

---

This document was created from the closed caption transcript of the December 7, 2021 City Council Regular meeting and Work Study session 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/12-07-21-regular-and-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: 00:00:01]

Mayor Ortega: Welcome, everyone. I call to order the December 7<sup>th</sup>, 2020, city council regular meeting to order. City clerk, Ben Lane, please conduct the roll call.

#### **ROLL CALL**

[Time: 00:00:16]

Clerk Lane: Thank you, mayor. Mayor David Ortega.

Mayor Ortega: Present.

Clerk Ben Lane: Vice Mayor Tammy Caputi.

Vice Mayor Caputi: Here.

Clerk Ben Lane: Councilmembers Tom Durham.

Councilmember Durham: Here.

Clerk Ben Lane: Betty Janik.

Councilmember Janik: Present.

Clerk Ben Lane: Kathy Littlefield.

Councilmember Littlefield: Here.

Clerk Ben Lane: Linda Milhaven.

Councilmember Milhaven: Here.

Clerk Ben Lane: Solange Whitehead.

Councilmember Whitehead: Here.

Clerk Ben Lane: City Manager Jim Thompson.

Jim Thompson: Here.

Clerk Ben Lane: City Attorney Sherry Scott.

Sherry Scott: Here.

Clerk Ben Lane: City Treasurer Sonia Andrews.

Sonia Andrews: Here.

Clerk Ben Lane: City Auditor Sharron Walker.

Sharron Walker: Here.

Clerk Ben Lane: And the Clerk is present. Thank you, Mayor.

Mayor Ortega: Excellent. We have Scottsdale police officers, Sergeant Jeremy Pitt and Anthony Wells, as well as firefighter Chandler Walker present and ready if anyone needs their assistance. Please stand for the Pledge of Allegiance. Vice Mayor Caputi.

[Time: 00:01:08]

Vice Mayor Caputi: I pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands: One nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

Mayor Ortega: Well, let's start with good news. Two high school Scottsdale teams are headed to the state football championship. Both Chaparral and Saguaro high will be heading to Sun Devil stadium on Saturday, December 11<sup>th</sup>. Chaparral's game begins at noon, and Saguaro's begins at 5 p.m. Congratulations to both schools. Chaparral is led by Brighton Silber as quarterback. And so we look forward to that, and we'll -- as we step into the holiday season, and the new year.

**PUBLIC COMMENT**

[Time: 00:02:26]

Mayor Ortega: At this point, we open for public comment. Public comment is available for citizens and residents of Scottsdale to bring forward a topic which is not -- not on the agenda, but -- and has to be within the council's jurisdiction.

No official council action can be taken on these items and the speakers are limited to three minutes to address the council. So as you come forward. And by the way, this option is available telephonically, but as you come forward, please state your name, your address, and then go into the topic. So we have no -- I believe no public comment on a subject. Therefore, I will close public comment at this time.

**MINUTES**

[Time: 00:03:30]

Mayor Ortega: Next, we have the approval of the minutes. Are there any revisions? If not, I request approval of the special meeting minutes of November 9<sup>th</sup>, 2021, the regular meeting minutes of November 9<sup>th</sup>, 2021, and the work study session minutes of November 9<sup>th</sup>, 2021. Do I hear a motion?

Councilmember Janik: I make a motion to approve the special meeting minutes of November 9, 2021, regular meeting minutes of November 9, 2021, and work study session minutes of November 9, 2021.

Councilmember Littlefield: I will second.

Mayor Ortega: Thank you. We have a motion and a second. Please register your vote. Thank you. It shows unanimous.

**CONSENT AGENDA**

[Time: 00:04:21]

Mayor Ortega: Okay. Next, we will be moving on to the consent agenda items. These items are

items number 1 through 28, and as listed and posted, there is an opportunity for the public to speak on any consent agenda items, however, I do not believe there are any to -- regarding any of those items.

Accordingly, I am open to a motion, and I see Councilman Janik on consent items 1 through 28.

Councilmember Janik: I -- I just have a quick question. On item number 21, community development block grants, I would just like a little explanation by the parcourse, and what it is and what it will provide.

Mayor Ortega: Thank you. We have Bill Murphy the director, you can answer this question briefly.

[Time: 00:05:40]

Bill Murphy: Good evening mayor and councilmember -- Councilwoman Janik. So this is the funding that we received as our second tranche and we had 1.2 million is what we totally had. Your question was as far as at the playground or --

Councilmember Janik: More detail on the parcourse, what is involved in that?

Bill Murphy: Those are actually fixed things for you to do exercise. You can do pushups and sit-ups and things like that. They are actually individual apparatus.

Councilmember Janik: Okay. And then the Ramada is just like a --

Bill Murphy: Regular picnic Ramada.

Councilmember Janik: And all the money comes from grants?

Bill Murphy: Yes.

Councilmember Janik: Okay. Thank you. I appreciate that.

Mayor Ortega: Thank you. I believe those are related to Paiute community center. Next, we have Councilwoman Littlefield.

