vision that leads off with Scottsdale will continue to be an exception Sonoran desert experience and the premier southwest tourist destination, I like that version.

The CRC added a term later on about academic opportunities. I agree with councilwoman whitehead, we don't need to insert that. And that's kind of my bias on that. I like the idea that that vision statement would also include the aspirations, the three points that were pretty clear. They cover our business prosperity, the heritage of events, our history and culture and so forth that's brought us to where we are.

And I would now turn to the area called our community values. So I have some comments there and I will ask us to get some consensus. The -- these points are bullet points. And I would call these guiding principles under our -- under our general plan 2001. These values will be at the forefront of our decision making and implementing our vision, our community aspirations and goals found in the general plan, and shall be the basis upon which inconsistencies in the general plan are resolved. Values are listed are of equal importance.

So here they are able to drill down and it's, again, an area that starts to get into some pretty strong statements conservation of the environment, respect culture and so forth, engagement, and collaboration. And as I compare this list with the one that was provided by Councilwoman Janik and I believe was, you know, the result of earlier vision statements, I can pretty much cross off the list of -- I mean, correspond several things where it talks about managed growth responsibly, for example. That's one of the -- and revitalization. Vibrant economy, and so forth.

So I think that the longer form that was provided by Councilwoman Janik and I believe -- sorry Vice Mayor Janik and Councilwoman Littlefield also build on the heritage aspects and are multicultural attraction of Scottsdale. So these will be the guiding principles.

I feel that there is one missing on this and I would invite you all to consider that after maybe advanced innovation and prosperity, that with would use the guiding principle to respectfully consider the original township area of Scottsdale as to low profile, low density and pedestrian character, that has created our legacy.

So I'm adding to those character -- excuse me, our community values, excuse me. And I believe that understanding that that is also part of our, you know, respectful consideration of the original township, as to low profile, low density and pedestrian character.

[Time: 01:31:43]

So I would ask us to kind of to consider that as an additional guiding principle. This area has never been -- was raw land 100 years ago. So I feel that as commitment to our what we would call the downtown that that needs to be a consideration. I would invite any other comments. I think there's a way to read back some of the points that were made. But if you have anything additional -- at this point, we are ready to look at some -- not actionable but some consensus building here. Go ahead.

Councilmember Whitehead: Could you read your added community value one more time?

Mayor Ortega: I wrote it -- respectfully consider the original township area as to low profile, low density, and pedestrian character. And in discussing, that we have to recognize that that has a value in our communicate and in particular, the -- community and in particular, the original heart of our downtown. I think that's a guiding principle that can and should guide our decision making as we renovate, you know, and so forth, make those decisions. Councilwoman Caputi.

Councilmember Caputi: Are you talking about the area that's historic old town? Those couple --

Mayor Ortega: I'm talking about the entire two mile -- or the original township of Scottsdale.

Councilmember Milhaven: What do you consider the original township. It's second street to -- what would the boundaries be?

Councilmember Caputi: You have to be way more specific before I could agree to that.

Mayor Ortega: Okay. Well, then, I -- I could then expand it to the area known as old town character area plan. I was trying to narrow it down, but it originally was one square mile and I believe that we should have a legacy or a character element in that -- that understands or takes special care with that area. And so if it was a large area, it would be the entire downtown area.

I'm saying be careful of low profile, low density and pedestrian character. That is what originated Scottsdale. I'm not putting any limits on that as far as how the ordinance may be changed or otherwise construed. So at this point, perhaps what we could do is -- you have been taking notes, Ms. Perreault. So could we start with the discussion looking for consensus on several areas that were on our overhead chart about the administrative portions. What did you hear and can we sort of replay that?

Erin Perrault: Mayor and council, what I heard hasn't the theme seemed to be that there is an agreement to cut down that intro test, leading up into the plan so that we can get into the body of the plan quicker.

So we can take a look at that and mock it up the way it could look and bring that back to council for a final decision on what that looks like, based on the staff recommendations that you heard this evening. So it seemed like there was consensus on at least moving forward with that. I heard consensus on trying to reinstate some of the shoulds and musts in the plan as much as we can and we will look at that from an internal city staff standpoint. We will look at that and mock that up as well.

With regard to the vision statement, I'm a little less unclear on what vision statements. I heard support for the 2014 along with the community aspirations. We had some other suggestions so it would help staff and myself, to tell us what to test with the public. We can bring that feedback to you but some clarity on which ones we are bringing out would be helpful.

So we have the 2001, we have the 2014 task force which it sounded like those that liked anything in the plan landed on the task force plan, versus the citizen review one, which were minor changes anyway. So it sounded like we had two contenders to take out and then potentially a between what Councilwoman Littlefield and Vice Mayor Janik suggested as well.

[Time: 01:37:37]

Mayor Ortega: In that light, I think there was some support for supporting the vision and the aspiration and we don't have the pictures of everything flashing and so forth. Are we pretty much in that direction? Go ahead, councilwoman.

Councilwoman Littlefield: Basically the two statements that Vice Mayor and I had, I think it came from the same group at the same time they were working together and they just were two different groups and they said the same thing and different words.

As I read this through, I think the Vice Mayor's is shorter and more concise and bullet pointed and it's easier to understand rather than paragraphs. I do like it. It contains the same things that the citizens agree to in the task force and the decisions that they held in the town hall visioning process.

To me, it's important that we have the items there rather than the format. So if everybody likes the bullet point shorter format, and easier to read and look at, I'm fine with that. To me, this -- the vision statement, I know it's just a vision, on and on, but it's the cornerstone of where we want to go and how we want to get this and what we want to do as a city and I think it's very important that citizens agree to that. And that they know what it is that we are trying to do in the future so that they don't look at us and say, what? You know?

It's a plan to sustainability and a plan, a cornerstone so our general plan, the whole thing. So I would be happy. As I said, I'm open to different people's ideas and visions. I'm open to the Vice Mayor's vision statement. I think it was much the same as the one I had, just in a different format and easier to read. Okay. I have Councilwoman Whitehead and then Durham, please.

Councilmember Whitehead: Okay. So I wanted to know if we could do a combination. I liked your first sentence and I liked Councilwoman Littlefield's first sentence. Your first sentence starts off strong but

then I thought the part about -- and I'm sorry, I should have had copies of both. The way Councilwoman Littlefield describes us -- can you read first part of your statement?

[Time: 01:40:19]

Councilmember Littlefield: Scottsdale vision. With an international reputation one of the most desirable places to live and visit in the United States, Scottsdale enjoys a singular position in the valley of the sun. Scottsdale is say vibrant city with charm being look and feel of a much smaller community.

Councilmember Whitehead: So I wonder if we can combine. Those were two sentences but if we took out the second part of that sentence, which says we have a special place but if you could read the first sentence you liked. I'm sorry, mayor. The second part --

Mayor Ortega: I like this because it's a sense of place. It started with a sense of place and not necessarily our international representation. Scottsdale will continue to be an exceptional Sonoran desert experience and the premier southwest tourist deaf nation.

Councilmember Whitehead: So I don't think that gives us the credit we deserve that last little bit. I like -- this is what I'm throwing out. I like -- we are not even a premier -- we are a we are an international destination. So somehow if we can strengthen the second part of that sentence to incorporate some of the words, so I would like to see a hybrid but how we get there that's up to Erin. That's what I propose is a hybrid of the two.

As far as the bullet points. I think what the mayor is suggesting, the community values, the few bullet points cover all the bullet points and I'm fine with making that happen, and if that happens just editing it in but I like the idea that Phoenix is short and I think ours should be short. I think vision statements are very important. It might be the only thing that people read so that's it.

Councilmember Durham: Some of my comments echo from what you are reading from --

Mayor Ortega: Sure.

Councilmember Durham: Not right now. Through email or whatever, circulate both what you are reading from and what Councilwoman Whitehead are reading from, and I also agree with the point about being a premier southwestern destination.

There are many places in here where we are described as a premier southwestern destination. There are other places where we are described as an international destination. I think we should make sure we keep that right and I think it's on the international side. We get cars from Canada every day on the road and we have people from overseas.

So I think we should look for a consistency and a plan on that. And also as a further candidate for deletion, in looking where we could shorten this, I would nominate pages 15 through 19, particularly because on like 18 and 19, we talk about other challenges and aspirations which just in my view, further

confuses what our values and aspirations are. If there's a need to keep what is on 14 to 19 for historical purposes or whatever I would vote to put that into an appendix, but particularly in the language on 16 to 19 echoes what we have already been talking about.

And part of staff's recommendation was to move that to the appendix, yes.

Councilmember Durham: Okay. Good. Thank you.

[Time: 01:44:25]

Mayor Ortega: Conclusions? Vice Mayor.

Vice Mayor Janik: Rule by committee, as far as editing this, is exceedingly difficult, I would like you to recommend how we proceed with these changes so that you can facilitate it.

Erin Perrault: Mayor and council. It sounds like we have some consensus to take up a 2001 version, the 2014 version, and it sounded like agreement on the Vice Mayor's version of a vision statement. We will then collect public input on that and give you an idea of what the public's thinking or could be missing in any of those versions and well and hopefully try to help you craft something.

Councilwoman Milhaven: So we will take forward the most recent CRC vision statement and the new statement that will be the selection of all the comments made here tonight?

Erin Perrault: We would actually test three. The current 2001 vision statement that we have in the plan today, the 2014 version, not the CRC version is what I heard more consensus on this evening. And then what there is a not a lot of change between the CRC and the 2014 version and then the that --

Councilmember Milhaven: Why the 2014 and not the current?

Erin Perrault: Only because I heard more consensus leaning towards that than the CRC version this evening.

Councilmember Milhaven: Okay. I'm confused about what the 2014 version was since I'm looking at the --

Mayor Ortega: Thank you. The 2014 version is -- again it's with Scottsdale will continue to be an exceptional Sonoran desert experience and a premiere international tourist destination. If we just added the word international right there, it would also suffice to cover the intent of the other, you know, intro version of vision. I think at this point, we will move on to land use.

Councilmember Littlefield: I want to lighten it up a little bit tonight.

Mayor Ortega: Good. Good.

Councilmember Littlefield: The reason I really liked this vision was the first sentence about the international reputation of Scottsdale. When I was in Venice, a couple of years ago, and we went down the river and the lake and there was a gentleman sitting next to me in Spain. We were conversing and he asked me where are you from? I said I'm from the United States. I said from Arizona. And he kind of looked at me and didn't know where Arizona was. That was for sure. Oh, you know? Really? And I said, I'm from Scottsdale, the city of Scottsdale. Oh, Scottsdale! They knew what that was.

So we do have an international flavor and an international reputation of who and what we are going forward. I thought that's kind of fun. It brings that international touch, look, feel, out that we do want to keep. We want to keep these people coming here.

Mayor Ortega: Absolutely. Thank you very much. And I had the same experience when we were in the -- the same experience when we were in the Amazon. And there was somebody there from Colombia, who worked in New York City and he told me about Banderas restaurant in Scottsdale and he said that's his favorite place.