Councilmember Littlefield: Thank you, mayor. I just had a quick question regarding number 19 and SUSD, where they are going to be -- and I just got the white screen of death up here. So I can't read my iPad. I wanted a question, are they going to accept all responsibility for that? Joint venture.

Bill Murphy: Good evening mayor. Councilwoman Littlefield, yes, they are that is actually the parents association who has actually requested that, and they will be taking responsibility and

put it together and maintain as well.

Councilmember Littlefield: Okay. I wanted to make sure that we were not accepting in liability with that, if anything happened at the site.

Bill Murphy: Yep, that should be all theirs.

Councilmember Littlefield: All right. Thank you.

Mayor Ortega: Thank you very much. Seeing no other questions from council, or the public, do I have a motion for items 1 through -- consent items 1 through 28?

Councilmember Whitehead: Mayor, I will make a motion to accept consent items 1 through 27.

Mayor Ortega: To approve those?

Councilmember Whitehead: Yes, to approve consent items 1 through 28.

Councilmember Durham: Second.

Mayor Ortega: Thank you. We have a motion and a second. Please register your vote.  
Unanimous.

#### **ITEM 29 – CONSERVATION PROGRAM INVESTMENT**

[Time: 00:08:16]

Mayor Ortega: Next we move on to the regular agenda item which is item 29. It has to do with the conservation water program and the presenters are Kevin Rose, water resources administrator and Rebecca Davidson, National Forest Foundation. Please come forward. Thank you.

Kevin Rose: Thank you, mayor and council, my name is Kevin Rose, I'm the water resources administrator and I'm joined by Rebecca Davidson with the National Forest Foundation. And what we want to talk about today is watershed management.

Some of you may or may not know the Salt and Verde watersheds we receive 20% of our surface water that is treated at the Chaparral treatment water plant off Hayden and McDonald road. And the issue we are trying to address is unhealthy forests.

Yes, forests have to get an annual checkup that we all dread and what you see the picture on left is a healthy forest. Low vegetation and trees are spaced and then on the right, unhealthy forest.

We are trying to avoid dense forest, dense vegetation, which ultimately comes into two things, and we see this a lot on the news. Catastrophic wildfires, and what I deal with is flooding from those fires. Once we have those fires, and we get the flooding from rain runoff, we get erosion occurring in the watershed, but ultimately gets into the Salt River and the Verde River, which unfortunately gets to the Chaparral water treatment plant. And what does that do to the Chaparral water treatment plant?

The runoff we see increased cost. We see increased costs with premature failure of our equipment. We have to invest in new infrastructure, and then unfortunately it does impact water quality, and the summertime, we have to use more of a granular activated carbon to help to meet EPA standards.

So one way we have mitigated the watershed impacts is partnering up with the National Forest Foundation with other municipal and government partners and industry partners to form the northern Arizona forest fund. It creates green infrastructure projects to help us manage the forest and the watershed and the conditions. And this is what is particular to Scottsdale.

Since 2016, Scottsdale has invested over \$270,000 into managing our watershed. This is 18,000 acres of forest fuels reduced, over 300 miles of trail and erosion control which helps to reduce that runoff, that the plant staff don't have to deal with and we planted over 2,000 native trees. What I will turn over to is Rebecca. She will hand over the details of what these green infrastructure projects are.

[Time: 00:11:28]

Rebecca Davidson: I'm excited to be here tonight. I wanted to introduce my colleague, Sasha Stortz. She's the National Forest Foundation Arizona program manager, and Sasha and I both work together to manage the northern Arizona forest fund.

So a little bit about who the National Forest Foundation is, if you are not aware. We are a national nonprofit. We are congressionally chartered officially to the nonprofit partner of the U.S. Forest Service and we work in a lot of different ways but here in Arizona, we raise money and create partnerships to do the kind of project work that Kevin was talking about.

So these really important watershed health and restoration programs and with the northern Arizona forest fund we are particularly interested in investing in the Salt and Verde watersheds which provides a significant supply of surface water down here to us in Scottsdale and across the valley.

So the projects that I will be talking to you about are the kinds of emphasis areas that we invest in. So first, I will talk about forest and fuels projects. I will talk a little bit about sediment projects and then I will wrap it up with hydrologic benefits and then Sasha will roll it on home with all the added benefits from there.

So thanks to the partnership with the city of Scottsdale, we have invested in tremendous areas of interest with respect to forest and fuels management. And these come in the way of hand thinning, mechanical thinning or other kinds of treatment mechanisms that thin those overgrown forests out and reduce the miss being of crown fire, in particular.

We want fire in our landscape, it's a natural part of our ecosystem, but what we are trying to avoid are the landscape scale fires that we are seeing more and more in the news and then creating an opportunity to, you know, reduce the risk of fire and flood. So with our partnership with you guys, we have invested in the bill Williams mountain, which is up on the Kaibab, and Banning Creek which is in the a wildland urban interface area in the city of Prescott and around there and also in the Verde watershed.

So these kinds of projects reduce crown fire and flood risk and project water quality and sustainable supplies and ultimately protect the downstream communities and the water delivery infrastructure.