We will go on to land use, again using the same system of the staff presentation, questions for staff, if you can note any questions in the presentation, and then continue.

[Off microphone comments]

[Time: 01:48:55]

Councilmember Milhaven: It seemed to me there were other requests for changes that folks made besides the vision statement.

Mayor Ortega: If we missed something --

Councilmember Milhaven: I thought we were going to agree or disagree. So, for example, someone commented that they would like to have prop 420 in there. To me, it depends how it's represented whether I would agree to include it. The because the person made the recommendation. I thought we were going to come back and discuss the recommended changes.

Mayor Ortega: Hmm. Councilwoman Milhaven.
I was thinking that perhaps that's a land use issue that we might get into later, although some things may be mentioned briefly.

Councilmember Milhaven: And you wanted the value to include the township with a low profile and low density. I don't know that I agree with -- I don't know that I agree with that and I certainly don't think that that's the right place for that if that's going to be included in the general plan.

So if we are going to move on -- if we discuss this section and we are going to move on to the next, I don't know if we have consensus on all the changes that were recommended.

Mayor Ortega: I think you are correct that we had not -- did we cover that from a consensus standpoint as to the value of downtown and just respecting some inherent character. If we need to have nods, we can get that and place it in the community.

Councilmember Milhaven: I know we can't take any legal act in the work study, but someone can make pay motion to recommend a change that staff bring back in the next draft, and then we can vote whether or not we bring that back to have clarity.

Mayor Ortega: I agree that the work study is an open conversation but actually what we are doing is we are taking our consent Tuesday from digesting this and then going out to test those suggestions in the community.

So we are not -- we don't need to vote on them before they are tested.
We want to explore those concepts and that's the purpose of our -- of our discussion.

Councilmember Milhaven: Well, I would not be agreeable to test some of those topics. You are agreeing to put it in the plan. So if the majority of us don't think it should go in the plan, we shouldn't test it.

Mayor Ortega: You are correct but maybe --

Councilmember Milhaven: What I'm saying we are moving on before finding out if we have consensus and what I'm saying is before we move on to the next section, let's see where we agree or disagree based open the suggestions that people already made.

[Time: 01:51:53]

Mayor Ortega: Okay. I will repeat my offer to that one of the guiding principles is to respect the character of the old town area as to low profile, low density and a pedestrian character. And if we want to test by discussion in a positive way. Councilwoman Whitehead.

Councilmember Whitehead: I was asked by a citizen to have a character area plan for the -- I think what is called type one downtown in the -- I think -- I think it would take -- I would like to see some verbiage from the staff that would make sense for the general plan where it's more specific as to the boundaries. We want to make sure that the general plan is consistent with what's outside. So if that makes sense. I like the idea.

We want to respect and honor our roots, I think, and got us -- you know the kernel that got us there, but I don't want to put that over a tall building. That's what I'm worried about.

Mayor Ortega: Councilwoman Caputi.

Councilmember Caputi: It's just too vague. We have character area plans that are very different in the Old Town area. That's why I was pushing back with -- I mean, there are 4 square city blocks that are considered actual historical old town and we are trying to preserve that but the downtown area, I would

have to disagree, I don't think there's community consensus that it needs to be low and spread out.

I don't think that's right at all for our downtown and I think a lot of our community would not agree. That the downtown needs to be kept low and spread out. It seems an odd way.

Mayor Ortega: The general plan has shown a downtown area. And the current heights are what can evolve with the ordinance. The recognition of that area is important as to the foundation and the character the Scottsdale and the current heights have been up to quite high. But it's a general character that, that is, height is what made Scottsdale.

It's a generality and it repeats the character and the low profile. Any other comment from somebody if we can generate a consensus. Councilman Durham?

[Time: 01:55:32]

Councilmember Durham: Well, if this is to be one of the community values there on page 12 and 13, correct? There is very little to nothing in the community values about our history and western origins.

This' really nothing else about our view that we are west most western town. I think we need to be specific about which areas are being -- probably be specific about which areas are being considered but it's -- you know, I would certainly consider some language along those lines.

Mayor Ortega: Councilwoman Littlefield.

Councilmember Littlefield: Yes, I would support that. I think we want to keep our history. We want to keep the feel, the look of, it the touch of it if you will. We want to keep the old town character, the density and the profile. I do agree that if we want to go ahead with this, then we should put this into our community values section and add it to the respective character and culture to have the historical respect and desire to continue that so then it will be connective.

Mayor Ortega: Thank you, Vice Mayor Janik, please.

Vice Mayor Janik: I agree with Councilmember Littlefield and Durham I do think -- I know we need a map to show us exactly what we are talking about because it needs to be defined and until it's defined, it's difficult for all of us to say, yeah, that's great.

And I think that many of us would say, fine, if it's limited to the area that Tammy refers to, Councilwoman Caputi, that core. I need to see that. I need to see it on a map. I think it could fit in there, but I need more information on it. Thank you.

Mayor Ortega: Councilwoman Milhaven.

Councilmember Milhaven: I think when we get to community values they are supposed to be really, really broad. If we have to get to a map, while I don't think it needs to be included. In the majority wants

to include it, it's more appropriate in a different place and so if my -- my opinion, if you wanted to strengthen -- I think it makes all the sense in the world to maybe enhance respect character and culture to maybe make a little stronger statement about respecting and preserving our heritage in a broad way, which is consistent with what you are trying to do. And then if you want to get more specific with a map it belongs someplace else in the plan. I don't agree. If you want to do it, that's a better way to do it.

Mayor Ortega: Councilwoman Whitehead.

Councilmember Whitehead: I agree with Councilmember Milhaven just said. No map. Now that I understand it's a broad context, and so I do support the idea and it's -- you know, even if there is a tall building on an area that doesn't mean that we have a plaque and provide that history. And I didn't notice the emission and I'm supportive of it in that regard.

Mayor Ortega: Good. Then I think we have consensus to move forward with testing that in the community and thank you for bringing that to my attention, Councilwoman Milhaven. We will now get to the presentation on land use presentation by staff.

[Time: 01:59:43]

Erin Perrault: Slide 39. Chapter 1 is the character and culture chapter. It includes three elements in the plan, one focused on character and design which is community. The land use element is state mandated and then the arts, culture and creative community element is again created by our citizens and not state mandated. Next slide, please.

So there's an emphasis that's placed in this chapter on the diversity of the character that we find throughout Scottsdale, the quality of define that we have in Scottsdale, the varied lifestyle choices in terms of the character types that we have, and also the land uses and as well as the commitment to the arts that has been added by state, the general plan amendment criteria and then, of course, we have the community created elements that I mentioned previously. Next slide.

You can move forward, please.

So in terms of the lab use element, there are a variety of goals and policies that support those. Again, the little double plus sign indicates that the content that you are seeing in that element is state mandated content that we should have in our general plan. So we have a mix of both. We have content that is state mandated and created by our citizens. Next slide, please.

This is a sampling of the state requirements that we are supposed to have in the plan per the state statute. Next slide. In terms of the element, it has an introduction. Next slide.

It gets into playing out our land uses, the generalized land uses by percentages and then goals and policies and a number of elements.

That one highlighted policy that you see at the bottom, I'm going to mention because we got a lot of

community comments about that. What the Citizen Review Committee did is listen to the comments and edited. It's hard to read from here because it's in light blue but the original intent of that policy was talking about communicating the community in land use discussion.

It was written by the CRC about land use discussions which are neighbor associated and residential and the community comments was the community should be included in all and use discussions and so the CRC did correct that. Next slide, please. Next slide.

So in the land use element not only do we have the general plan amendment criteria but we have land use definitions for each of our land uses designated in the general plan. Staff uses the land use definition and how it's written along with the general plan amendment criteria to determine whether a case would be a major or a nonmajor general plan amendment. I highlighted rural neighborhoods in particular here because we did receive some comments to adjust that language from the community between 2014 and 2020 and the Citizen Review Committee agreed with that adjustment. So I just wanted to point some of that out. The light suggestions are from the Citizen Review members themselves. So as we move forward, it's just those are adjustments for you to consider. Next slide.

In terms of the task force that came out in 2014, the task force decided to compress office use and employment into one category. It doesn't change where the office uses or what types of uses. It relabeled them as part of that process. So one decision point will be do you want to retain office use as labeled in the 2001 plan as office or do you want it to be coupled with the employment category? Again, it doesn't change anything. It's just a labeling factor. Moving forward.

[Time: 02:04:50]

We have the 2001 land use map that we have today, as modified through 2001 by council action. What that means is a minor a major general plan amendment has been taken through and those cases have been provided to you in hey handout this evening.

I'm not going to go through any particular cases bought you do have a listing of those just so you know what has changed since 2001. The draft task force land use plan is on the right and as I said, really there's no change in terms of we're not proposing to change any land uses. The reason being that we looked at the land use mixture that we have today and for a ten-year update, we ran it through our land use analysis model, and it is fiscally sustainable for the next ten years.

The only thing you see different open the right map as opposed to the current general plan map is the compression of recoloring office to a light gray and it being labeled employment instead of office. Next slide, please. In terms of the future land use. We have mapped open space differently than in 2001.

You can see in the little inset on the slide, green circles with white Gs in them. They were to indicate golf courses which are developed open space. Those are now mapped and the white Gs go away on the map. In terms of natural open space, at the general plan level, what we map. The preserve is designated as natural open space from a land use standpoint and the open space element, it certainly designated and shows the preserve.

We also designate open space. And those are mountainous areas or large outcroppings that have been designated as open space. And then the circle designations we actually only have two left but for a long time, the general plan showed what looked like multicolored pie charts and those were to indicate that those particular colors, which represented land uses we're going to be located in that area during our growth phase.

There are two left on the map and those are specific to two cases that have gone through the public hearing process and those were included on the map we have today in the general plan and they are specific to a certain case boundary and so those generalized land uses cannot be placed anywhere in the city.

And then I don't know how many of you know about the resort stars but our 2001 general plan was ratified with the floating resort stars. It indicated that north of deer valley we had a variety of resort stars that indicated we wanted to have the resort land use located up in that year and that was carried through from a general plan from the 1980s.

What we have done, since we had so many cases processed under the resort stars and that land use has been designated, we don't feel the need for the resort stars and we gotten rid of the ambiguity of the plan and where resorts and tourism land uses are designated up north. We very little that addresses our airport in 2001. This time around, there were goals and policies specific to the airport from a land use -- contours map because different development has to take into account the noise contours when they come through the public hearing process. Next slide.

In terms of the map, we aren't proposing as I said to change any land uses and that includes the rural neighborhoods land use. However, we did get quite a bit of the community comment about relooking at rural neighborhoods from two aspects. There are larger lots in rural neighborhoods and right now the density that you can build to under the rural neighborhoods definition is one dwelling unit per -- you can take it out a little while in terms the community and public outreach, but that council at the time decided not to move forward with splitting rural neighborhoods into two different land uses. Next slide.

[Time: 02:10:14]

The idea has come up again, and what that means is anything that would be zoned up north r1-130 or r1-190, the proposal would be to try and keep those large lots preserved at the larger acreages, 5-acres or 3 acres. It would mean if we designated or split rural neighborhoods out into two different land uses that they would have a different amendment process in terms of how we heard it from the community. What they would like to see, they would like to make it a little bit harder from a general plan standpoint to change those large lots into one dwelling unit per acre.

So it would mean changing anyone that had one of those properties would now have a major amendment process, and the difference between those is additional planning commission hearing. It can be only heard one time a year but especially important to a lot of folks is how many votes it takes on council and it would be an additional vote of five and not a simple majority of four. Next slide, please.

It would not change the zoning. What we mocked up you for this evening, showing you what properties exist at that zoning today and what properties would be affected. Next slide. Those properties are all north of deer valley. This is just a zoom in of where they would be located in the community should you pursue this idea. Next slide, please.

The land use acreage result as of today, those dark colored properties if they were desert rural, they make up 6% of the overall acreage citywide. In terms of our two character areas up north, they are about a quarter of each of those character areas. Next slide, please.

Even though they are a quarter of those character areas you can see on this map that about 57% of those properties in those areas are already developed. But 43% are currently not developed. Next slide.

So that ends my presentation for the land use element section. We do still have the major amendment criteria to go through. I wanted to stop here to get some direction from the mayor and the council with regard to land use. Again, it's really a decision point if you want to retain office the way it shows now in the 2001 general plan or combine it as suggested by the task force.

The main reason they suggested combining those was they felt like it was confusing when you call something employment. That means light industrial. Because office also means employment to people. It doesn't change where those office land uses are. And it doesn't change the type of -- change the type of use that can happen on those particular properties and we would need to know whether you want us to take this desert rural idea back out to the community and test it in the community during public outreach again.

Mayor Ortega: Well, thank you very much. We would entertain a first round if we have any questions about the presentation, and then go through that and come back. If we can give direction or a comment on that land use. So let me just start out with Vice Mayor Janik. Any questions or comments back to Erin?

[Off microphone comments]

[Time: 02:14:09]

Vice Mayor Janik: Could you repeat quickly in reference to page where you made the change to the office designation?

Erin Perrault: Sure. I can put it back up on the slides too.

Vice Mayor Janik: Thank you have.

Erin Perrault: Let me see. So it will be slide 49, please. So what the task force did is they combined them all under employment but made a distinction between light industrial employment and office by color coding them as dark gray and light gray on the current -- or the proposed land use map in the draft.

Right now office is pink on the map and not light gray, and now office is a subsection of the employment section. So this is relabeled as employment.

Vice Mayor Janik: Thank you. I think it was a good change to make and I think it organizes two areas that are very similar and then it makes it easier to understand. And in terms of the land use categories, I think we need to go back out and we need to test the desert rural neighborhoods designation, which are the larger acreages and that we would be a major amendment rather than a minor amendment. Thank you.

Mayor Ortega: Councilwoman Caputi?

[Time: 02:16:09]

Councilmember Caputi: Again, I feel like this is a little confusing questions versus comments versus --

Mayor Ortega: If you want to consolidate them.

Councilmember Caputi: It feels a little redundant.

Mayor Ortega: All right. Go ahead.

Councilmember Caputi: Sure. I agree. I'm perfectly fine with the combining of office and employment. That makes total sense to me and not a big deal. I guess I'm okay with asking again how they feel about a desert rural designation. It doesn't designate my own opinion about that, but I'm certainly fine with asking others their opinion. That's the whole point of the general plan to make sure that we reflect what the citizens want. I'm okay with putting it out to ask. One more tiny comment, though. I would want to know how that interferes with private property rights. That does make me a teeny bit nervous that whole desert rural, telling a private property owner that they would not have the right to subdivide or make it smaller.

I don't know how that works legally, but that's probably something we need to think about before we give people the right to vote on it. I don't know if staff needs to answer the question now but I want to throw it out there. It feels like a huge intrusion on a private property right.

If we go out to the community and we ask them to weigh in on it and they say yes, and it can't be done, that feels a little weird. That's my comment.

Mayor Ortega: Thank you. Councilwoman -- sorry, councilman Durham. Go ahead.

Councilmember Durham: I agree with the change in employment and office faces. As long as that does separate out the light -- and -- is there a category for heavier industrial?

Erin Perrault: We don't have any heavy industrial in Scottsdale.

Councilmember Durham: Okay. And I agree on maintenance of the 3 and the 5-acre properties.

Mayor Ortega: Thank you. Councilwoman Littlefield.

[Time: 02:18:28]

Councilmember Littlefield: I agree with councilman Durham. I would like the change, the split and I don't have a problem with office wordage or terminology. I do have a couple of questions, though, Erin, for you. On page 65, we have open space, developed open space, natural open space and then the McDowell Sonoran Preserve was crossed out. Can you tell me why that is no longer part the city landscape? When it should have -- be part of the general plan?

Erin Perrault: So mayor and council --

Councilmember Littlefield: Under open space, it's not there. I mean, it has a line through it on page 65.

Erin Perrault: Oh, yes, the reason that was crossed out is because we -- it is designated as natural open space. So it's combined with that currently. As a land use. It's designated -- it's not identified in our open space element as the preserve and it has a lot of goals and policies related to the preserve and that element as well. But that was the change there. It's already perhaps into the natural open space.

Councilmember Littlefield: Personally, I would rather have it separated. Under 64 land use patterns and this is where I'm having a problem with what we are doing because I had so many individual things going through. Land use patterns help -- help is the verb and that's what their purpose is.

Mayor Ortega: Excuse me, did you have a page number?

Councilmember Littlefield: Page 64. And I support dividing the land use in rural neighborhoods so they have a separate category and major vote as opposed to minor. So that's a good thing. I do agree -- I had a number of questions on goal lu4 on page 69.

They had a bunch of context appropriate land use patterns, support of variety of compatible mobility choices and I guess my question is: Why the cross outs? I mean, we don't support shorter trips? Why did we cross out lu4.3 and promote transportation choices that responds to the community's land use? That seems logical and neighborhood lifestyles.

Again, that seems like an obvious connection there to how we are using the land and how we will get about on it. Downtown may be better for scooters, rather than rural neighborhoods but it seems like that makes sense to me and I don't know why they cut it out. Okay?

Then over on the next page, on 70, attract and retain diverse employment businesses, I assume we want high quality employment businesses. The LUs 6.2, support plan clustered employment centers of healthcare and research and development. Related to similar uses such as healthcare, research and development. I guess the first one is crossed out so you don't have the reputation. Either one is good.

Encourage commercial land uses of similar scale and character: In proximity to. That's fine.

The problem I have with lu6.3 and it's one that we talked about a little bit, it's not definite enough. I have a real problem with allowing commercial land uses, even if they are similar scale and character, in proximity to or within high density -- medium or high residential areas to promote walkable connections. That's too open.

They are probably talking about STRs or things like that, but it doesn't limit what can be put in a residential area as far as commercial development in any way. And I'm sorry, I'm very untrusting when it comes to things like that. I want that limited, whatever it is, the purpose is, I don't want to see a gas station on the corner of my street. And I don't want to have ATVs running up and down the street because there's a store right next door, which is something we do have this Scottsdale, by the way. And I don't want a 7-Eleven on the corner of my street.

I don't have anything against them, but I just don't want commercial development to be able to go inside residential areas with no control on it.

Mayor Ortega: Councilwoman Milhaven.

[Time: 02:24:13]

Councilmember Milhaven: If Councilwoman Littlefield finds 6.3 offensive, we should delete it.

Councilmember Littlefield: Thank you.

Mayor Ortega: Okay, Councilwoman Whitehead.

Councilmember Whitehead: Are we going to go over pages 50 to 62? Yes. Then I will move on to land uses. I agree with a lot of comments and -- that were just said from Councilwoman Littlefield and Councilwoman Milhaven, I'm fine with removing that item. Let's see. Sorry. Okay. Page 69. Again, everything that Councilwoman Littlefield said, it just looks like we tried to quickly go back to 1950 and just make cars king.

So I don't think that was the intent but that's just sort of how it evolved because cars are dominant right now. So lu5.1 encourage a variety of compatible mixed use land uses on major streets, I want to make sure -- here we go. It says -- we want to improve air quality, but they deleted reduce automobiles.

I would say one or the other. I would say put back automobile use and improve air quality. I think that makes a lot of sense there. Okay. Now move over to page 72. I agree with commercial employment, that combination is good for me. The combination there. Okay.

Now page 74. So we have ordinances -- first of all, in a sense this is a marketing document too. I mean, that's what is great about Scottsdale. So we don't want to ever miss an opportunity to sell ourselves for what we are. Under natural open space you have McDowell Sonoran Preserve as if it's

subservient of natural open space.

McDowell Sonoran Preserve is regulated, governed by its own ordinance. So -- and we noticed in the next section, we can develop natural open space, but we can't develop the preserve. So I would say, natural open space should be a category and then the McDowell Sonoran Preserve needs to be its own category because of the ordinance but that's not the only thing great we have done in this state or this city that is really a national leader -- we are a national leader in protecting open space and that's our NAOS ordinance.

So, again, NAOS is not subservient to natural open space. It can't be developed. So NAOS and it's something really fabulous that again, we were just, you know, national, maybe international leaders in that. So those two land categories are governed by ordinances. They need to be their own separate categories there. And I want to say that it saves tax dollars and restores public trust.

Anybody can come to the city, if something is implied in the general plan and ask to do whatever they want. That's their freedom. They can come and say they want to put a Hilton hotel in the preserve. And that costs staff time and the taxpayers a lot of money. And we want to be very, very clear and then we have to say no you can't and then we can be sued. So he with want to be very clear in what can and cannot be done.

If you have a land use that's governed by an ordinance, it should have its own category. Infill incentive district, page 75. It came about because we wanted to incentivize developers. There's not a square inch in this town, I would argue that is not very desirable and we don't have a shortage of people would want to build. I would argue that we should remove the infill incentive district overlay. And with that, I'm at the general -- like I said I do have comments on the character. With we get back to that, but I think I'm good. Thank you.

[Time: 02:29:09]

Mayor Ortega: Well, thank you all. I will wrap up with a few comments as well. First of all, I do agree with the topic of designating office and separate from light industrial. Also, testing the rural desert component, but I also want to at in a couple other comments that are listed in the glossary. We are dealing with the determine one dwelling unit for 190 square feet. So there are three terms in our glossary. One is low density. It's defined as one dwelling community per one or two acres. That's glossary.

The second one is called medium density and there it's defined as less than eight units per acre. And this is riding along through the -- in our general plan. High density is defined as anything over eight units per acre. There's no cap. There's no cap written in it. And we have seen projects proposed with 190 units per acre. Or at the rose garden there was 83 acres, on city property that would be surplussed or whatever. Well, that's ridiculous that we don't have a cap.

The high density, that's named and let's see, light density is 262 and medium density is on page 263 and then the high density, it says a relative determine, usually used to describe development dominated by

multifamily housing or areas of more than eight dwellings units to an acre of land. I definitely recommend that there be some sort of cap or another designation that says ultra high way out of sight, the sky is the limit density which is not adaptable to Scottsdale in my opinion.

So there's a major gap there. I would suggest that we test a cap on that term of high density. And that overrides in all the other discussions as we get into other components of character and so forth. Since the subject was brought up about the infill incentive, I'm also inclined to delete that as far as a term -- it's certainly optional from the council level or actionable, but I would look into that one as well. At this point, could we have a readout on the questions and next part of land use.

[Time: 02:32:19]

Erin Perrault: I heard consensus on moving forward with the combined office and employment. We also -- it sounds like we have enough consensus to take the desert rural out and talk to our citizens about it with regard to that. I don't know that we heard consensus so you may want to test consensus on your infill incentive statements. I think that about covers everything that's come up.

Mayor Ortega: Thank you. And I did recognize the cap limit on high density as a subject.

Erin Perrault: Yes and mayor and council, I will just clarify for the public record, the way it's set up now because of those definitions, when you look at the generalized density that we are supposed to provide per state statutes in the land uses, in the land use element, those are the generalized densities. So right now, rural neighborhoods is one dwelling unit per acre. You can go up to.

And then you have suburban neighborhoods which is two dwelling units up to eight dwelling units and anything over that is the urban -- or suburban is two to eight and anything over eight is the urban. It won't be like an ordinance where you have the specific density caps, but we're just providing the generalized densities to give a definition to the land uses. They are just generalized.

Mayor Ortega: Thank you. I have a comment from Councilmember Milhaven and Durham and Caputi.

Councilmember Milhaven: I would like to understand. So state statutes gives the city to set up infill incentive districts and we have some already. By taking this out, what is the practical implication of taking this out. Does it deprive the city to create districts in the future?

City Attorney Sherry Scott: Mayor?

Mayor Ortega: Attorney Sherry Scott.

City Attorney Sherry Scott: I don't think it will create the right to create an infill district. It's in state statute. I'm nearly positive and I will look to Randy and Erin to correct me that when the city creates the infill incentive district for the downtown, we didn't have this type of designation in the general plan. And I'm getting a nod that that's correct.

We created the infill district without having this type of designation in the general plan. The infill incentive district that's currently in place in the downtown does provide more flexibility in terms of development.

And certainly, if somebody were to bring a proposal through the city council to develop under that type of an infill incentive district, this he would still have to comply with the general plan and the council would have to find that they complied with the general plan before approving that zoning. So I'm not troubled from a legal standpoint with that coming out of the general plan.

Councilmember Milhaven: So it wouldn't -- I'm restating what you just said. So it would not prevent a new council to create a new infill incentive.

City Attorney Sherry Scott: But it has to comply with the general plan.

Councilmember Milhaven: So I see no reason to take it out if the -- if the invention of people to take it out was you can't do it. I think just to let folks know that that is an option is being a little more transparent. Thank you.

Mayor Ortega: Thank you, enter there. Councilmember Durham?

[Off microphone comments]

[Time: 02:36:47]

Councilmember Durham : I didn't have it on, I'm sorry. On page 74, it says that the natural open space category includes the McDowell Sonoran Preserve and this also relates to a comment that Councilmember Littlefield made about including it in the natural area open space and it seems to me that it really shouldn't be included in that category because it is a different type of animal which is not controlled solely by ordinances which can be changed pretty easily, but it's now a different category which is embed in the chart.

So I think at a minimum, the language on page 74 ought to refer to the changes made by Proposition 420. I would rather not have it included as part of the natural open space category because it is legally quite different. It wouldn't be the end of the world if it is included, as long as we specify that it is in a different category all of its own as a result of the charter. Thank you.

Mayor Ortega: Thank you. Councilwoman Caputi, please.

Councilmember Caputi: Just a really quick question for Erin. The one dwelling per unit and more than eight dwellings. Where did that come from? Who decides low density, medium density or high density. What is the thought process do you know what I'm saying? Where does that come from?

Erin Perrault: So mayor and council, it came through the public outreach process for the 2001 general plan. So the general plans that we had before the 2001, almost look like zoning maps. They were very

specific and parcel-based and per the state statutes we needed to roll up categories into more generalized categories.

So it was really the 2001 public outreach process to create that general plan, and communicate consent -- community consensus and that sent it to the voters with regard to what was acceptable of rural neighborhoods, suburban and urban neighborhoods.

[Time: 02:39:30]

Mayor Ortega: Thank you. Councilwoman Whitehead. 20 years ago of what we considered density and what we consider density is different. I support the idea of looking at that high density and coming up -- high density and coming up with different category. On the infill incentive. This is a document about our priorities.

This is a living document, but the question is, do we want to ask the highest quality developers to give us the most or prioritize ways that the developers can pay less? And that's what the infill incentives is all about. Do we want the most out of those who want to come and build in our city or do we want to give them opportunities to pay less?

And if you read the rest of the general plan, it talks a lot about requiring or -- needing more open space, needing higher quality design standards, needing for development to pay for itself. So this document doesn't say a future city council can't change the general plan. I mean, that general plan changes all the time. They are living documents, but I absolutely don't feel that infill incentives are a priority and therefore, they should not be included. The other thing I just -- I do want to touch on something that Councilwoman Caputi said, is the -- and I did go through it. I was the one who talked about the desert category, the desert rural and so we're not telling a developer you can't do something.

We're just making the process such so that it's -- it's a little bit more intensive. And it has a little bit more review. So I met with city attorney Sherry Scott, and so we're not changing somebody's right to build.

Finally, I would like to get a consensus on the land use that -- or the categories, the land use categories because I think it's very, very important. Every single developer that comes to our city talks about the general plan. In is it, guys. And every ordinance follows it. So what we want is to -- we want to protect our taxpayer dollars.

We want to protect our staff time. We want to protect our city by making this document crystal clear. And if a developer wants to change something, believe me, they are not shy. They will come forward and sometimes they have some pretty darn good ideas! But we need this document to be clear.

So I wanted to see if there's a consensus. And Councilmember Durham said now we have a city charter amendment to the preserve but an ordinance is still different from other natural open space. Think it's better to have so many categories and safety nets. So I argue that we should have a natural open space and McDowell Sonoran Preserve category and that should refer to the ordinance that is in place in

addition to the city charter language and then we should have an NAOS category which refers to the ordinance. I wanted to see if there is consensus there.

[Time: 02:43:03]

Mayor Ortega: Hmm. I -- I may need clarification as to whether there is an overlapping overlay of some sort possibility. I don't know if that's the path you are going or a separate category for the acquired McDowell Sonoran Preserve or the boundary of the McDowell Sonoran Preserve to explore that a little bit more. I don't know if I can get some help from staff on that. Do I understand what you are saying? You want a separate category?

Councilmember Whitehead: Yeah, that is a staff question. I think we consider what is acquired. Well, you know, it just -- that is a staff question. The McDowell Sonoran Preserve is governed by different rules and laws than natural open space. So it needs to have its own category and same with NAOS, they are just governed different and they are not developable and then should not be under a category where there is an option to develop. It just -- it makes it unclear, and it makes it cumbersome for staff to explain it to every developer that comes forward.

Mayor Ortega: I would -- I think I hear that. There are specific rules that are separate for staying on trails even bow hunting other things that have to be harvested in the preserve, that's at the ordinance and rulemaking level, perhaps it's also at an ordinance level and maybe not -- it doesn't have to be covered here but if you want to explore that question, bring that back, we can in the next work study get a clarification on that.

Councilmember Whitehead: I guess I would like to see if there is a consensus. The general plan dictates what our ordinances how we write our ordinances and so I feel like it's fun we have these ordinances written and it's like character area plans as if we organized the historic downtown in the same character area plan as a high density development. That wouldn't make sense. So I want to keep separate -- the entities separate. I would like to see what people's thoughts are on that.

Vice Mayor Janik: Can I briefly? So you are looking at page 76, am I correct?

Councilmember Whitehead: 74.

Vice Mayor Janik: Is the grid that says the change in land use category?

Councilmember Whitehead: No, uh-uh.

Vice Mayor Janik: Shouldn't the land use categories reflect what you are requesting as well?

Councilmember Whitehead: These two categories should not be in the table because they are not developable. We need to be clear on what is in the natural open space.

Vice Mayor Janik: That's what I wanted a clarification on. Thank you.

Mayor Ortega: I'm looking at the McDowell Sonoran preserve, it's protecting wildlife, et cetera. It is defined as a -- as an area, but as far as the zoning is there another comment of how that could be included, Erin, in --

Erin Perrault: So mayor and council from a preserve standpoint. We show anything that has been purchased in the preserve currently and that's designated as natural area, open space. When you look at -- on page 74, at the very end of the land use definitions in terms of the open space categories, the last sentence says preserve land will remain as permanent open space with limited permanent construction.

Which is -- it mirrors some of which has been added to the charter as well, because there's discussion in the preserve ordinance about what that limited permanent construction can be. So that was the intent. That's carried over from 2001. So that's how the preserve is handled now.

In the open space, the full preserve boundary is shown in terms of what the ideal purchase area would be so that we do represent both at a general plan level currently with regard to the preserve. We do not currently represent NAOS, the tract NAOS, that's an ordinance level detail.

The only other NAOS, as indicated on the general plan map are those large outcroppings right now in terms of the boulders area that we want to see preserved or the mountainous areas they are not part of the McDowell Sonoran Preserve.

Mayor Ortega: Councilwoman Whitehead, please.

Councilmember Whitehead: I was hoping to hear from some of the others. Again in the 2001 -- what I remember is McDowell Sonoran Preserve is a separate category. This is having it move over a little bit to the left and suddenly you change the entire meaning of that table a couple of pages forward. When the 2001 document was written, there was no NAOS, am I correct on that? Now we have this NAOS which my point is you have a label that tells a developer how to develop land. So it's really best to not include in that table any land that can't be developed. Because that adds -- that adds a possibility of a lawsuit. It adds -- so I guess I would like to hear from the others if there's some agreement on that.

That one I -- as people might be able to tell, I feel pretty strongly about, just -- I don't think there's -- I see no downside risk in categorizing land uses in further detail rather than lumping them together but I see downside risk in lumping things together that don't -- that aren't exactly the same thing. You know?

[Time: 02:49:47]

Vice Mayor Janik: I agree with that.

Mayor Ortega: And allow me to ask staff. So I will ask our development director, Randy grant on that for a comment. He may be muted at his station. So perhaps -- Randy grant is down below at the base of the stairs.

Development Director Randy Grant: There we go. Natural area open space is really a term of art relative to the environmentally sensitive lands ordinance.

And as such it can be dedicated in tracks or on lot. It would be very, very difficult to try to predict where NAOS is going to go and it would be difficult to map on a scale once it does get dedicated. There are protections about when it can be released and what it can be released for and that time of thing.

We don't have wholesale release of natural area open space but on lot open space, it's not uncommon for a property owner to come in and say -- it couldn't have been predicted when the subdivision was done and so I will dedicate NAOS over here and release it over here. I think we would want that kind of flexibility.

But open preserve -- preserve open space is really different than natural area open space, and I -- natural area open space is very valuable but I don't know if we can categorize it and map it as such. It would be very difficult to do it that.

Mayor Ortega: Councilwoman Littlefield, please.

[Time: 02:51:33]

Councilmember Littlefield: On 74, I would like to see the McDowell Sonoran Preserve paragraph moved over to a line with developed open space and natural open space so that it gives the idea that it's a separate category there and is not subservient to natural open space. That's one thing. I'm in favor of doing away with the infill incentive. We could if we -- you know if we decided we wanted to but it doesn't make it so that it looks like it's a -- a normal thing that the city would do in the normal course of business. It isn't.

It's something that would be abnormal and would have to have separate discussion and separate meetings and go from there. I'm not doing this to say it can't be considered in Scottsdale. I don't think we can do that. But I'm saying let's not just put it down as one the obvious alternatives of land use, because it would be -- it's not one we would actively look for. As far as the change in land use category, a, I would like to have rural neighborhoods divided into two categories. One would be 1 to 2 acres and everything necessary that category over 2 acre or more. And the 2 acres or more would be a major general plan amendment. And smaller areas could be minor on A. So -- AA. So if you will -- so that's one the things I would like to see. Also I had a question on the very bottom of page 76. There's a paragraph down there that is totally done in. Why was that erased?

Erin Perrault: Mayor and council, you can see two deletions on page 76. The task force had entertained the idea of including the McDowell Sonoran Preserve in the land use matrix, and then decided better not to because it's protected differently under city ordinance -- well, at the time under a city ordinance and now also additionally in the charter since then. So that was removed from the land use matrix that you see. And what was accompanied -- because that was removed from the land use matrix, that went along with it, be so we just took out the reference to it as well.

Councilmember Littlefield: Oh, okay. If that's what the consensus is of the council, I'm fine with removing it but I think it should be set up in such a way that it shows on the matrix, its not going to be developed in any way shape or form any way, anyhow except for the gateway-type things, you know? things that are allowed. So maybe just take it out. Maybe that's the easiest way to do it. I don't know. Also, that's the same kind of thing. And the circles, we talked about the circles.

If -- you know, I think I'm pretty good here on the rest of this. I think I would -- on the bottom of page 78, the change greater than 10 acres gross in the general plan cat Gory to cultural institutional or public use in a municipal or nonprofit cultural facility, that's not adjacent to rural or suburban neighborhoods. Can you go into what the thinking was on that last paragraph or bullet point?

Erin Perrault: Mayor and council, we are now into the major general plan amendment section. I have a few slides if you want me to move forward to that, but I can answer that question as part of it.

Councilmember Littlefield: Okay. Thank you.

[Time: 02:55:43]

Mayor Ortega: Then I did hear that Councilwoman Whitehead asked for a consensus. I think that several of us want more information. That's my opinion, that we have to get that information for perhaps the next work study, but in order -- unless it can be clarified for me more, I don't think that it's a practical -- we know NAOS is just like cut in stone and it's perpetual easement practically, until it gets relinquished. So it let me say that I'm not very clear on that as far as having a consensus.

Councilmember Milhaven: I have no objection to making it a separate category, even if there they are similar or the same or it gives my colleague some comfort that it recognizes a special preserve. I have no objection to making it a separate category.

Vice Mayor Janik: I also concur that the McDowell Sonoran Preserve belongs as its own category and I think we should remove infill incentive plan. I do believe that we need to separate the rural neighborhoods into a desert rural and rural neighborhood based on the acreage that that should be a separate category for land use. I concur with councilwoman Littlefield on that. Thank you.

Mayor Ortega: I will go it's not necessarily a NAOS. We will continue with another land use element, after a five-minute break. Let's do a stretch or whatever, and we are still in session but let's just take a short recess.

[Break]

Mayor Ortega: Okay, mayor and council, we are resuming our work study. And February 9th, and continue with the presentation on land use. Thank you, Erin.

Erin Perrault: Next slide, please. So per state statute requirements, the general plan is amendable. And

each municipality is allowed to establish their own criteria for how that amendment occurs. So criteria will look different from community to community throughout the state. And the criteria defines really what constitutes a process, either it's a major general plan amendment process or a minor general plan amendment process. Next slide, please.

[Time: 02:59:51]

I know I touched on this earlier in the land use, but the difference really is that a major general plan amendment can only be heard one time a year in the same calendar year that the application is made to the city. It requires an additional planning commission hearing. It requires an additional vote on council to be approved and we are also required to do enhanced notification to our surrounding jurisdictions who also get to weigh in from a public input standpoint on those major amendments. Next slide, please.

What do our amendment criteria do? They are set up to do a variety of things but to simplify it down, really it's set up currently with the land use matrix to help protect residential areas from increases in intensity and density. It's set up to go the other way and protect our economic engines from decreasing or being eroded as well. It certainly, again, qualifies what the process would be and in each case, you have to be proposing a change in general plan and use. Next slide, please.

So when we get into the July draft general plan, this land use matrix currently as set up does the same as the 2001 general plan matrix does. So how we have been processing cases to date is similar to what is being proposed this was the task force proposal and then the Citizen Review Committee retained that.

So I know there are a few thoughts on what should be in this land use category matrix moving forward, but simply put if you are changing from one land use category to another, there's a -- category to another, there's a process you will have to go through, either minor or major and it doesn't matter what size parcel you are, that land use change will have some sort of process to it.

The second criteria -- and I should mention the first four criteria all are in the 2001 general plan and have been brought forward both by the task force and the Citizen Review Committee to be retained. So the second criteria is -- go ahead and move forward the slide for me. Oh, keep going. Sorry.

In terms of the land use matrix, back one slide, please. In terms of the land use matrix, although I said they similar in how they would process minor and major amendments 2001 to the current draft in front of you, there are a couple of changes. One that seems to be a consensus on council already is the combination of the office and employment.

So you would see that happening on the right in the land use matrix, and then the other thing that's been deleted is category d and the 2001 general plan, they are all listed as like minor commercial, minor office, but gone of those land uses listed like that in this matrix were ever designated on the map. So we don't have specific locations for those on the map and the task force recognized this as did the CRC.

So the recommendation was just to delete that and do straight out commercial employment as you see on the right. Next slide, please.

The second criteria. What you are looking at on the left is the acreage criteria. Could you trigger a major amendment even if you have a -- even if you are a minor amendment under the first, you could be a major on the second criteria.

So currently anything south, generally of the cap canal or in areas A and B that are notated in white on the left map, it's 10 acres triggers a major amendment. North of that or the yellow areas on the left of the screen are 15 acres currently.

The draft general plan in the task force discussions and citizenry view discussions about it -- citizen review discussions about that maintain the task force proposal is to do 10 acres citywide moving forward and I think behind that from the citizen standpoint was that as we reach out a buildout community, we should be discussing those land use changes even more and they were looking to have that 10 acres city wide. So that's a little less flexible than what it is today. That looks like this is just graphically representing.

[Time: 03:05:00]

So the red and green on the left or the 10 and 15-acre parcels that we have in the city currently. The middle graphic shows those properties that would now go from 15 to 10 acres and then what you are seeing is all properties that that could potentially affect citywide. In terms of that acreage criteria as I said, each city gets to decide what their criteria is.

We are much more on the conservative end of things when it comes to looking at acreage triggering a major. We are similar to Cave Creek in had changing to 10 acres citywide and the only other conservative one is carefree at 5 acres. Moving forward.

Since the 2001 general plan was ratified, we have had 147 amendment applications 30 of those have been major amendments. Or 68 have been nonmajor amendments. Two have been denied in terms of the major level and one nonmajor has been denied. What the general plan does is behind the scenes it works in terms and ways that the citizens hoped it would. Most do not make it to the light of day because they are not in conformance with the general plan, or what they are proposing is far afield of the general plan.

In terms of the criteria, number one in terms of that land use catches a lot of major amendment criteria, and then number two, backing that up does. So we have never had a major amendment be determined based on criteria 3 or 4, which I will get to in a second. Criteria one or two have been very strong in determining those major amendments for the community. And have been carried forward into the graft plan today. Next slide. -- the draft plan today. Next slide.

Criteria 3 and 4, criteria 3 is based on the Clark areas that we have -- character areas we have adopted in the city and if a land use change was against what the goals and policies in those character area plans are, then it could be deemed a major amendment. In addition, we look at water and wastewater infrastructure for criteria 4.

In terms if there was a premature upsizing, that the city would have to do, it could trigger a major amendment. Again, we have not had any cases triggered by either criteria 3 or 4 since 2001. Go back one slide, please. It's hard to see from here, sorry.

In moving forward, through the task force, added three new criteria to the amendment criteria section of the general plan. The first one is really looking forward if anyone wanted to change the criteria itself, that would constitute a major amendment. The general plan is violent on that currently. We don't have any protections in there like that currently.

In addition under number five, if anyone came in to propose changing the land use densities or definitions of the land uses, which staff again uses in conjunction with the criteria to determine a major amendment, that would also trigger a major amendment. So we don't have that protection in the general plan either.

In terms of number six we have growth areas that we will get to in future sections and future meetings in terms of discussion, but with regard to those growth areas, next slide, please. You can see that we have three. The one is the airpark area and then the old town area and the McDowell corridor areas. In terms of what the task force proposed is to retain those three growth areas in the city, but if in the future, anyone wanted to propose a new growth area, that would go through a major amendment process. We do not have that protection in the general plan currently either.

[Time: 03:10:01]

And then moving forward, there's been a lot of talk about this already, in terms of the overlay sections. With regard to the infill incentive district overlay, that discussion, the -- the last infill incentive district that was in downtown was in 2010. So it was a lot of the task force members between 2012 and 2014.

So they wanted to include something at a general plan level, because it's a separate state statutes that allows the city to go through the process of designating an infill incentive district and what they wanted to ensure is that in the future, rather than a simple majority of council being able to designate an infill incentive district, they wanted to add that to the general plan to add another layer, meaning an additional vote would need to be made to designate the infill district. I know we have discussed that a lot already this evening.

And then finally we have some flexibility in the general plan and that includes really areas where we might want to encourage certain types of land uses. So in the airpark, the 2001 general plan has a designation called the regional use overlay. And what it means is if there's a large use, maybe a university or something like that, that the city is really attempting to attract or wanting to attract to the area, that it could be deemed a minor amendment versus a major amendment to allow for some of that flexibility for opportunities that come up for that specific area only. It couldn't be used anywhere else but in the airpark.

In addition, when the 2001 general plan was drafted, prior to that, the shape character area plan was

already developed by our citizens in that area and that character plan had flexibility basically from Hayden road east to our city boundary, and then around the Mayo district. And what that allows is for different -- only for specific types of land uses would flexibility be considered between a minor and a major amendment.

And so what's been brought over by the task force is maintaining that flexibility from the 2001 general plan to the current amendment criteria. Again, those are very area specific and that flexibility cannot be used anywhere in the city except those specific areas. Moving forward? So in terms of this section of the land use element, what we would be looking for in terms of direction is, you know, head nods to maintaining the four amendment criteria that we currently have in the 2001 plan, whether you want to bring those forward or not.

There are some suggested public edits that are in the draft document for you to consider. And then we would look for some direction on the 10 and 15-acre versus 10-acre suggestion that the draft plan has. That's criteria two. We would also look for any direction you have on criteria 5 through 7. And any of those exceptions that have been brought over from 2001, and that includes regional use overlay, the Shea corridor and the Mayo Clinic area. That are very geographic specific. Thank you.

Mayor Ortega: We will now ask staff any question and weigh in on the matters that are posted here and on the slide. I will start with Vice Mayor Janik.

[Time: 03:13:56]

Vice Mayor Janik: First of all, thank you, Erin. You did a very good job explaining those edits. And by and large, I think most of those edits are very good edits. Calling for 10 acres versus 15, I think is a very good citywide change. And as I look at the rest of them, I think most of them are very positive changes to the general plan. So thank you.

Mayor Ortega: Thank you. Councilwoman Caputi, please.

Councilmember Caputi: Okay. That's a long list. Aim okay with the regular four amendment criteria. I agree with going to 10 acres citywide makes sense. The language on numbers 5 to 7 look okay to me. Exceptions to major amendment, yep, and I'm okay with the overlays as well. You can circle back to me but for the moment, I'm okay with the suggested changes.

Mayor Ortega: Councilman Durham.

Councilmember Durham: Thank you for the explanation. It really helps to understand. I think I'm okay with everything here. Now with your explanation, I will go over this more carefully so I reserve the right to make objection at a later point, but I think as I understand everything, it looks fine with me.

Erin Perrault: And just for clarity, mayor and council, I'm looking for direction to basically take this content out to the public. I'm not looking for your final answer tonight.

Mayor Ortega: Good. Councilwoman Littlefield, please.

Councilmember Littlefield: Definitely like the change of criteria to 10 acres from 15, that's good. The other things I don't have an issue with at the moment, I will be interested to see what the citizens say when they come back. I had -- I'm pretty happy with it, the way it's going. So let's see what they say and go from there.

Again, just watch the wordage as we discussed earlier and change all of those that are weak and don't really say anything. That's basically it. I'm pretty fine with it. But okay. Okay, okay.

Mayor Ortega: Councilmember Milhaven.

Councilmember Milhaven: I have no additional comments. Thank you.

Mayor Ortega: Councilmember Whitehead?

[Time: 03:16:46]

Councilmember Whitehead: Well, thank you, mayor. I have a few comments. On the table, the change in land use category, and everybody receives a handout. So the reason I think these first chapters are so important is that it dictates whether or not we meet our goals and -- our goals and objectives in the whole rest of the document.

So, for instance, on page 90, 92, and 93, just to give you three examples, we stress that not only do we have to preserve everybody bit of open space we have, but we have to expand open space. So the best way to do that is to start by not losing open space. And then work on trying to get more open space.

So with that in mind, we should make it very, very clear back to the subject, which open space can be developed into houses and which cannot? So I spent a lot of time with Erin. Erin, thank you so much for your time. Also thank you for clarifying. We hadn't talked about that. So that was a good clarification.

So what Erin recommended in any conversations with her is -- so natural open space, we pulled the preserve out and we'll talk NAOS another meeting but there's a whole lot in natural open space. And I will give you a couple of examples. Well, I will give you one example. I negotiated very hard nor open space in a -- for open space in a project downtown. So that project when it's built has 30% of land that's -- that will be public open space.

Now, five years from now -- and that was in exchange for height. That was just how the negotiation went. If five years from now the developer comes back and says I would like to develop this land, we don't really have a mechanism to stop that. What Erin recommended is that we add definitions and so the definitions that I would like to propose -- and I would like the public to see this because the public is very sensitive about this.

So we have natural open space, developed open space and public use buildings. So I'm -- but for the natural open space and the developed open space, I would like to have the definition state that we don't

develop parks. Designated parks. I would like to state that we don't that land that has been negotiated as part of open space, that can't be developed. I'm looking for my notes and I'm sorry. And I would like to further the discussion.

Maybe this is where we NAOS, you can build houses new don't develop this land. There's two different categories. There's the non-private NAOS and private but we need definitions. If we as a city say you can build here, if you preserve this land, we better hang on to that. So any private or public land that's designated as open space is part of an approved zoning case. Any public land leased by the city of Scottsdale, this has come up recently where there's natural open space and the city that has some deed restrictions, the city leases it and then develops it for private use. I'm a little uncomfortable with that. I think we need to have a better definition on what we can and cannot do. And any land that is designated as a trail or a public trail, public path.

So I think those are categories that are in the definition. They are not developable. But then there's still plenty of -- there's a lot of land, public and private that could be developed, and I would propose that we certainly public buildings, public -- public open space. I think it should be a major general plan amendment, any time we want to change those precious designations, those designations that give our city value. I would like to see those become major.

And then with the two desert rural versus rural, that changes the table as well because then the desert rule becomes rural is a major. Those are my changes there. Everybody was happy with the 10-acre as was I. There's something for contemplation. Since we have gotten far more dense downtown and this is similar to what the mayor was saying, do we want to reduce the downtown acreage for major general plan amendment?

I'm just throwing it out there like 5 acres because with every acre we are adding so much more density. So that -- I just thought that's something for consideration. So 10 acres north and then reduce it further downtown? I'm open to that. I think I'm done. I'm done.

Mayor Ortega: Thank you. And I will go back to Councilmember Milhaven.

[Time: 03:22:51]

Councilmember Milhaven: Thank you. I just want to clarify, because I think Councilwoman Whitehead said about something is not developable. As I understand it, unless someone is willing to deed restrict their property themselves, we can't impose and say you can never develop but we can put hurdles in place that say here's the hurdles you have to meet in order to get -- so -- because property owners have a right to petition their government to change their uses.

So I don't -- so we don't have the right to say you can never, ever, do anything with this property, but we can put in hurdles to say if you want to do something, you have to come ask us and we will make it a really high bar.

City Attorney Sherry Scott: Mayor, Sherry Scott from the legal department. Yes, I think that's a fair

statement, that the city can certainly designate the preserve land and city parks and say that this -- this is not something that the city is going to look towards developing. But when you are dealing with private property, you put the land use designations on there, we would never put a preserve land use designation on property that's not in the preserve, just by way example because that owner still has a right to use that property.

And then you are looking at the various land use designations to determine what type of zoning they could bring forward to the city council if they did want to develop under their current land use designations and, of course, there's always the process for' minor or major general plan amendment, if the general plan needed to change in order for them to bring their process forward, their application forward.

Councilmember Milhaven: Thank you.

Councilmember Whitehead: May I speak to that real quickly. Thank you, Councilwoman Milhaven. Yes, I don't want to -- perhaps my ideas should be vetted through legal, but -- and it -- and the case that I was talking about does have deed restrictions. So maybe that's what the council needs to understand when we do negotiate open space, what do we need to do in order to -- to protect public land that we are promising to the public and have the definitions reflect it. I will continue to work with legal on that.

[Time: 03:25:13]

Mayor Ortega: Thank you. Everyone has weighed in and I will weigh in now. I concur with bringing these criteria forward. The other mention I will make is that when we worked on the general plan 2001, we had provided some flexibility and then expected that something could evolve over time, and in some cases such as the Shea corridor it really hasn't regardless of whether it was an exception or not.

Most the decisions were made as to whether or not land can be assembled. So if there's multiple properties and somehow the scope of the project gets larger because the developer or developers are able to subscribe to one project and maybe make a major improvement. So I do see the value of having the exceptions that are in the criteria now. As to generally some of the comments that Councilwoman Whitehead had, I don't know as to form if it's better to handle some of these issues in a glossary definition of what -- so there's an opportunity there in the general plan glossary.

There's also an opportunity in the ordinance -- ordinance glossary and I just say that by those definitions and I know we are not -- that's why I'm a little picky about that and whether or not it may be easier to handle such a question with a term in the glossary and -- and be able to handle it that way. Especially if it's a new -- a new criteria. I think I read the consensus, move forward with these -- with these topics. And at this time -- yes, go ahead, councilwoman.

Councilmember Littlefield: Thank you, mayor. I just had a question, I came it across after I spoke.

Mayor Ortega: Sure.

Councilmember Littlefield: On page 78, this is really for Erin. There is a bullet point that says, if a project applicant wishes to appeal the designation of -- the planning and development director or the position equivalent will make a major amendment process determination. Shouldn't that, council that would make that determination?

Erin Perrault: So mayor and council, that is a carryover from 2001 general plan. So we currently have it written as that, in the 2001 general plan. That's certainly something you could consider looking at as part of this update process.

Councilmember Littlefield: I think I would like to do that, make that update a possibility for discussion later on.

Vice Mayor Janik: I would agree with that.

[Time: 03:28:18]

Mayor Ortega: I might ask for a clarification, legally whether or not -- typically when there's an appeal, it may go to superior court or could go to another jurisdiction. Perhaps I'm speaking out of turn here, but isn't there a separate process that moves on to the county level? Please Ms. Scott.

City Attorney Sherry Scott: Mayor, thank you. So typically when you are looking at a land use process that's been placed in your zoning ordinance or your general plan, it's going to be an administrative decision by the zoning order -- the zoning administrator or other appropriately designated staff to make that decision as it moves forward.

It would be a very awkward process to come before council at a preapplication process whether there's very little known about the project to ask the council do you think this is a major or minor general plan amendment? The council always has the ability to turn down the case that is coming forward to them and that's the policy decision that council gets to make, but when we are looking at procedural questions under the ordinance or under the general plan, I do think that that is best left to the zoning administrator or another member of the planning department.

Typically, to more directly answer your question, mayor, if -- if the zoning administrator is making an interpretation or a decision that the member of public disagrees with, it will go to the board of adjustment then for a hearing. They have a certain period of time to take that to the board of adjustment.

The board of adjustment sets a quasi judicial board and so it's not politically lobbied in any way, and then if the applicant or the city is unhappy with the board of adjustment's decision, it could be appealed on up to superior court. If for some reason we thought it didn't fall into that process then I suppose somebody could directly challenge the zoning administrator's decision or the plan ago -- the chief planning officer's decision and go directly to superior court.

It just doesn't seem like the kind of decision to me and I will spend some more time thinking about it

that would be appropriate for a legislative body.

[Time: 03:31:10]

Councilmember Littlefield: We are making these decisions on land use and qualifications of land for various and assorted types of changes. That seems to be one of the those changes that we would be allowing and so it would fall under the same kind of general category.

Just because a developer says I don't -- I don't like what you decided over here, guys, I'm going to fuss and make it somebody -- somebody else make that decision because I don't want to go back to the council.

City Attorney Sherry Scott: If I could just give you an example of what we have explained to past councils. In situations where the council disagreed with the zoning administrator decision and possibly disagreed with what the board of adjustment did with that zoning administrator decision at the hearing level, the council always has the ability to change the zoning ordinance.

So if the council is frustrated with a zoning ordinance interpretation, they think that the planning department got it wrong or the board of adjustment got it wrong, the solution for the council -- and it may not help you in that one particular case but moving into the future is to clarify the ordinance itself or in this case initiate a general plan amendment and clarify the text of the general plan if you think that the intent of the general plan is not being carried out.

That's the ultimate remedy that council has but once the council acts and has a document, that the voters have ratified, it -- it -- the council is really not in a place to administer that document. You have to have somebody on staff that's administering those decisions and then a process in place if there's a disagreement.

So if the council really wanted to spend more time on that item, it I think what we would do is think about, is there a process? Some kind of appeal process or hearing that we could use instead if there was a disagreement? Again, that gets tricky, because council will be acting in a quasi judicial role if they engaged in that sort of process. Yeah.

And you could have already been receiving comments from various parties before that ever gets going, and that becomes very difficult to undo. Right?

Councilmember Littlefield: Thank you.

Mayor Ortega: Thank you. Councilman Durham, please.

Councilmember Durham: Who makes the original designation of whether or not it's a general plan, major amendment? Is that someone lower than the planning and development director?

Erin Perrault: Mayor and council, it's typically city staff in conjunction with Randy's position. So, yes.

And it's based, again, on what's in the general plan. So those land use definitions and all of the criteria that we have been discussing this evening.

[Time: 03:34:26]

Councilmember Durham: Yes, it seems a little weird that if the planning and development director is involved in the additional decision, that the appeal is made to him or her. It's getting to review your own decision.

Mayor Ortega: Back to legal for a second. Thank you, Ms. Scott.

City Attorney Sherry Scott: Let me clarify and maybe you already understood this, that part of the general plan, you could change. You could designate somebody else some or member of staff. That would be outside of the regular course, but still somebody charged with administering the -- the ordinances and the general plan that the council passes. So you could -- you could consider that.

Mayor Ortega: Thank you. And Ms. Perreault, I would just conclude the topic with just a quick -- I think we have direction on this, consensus, could you just say do we have minimal public comment on these particular issues on this section? And then move on.

Erin Perrault: Yes, we haven't had a lot of public comment on this section.

Mayor Ortega: Okay. Thank you. So continuing with the presentation. Ms. Perreault.

Erin Perrault: So the next portion is the character and design element, next slide. Next slide. So in terms of the character and design element, we have character types in here. It's just a general idea of what types of land uses, how they might be designed and what they might look like. They are included in this portion of the general plan. Again, this is not state mandated.

This is something that our community wanted as part of the 2001 general plan process, and that element has been brought forward through the task force and CRC processes. What you see highlighted with regard to some of the text on those pages -- and I'm going to shift to my pages so I can read them to you. But what is highlighted there in terms of character and culture include some discussion that the CRC had with regard to what the that is being force tried to do back in 2014.

What the task force tried to respond to were public comments at that time, about providing some kind of guidance to height in the community. Recognizing that they were some folks that would like to see our general plan and prescribe height, which we cannot do, the task force had proposed just providing generalized heights oranges of heights by character type to give the community an idea of what the look and feel and height of areas would be.

Now, it wouldn't be a regulatory piece as it was set up. What the CRC did, just this past 2020, is during their process, they actually decided to edit out those generalized heights and just use references to -- so we heard a little bit of both from the community in terms of support for that editing out of the height

and we have also heard that some people would like to see that put back into the draft plan. So that's one key area of consideration for you. Moving forward. On the next slide.

There was some discussion on this particular slide with regard to the language that the Citizen Review Committee had proposed to edit out. And what that is, is they are bullets that further help describe the rural character type. Those bullets directly come from the two desert and dynamite foothills area. The reason why they struck through those bullets they recognized that we have rural neighborhoods that aren't in the desert and dynamite foothills area.

We do have some in central and some south just south of Downtown there's some pocks as well. So rather than, you know, keep it to just those bullets that really represent just the northern rural character, they back those out of the plan. It doesn't mean that they are in the character plan. That content is still in the character plans. Next slide.

We does hear some comments with regard to the CD 1.2 and CD 1.4. We had some community comments about some of the changes there that the Citizen Review Committee made, and the community comments were really to restore the original language that was there.

The community liked seeing more the specificity that the original language included building height, overall density and building orientation in CD 1.2 and then massing as well recognizing that massing and density are two different things. So we did hear that from the community. We also heard that from a couple of councilmembers as well. So something for you to consider there. Next slide, please. In. Slide -- next slide.

In terms of the bottom right of the slide, there was a deletion that the Citizen Review Committee made. It was text that had been proposed since the 2014 task force. It didn't get lost completely. What the Citizen Review Committee trying to do is combine the text at the bottom, the last policy there, and they combined it with CD 7.3.

So it included celebrate southwestern and western museum art, both citywide and within historic old town. We have heard since then from the public that they would like to see historic old town separated back out and that original policy that had been proposed prior to the CRC edits westbound restored. So we did hear -- be restored. So we heard quite a few comments on that one.

[Time: 03:41:41]

And then moving forward, really the last piece to discuss is the character areas. So in the 2001 general plan, we actually were very ambitious as a community thinking that we would get about 22 character areas through a public outreach process and adopted by council.

To date, we have seven adopted character areas and, you know, they are very special parts of the community to a lot of our citizens. And so recognizing is that during the 2014 task force, we took out the original 22 character area map to the community. We actually did some design so the community had them writing on the maps of where they would like to see some of those character areas condensed

down and what that made sense to them.

And so what you see in this draft plan are, first, of course, we identify the adopted character areas and those are all identified and gray with their specific boundaries on the main map on the right. The inset map are those either combined character areas and when I say combined, it's not to lose the original intent of some of the character areas, especially up north, but at the time when the citizens discussed it, they recognized that there was a big hole that didn't have a character area, for example, between desert and dynamite hills boundaries and they wanted to see that covered by both of those, so expanding those boundaries out to cover that hole in the middle, for example.

In the Shea character area, we currently have two character areas that were established before the 2001 general plan and incorporated into the plan. The community actually sees four distinct areas that you can see on that inset map. So they would like to see character further defined in that area. So what we ended up with in terms of a draft plan is, of course, maintaining our seven adopted character areas, and then proposing eight future ones to be looked at.

Now, when we either modify a character area or designate a new one, what we need to do is do a full outreach and public hearing process and then as a council decision -- a council-level decision to designate that area or not or tweak the boundary and/or designation that's being proposed. So none of the current adopted ones would be changed by including this in the general plan. It's just kind of showing the community where future character area processes may happen on that inset map. Last slide, please.

And then these maps just recognize really a couple of cleanups or updates on the map. What you see on the left is the streetscapes map, as well as the different character types. What you are looking at is circles in green on the right is around the Shea medical campus and around Scottsdale road and Shea. We have identified those as now urban in character type area because they have developed out as that over time since 2001. So really, it's just reflecting what is currently on the ground today in those two areas. Next slide, please.

And then updating the streetscapes map to also include that cleanup and showing the different types of streetscapes we have in those areas as well. So, again, just updating to today's standards. And that concludes that part of the presentation.

Mayor Ortega: Thank you very much. And these are the summary of the consensus that are being requested or discussion. Let's start with Vice Mayor Janik. Any comments on those particular --

[Time: 03:46:05]

Vice Mayor Janik: Under the character types, did I understand you to say that it was ill advised to design the number of stories or how tall? Or it was a suggestion to go to more general terms?

Erin Perrault: Mayor and council, from the Citizen Review Committee standpoint, their general thought was to retract the generalized number of stories and go back to much more generalized terminology to

taller, medium height, that type of motivation.

Vice Mayor Janik: Did you get much public input on that?

Erin Perrault: We had mixed public input. They wanted a generalized heights from the general plan standpoint.

Vice Mayor Janik: Okay. I think I would prefer to keep that generalized height and let's bring it out to the community again to see where they are. And if you could go back to the previous slide, I would appreciate it. I'm fine with the character areas. CD-1.2, CD 1.4. I think that it is advisable to restore that language in 1.2, 1.4. And 7.5 but let me go back to that. Yeah. Restore building height. Yes, restore that. 1.4.

Again, I think that goes back to more definitive in our language, encourage and include massing. So I would agree with that and then 7.5. I do think it's -- we should restore 7.5 with the designation of old town. That's a separate goal. And I think that's it. Yeah. Thank you.

Mayor Ortega: Councilwoman Caputi.

Councilmember Caputi: The first bullet, what is that referring to.

Erin Perrault: Do you want to continue to have the character and design element since it's not a state requirement.

[Time: 03:49:12]

Councilmember Caputi: I get nervous as I said a couple of times tonight when we make things to specific. I think we need flexibility. I think it's important to use taller and lower scale. It's so contextual and particular to the item at the time. Sometimes taller with higher quality is better than lower with lesser quality. I don't want us to be in too tight of a box. Restore language. Remind me what that is again. Rural versus rural desert.

Erin Perrault: So in the rural character types there were some bullets that were brought forward from the character area plans up north, but it doesn't apply to our rural neighborhoods because we are rural neighborhoods in the Shea area and.

Councilmember Caputi: That's right. Yep. That makes sense. Back to the slide. It's getting late. I can't remember all of these lines. Yes, I think it's okay to talk about it or at least address the options of having more character area plans. Those are great guidelines. And then absolutely historic old town should always be designated in a separate category and sure more language with more detail is always better than less.

In terms of discussing the facts of heights and density and massing sure: I think more language is always better than less in those situations. Thank you.

Mayor Ortega: Thank you. Councilman Durham.

[Time: 03:50:52]

Councilmember Durham: Yes, from my point of view, these our page 50 to 54 were the most problematic. The most problematic of the general plan. I would go back to the prior language almost everywhere. I think giving general ranges of stories is very important because taller has a lot of different meanings depending on where you live. Taller in Scottsdale means something different than in Chicago. I think we need to give ranges.

I don't think it's overriding a zoning ordinance because we are not specifying any standards or what it must be. We are just laying out sort of general ranges and, you know, the direct guidance will be found in the zoning ordinance. So I found most of these changes problematic. I would definitely agree on restoring 1.2 and 1.4, and 7.5. And I'm confused by the map on 61. Because the little map, I think doesn't reflect the desert foothills or the dynamite foothills or the cactus corridor in Shea, east Shea area. Those are missing from the small map. Is there a reason for that?

Erin Perrault: So mayor and council, we did hear that from the public. We have tried to dot in those areas. They just might be hard to see but we have made an attempt to include that on the plan. On the inset map as well. Really the intent was for both maps to work together. You can see what has been established and then what we might be looking at through a future public process.

Councilmember Durham: I see the lines there but if we have already established those as character areas why wouldn't they be shown as gray in the smaller map?

Erin Perrault: We can certainly try to represent them like that. We wanted to show the citizen thinking that you might want to expand some of those boundaries up north. For example, in between desert foothill and dynamite foothills you have a whole section of land outside of the preserve that isn't covered by a character area. The citizens were looking at wanting to cover that from a character area standpoint in the future.

So that's why you are seeing some of that melding together. But, again that would have to go through a public outreach process and make it a public hearing process all the way before anything could be modified or changed.

Councilmember Durham: I see why you are marking out areas that have not been designated yet, but I guess maybe I'm being dense, but I don't understand why the areas that are already designated as not gray on the smaller map. That you mention it, I see the black lines on the smaller map. That are -- that are outlining those districts.

I guess are you suggesting that dynamite foothills might be expanded somewhat or -- or the airport might be expanded to include some of that gap there? The middle?

Erin Perrault: Mayor and council, what you are looking at is what we heard from the citizens. We did hear from the citizens that they would like to see us take a look at through a public process, expanding desert foothills and dynamite foothills to the north.

And that was to represent that graphically from what we heard from the citizens. And those that stayed grayed. They didn't want to see those changed. That's why the airpark one, the downtown one and southern Scottsdale remain the same.

Councilmember Durham: Okay. Thank you. I think I understand now.

Mayor Ortega: Councilmember Littlefield and then Milhaven.

Councilmember Littlefield: Thank you, I basically agree with Vice Mayor Janik and councilman Durham. I think they are right on target. And I don't have too much more to add. Thank you.

Mayor Ortega: Thank you. Councilwoman Milhaven.

[Time: 03:55:57]

Councilmember Milhaven: I would just share with my fellow councilmembers that in my experience, stories is not very accurate because you can have 8-foot ceiling and 9-foot ceiling and you can have floor plates that have more room for, like, wiring and electronics and things depending on what kinds of offices and so our architect may or may be able to speak to it better than I can, but stories aren't going to give you the comfort that I think you are looking for because stories can be lots of different levels.

And then the other thing, mayor, I know you wanted to put in something earlier about old town and I'm wondering if putting 7.5 back in doesn't address what you were looking for. 7.5 is putting back the western heritage of the historic old town area.

Mayor Ortega: Thank you. And I will move on to Councilwoman Whitehead and then I will have my own remarks.

Councilmember Whitehead: Thank you. Yeah, I agree with that height is such an issue we hear from so many people but floors doesn't do it. So maybe some consideration on how no give it more specificity, without losing the general plan aspect. Because that is really an explosive issue here. I agree and we are involved in a long email chains about the floors and so the floors means nothing.

I just also want to say the pages I'm not pointing to, Erin, they say things like good. Smiley face. So I do want to point that out. And also the bullet points I was going to ask you to put that back in. Thank you for explaining that on page 52 so I no longer will ask you to do that.

So last year, actually before COVID, if everyone can think back that far, Councilmember Korte and I were starting to start on a tree canopy plan and I think it's considered by a staff group that's working on this.

This seems like a good place to put the tree canopy plan in and I think it's not too controversial. So some wording on page 58, under the CD 5.1, 5.2 maybe some -- again, if there's consensus, something with a tree canopy plan that I think we need there.

And I was also going to suggest Councilmember Milhaven just suggested this, about the it seems to have one of these, CD 1.7, or 1.5 and combine the meaning of them.

And I support the character area plans as long as you and I have talked about it, as long as we are not overlapping two different character area mans and as long as there is a justification for it, I'm all for it. So I think that's. It thank you.

[Time: 03:59:11]

Mayor Ortega: Thank you. Overall, I would support that the character areas be generally somewhat fuzzy, the way they are presented, if they have been tested, that would be great and we have feedback. The area in particular of my concern is the downtown which is a designated area that has been in our plans since 1980 or so.

It's an area it happens to encompass some of the original townships, as well as the largest regional mall, right? In the southwest, and entirely different use element with heights and, you know, major scale situations. So we have an old town character area plan that's designated in our land use, however, the declaration and the range of what is occurring in there varies tremendously.

And at this point, what we are able to do from the land use standpoint -- now, we realize that any character area study can be rolled out by the council, and we did that back in -- when I was on council. So we took on the desert foothills and established that character plan on heights and other things. We can also revisit a character area plan, such as the old town area character plan.

That can be done through the zoning and public outreach process, but that's where a lot of comments are coming to me and as to the scale of the -- the out of scale components in the old town area character plan.

So what I will suggest that the what this body can do or recommend to go forward would be a doughnut cut inside of the old town character area plan. That would basically consist of the area south of the Arizona canal and running to Osborn and then from Osborn running to the Civic Center.

So that it could encompass Indian School, come west and cut across back on Scottsdale Road, but providing a doughnut. It is recognizing what I was trying to reach before, that there is an area that had recognizably was Scottsdale at a lower scale and had created the legacy components, and it's not just a four-block area of buildings of the 1920s. It's also an area from maybe the 1950s and as such, it -- I'm talking about Fifth Avenue and so forth.

So if this were to -- we could outline and test that so that -- it's not saying that everything is fixed forever like we are Charleston, South Carolina, or something like that. Certainly not. But there are guidelines

and there is a scale involved in making it low density and low profile and pedestrian scale. I think that's the sensitivity that I have been hearing repeatedly and a year ago, there was quite an issue on some very large mega projected within the character plan.

So I would look at that and ask my colleagues to consider testing the cutting a doughnut within that area. It's not just whether or not a building is historic or whether the surrounding areas as they are rebuilt. Right now they can be rebuilt to 44 feet, actually and there's several examples of that, but it has to do with setbacks step backs pedestrian shaded areas that will reinforce the flavor of our town.

So that's why I brought it up earlier in terms of the value of that. And re-enforcing the walkability and the international image that we have for the core area. I could redefine that so we can understand what we are talking about but strictly from Scottsdale road and where the proposed Solstice park is and south of the canal running to 68th street and then across to Indian School and then running where the valley ho is, of course, and then running up main street and second street towards cavalier and near Osborn. And then basically hitting our -- our civic mall area. This area is a treasure.

It's recognizable, and it will get rebuild and the question is why and how can it be thrown into the bucket of 150 story -- sorry, 150-foot buildings if you're in that area. I think that's -- that's the point I would like to make tonight, and I would like us to test that as a group with your consensus. It's only a doughnut cut and it would require extra sensitivity to that area so that it's not at the same scale of fashion square with whatever 2 million square feet of area or the taller projects that are north of the canal or east of Scottsdale road.

With that, those are the concluding statements. If there is a -- I will ask for consensus on my suggestion for some sort of a -- if we need more clarification, but why don't we do a read out on what we have so far up to my -- my suggestion. Thank you.

[Time: 04:06:27]

Erin Perrault: So mayor and council, I heard consensus on maintaining the element moving forward. Looking at potentially finding a happy medium between the taller/lower scale language and stories so we can certainly take a look at that for you. And restore -- not restoring the bullets under the rural, desert royal they are specific to the northern portion of the city and then definitely restoring the original language in cd1.2 and 1.4 and 7.5 and general consensus on the character areas, although that consensus on the last item that you brought up, mayor, has not been discussed yet.

Mayor Ortega: So thank you. I would be happy to add any response. It maybe is as much of, you know 40% of that wide area that I would say would -- would -- I was referencing. I have Councilmember Milhaven.

Councilmember Milhaven: I think you are getting far more specific than we want to be in a general plan but perhaps what you could do, if you would draft what you would like it to say. I understand you say western heritage, absolutely. Precious downtown. If you could maybe draft what you would like plan to, you might be more likely to get what you want.

Mayor Ortega: Good. Well, thank you. I appreciate that. With pictures. Good.

[Laughter]

Mayor Ortega: Well, thank you. That's a very good direction and I will do so. Are we -- where are we at in our evening right now.

Erin Perrault: We have done quite well tonight further than I thought we might get. So thank you for that. All we have left is --

Mayor Ortega: I'm sorry, Councilwoman Whitehead, I'm sorry. I should have looked at my board here.

[Time: 04:08:38]

Councilmember Whitehead: That's okay. I wanted -- one item that was left off and you are giving me the opportunity to expand it was the idea of adding some kind of tree canopy as other cities have in the southwest. And maybe also incorporate the -- because we have this in other documents the emerald necklace concept. Everyone has been talking about pedestrian and maybe tree canopy and emerald necklace.

Mayor Ortega: At this point, I will ask for the next steps on the next work study and the outreach that we'll be continuing and, of course, everyone we meet we can say, read it, we did. And respond. Please tell us where we are at.

Erin Perrault: So slide 95, please.

Mayor Ortega: Excuse me.

Erin Perrault: I was asking for slide 95 just so we can have it for the public as well. So we made it through all of Section 1 and Section 2. There wasn't a lot with regards to arts, culture and creative community. There's been general support for that new element. So really the only decisions for mayor and council in terms of direction this evening is if you want us to take that out to the public and test what is in it with the public input.

And so we made it through everything that we hoped to make it through this evening. The next meeting is scheduled for March 2nd, currently as a work study session. And then we would be looking at the next sections which would be Chapter 2, sustainability and the environment, which includes a variety of statement mandated elements and then Chapter 3 collaboration and engagement, which includes a city-created element.

Mayor Ortega: Well, very good. Thank you, everyone. And with that, we will be -- oh, one more comment, Councilwoman Littlefield.

[Time: 04:10:43]

Councilmember Littlefield: Yes, this really didn't have anything to do with the specifics of what we went over tonight, but I would just like to ask if it's possible to add more detail and specificity to the E.S.L.O., because that's something that's very unique to Scottsdale and I think a lot of citizens work very hard to get that involved in our land usage and land ordinances and it's been swept away on this.

I have seen it mentioned once or twice, but there's no description, nowhere it is, no how does it work. I would like to see a little bit more of that brought back and placed wherever you feel appropriate, within the general plan so that it becomes a more vibrant part of our land usage.

ADJOURNMENT

[Time: 04:11:36]

Mayor Ortega: Well, in closing, I would say that we are going to back to in Kiva, in-person meetings. So we will expect that this coming week. And continue with the city's business and the people's business. I really enjoy seeing one another now and thank you very much. With that, we are adjourned.