So just really quickly, on the big Williams Mountain, we worked to reduce high-risk fire on over 1500 acres since the inception of our partnership with the city of Scottsdale, reducing fire risk by about 60%, which is tremendous in those areas. And, again, there's some really important benefits.

[Time: 00:14:33]

There's been economic studies in this area to suggest that by doing this work, we can reduce impact by hundreds of millions of dollars, and we're also reducing impact directly to the city of Williams and throughout the water shed itself. For sediment and erosion projects, Kevin mentioned the roads and trails.

These are not the sexiest of but roads and trails are the preliminary area of sediment. So by protecting and improving roads and trails, we can also co-benefit, improve access but also make sure that those roads and trails are constructed in a way that reduce that sediment.

So we have a number of projects that we have invested over the years with the city of Scottsdale, including in the oak creek area, which as you probably know is one the major tributaries to the Verde, which then serves us town here in the valley.

And then on the Salt River side, we invested in a 49-mile stretch of the Sierra Ancha trail system which was in the footprint of a big burn scar. We reduced sediment moving into the system by many, many, tons annually and that's very exciting work. Roads and trails are a big contributor, which we are improving. We have supply sustainability and ultimately reducing that treatment cost that you guys see down here. A little bit about Oak Creek Schnebly.

It's a high use Jeep trail and we were seeing major issues associated with direct sediment input into oak creek and we were able to work with some really innovative partnerships including

Centurylink and pink Jeep tours to get that project completed and we estimate that by doing that project alone we are reducing sediment by 15 tons annually into the oak creek system. That's a lot of sediment.

And lastly, improved hydrology and reduced runoff. So we are also investing in improvements to wetlands, meadows, streams and springs and often these are very small projects in comparison to some of the others that we are working on, but as you can imagine, they contribute a lot to the health of our watersheds.

Thanks to Scottsdale's support, we have vested in several projects across the Salt and Verde, all again to ensure that we can improve groundwater infiltration. We can improve flow of water and really create sustainable systems that then feed into the larger watershed health projects that we're also doing.

One of the exciting projects that we are starting this year is called little green valley fen, it's on the Tonto national forest but fens in Arizona are extremely unique with very, very unique vegetation. This is one of only two of these kinds of wetlands in Arizona, and the area itself right now, we're fencing it. We will do some restoration to it and it really contributes to groundwater infiltration. And it's a beautiful place to go visit if you are driving that way up to Payson. It as a beautiful place.

[Time: 00:018:13]

So I will pass it on to sash, who will that you can about all the other amazing benefits that we get from implementing these projects in addition to the watershed health benefits.

Sasha Stortz: Thank you, Rebecca. So one kind of unique way that we have been able to expand some of the benefits of restoration, beyond watersheds is through the food for life program in northern Arizona.

You may have heard in the news about the closure of the Navajo generating station which was a coal-fired power plant which provided a significant number of Navajo and Hopi families with a source of heating for off-the-grid homes.

As an energy transition, we have been able to work with national forests in northern Arizona to provide some of the wood from restoration projects to Navajo and Hopi communities to help in that energy transition.

Now, in northern Arizona, a lot of those thinning projects involve moving small trees that don't have a lot of value. And so, by finding another market, essentially for this wood product, we are able to continue to accelerate the pace and scale of these restoration projects in northern Arizona where you have to remove the trees offsite and find a place for them to go.

And we were able to invest just a little bit of support from city of Scottsdale in this innovative



program to build a little momentum as we were trying to catalyze this effort, and today we are now at this point of having delivered over 2,000 cords of firewood from forest restoration projects impacting thousands of families, and leveraging that small investment into more than \$300,000 of additional support.

So to kind of zoom back out, with the of the city of Scottsdale and partners across northern Arizona, we have continues to just increase our ability to invest and impact the salt and Verde River watershed. This is the map that's complete and underway just under the past two years of our work in northern Arizona. The red dots are those fire risk reduction and forest thinning projects.

Green are community benefit and land restoration, and then the blue dots are those watershed -- water restoration and sedimentation improvement projects. And, again, over the past two years, we have been able to increase the -- or excuse me, reduce fire risk across northern Arizona forest by 4,000 acres with these thinning projects which is the equivalent of reducing carbon emissions by about 8,000 cars.

[Time: 00:21:29]

We have been able to reduce sediment downstream, by more than 55 tons annually and this is approximately 10 dump trucks of dirt removed from our water supply each year. And over 100,000 native trees and plants have been established in riparian habitats. So we have been able to work with partners like Scottsdale and many others to collectively make a pretty anything impact over the lifetime of the northern Arizona forest fund and especially these past two years we have just really seen a lot of really great growth. Just a few more statistics.

We have been able to replenish over 80 million gallons of water in the lower Salt River basin alone, like filling over 7,000 swimming pools and removing trash from the oak creek watershed, including with some volunteers coming up from the valley to help on those efforts. Again, equivalent to the amount of trash produced by the average American over three years. We have also improved over 23 miles of trails, serving thousands of hikers across the state and protected over 500 acres of riparian and wetland habitat, providing that wildlife habitat as well. I will turn it back over to Kevin.

Kevin Rose: So in summary this proactive approach, gives us great infrastructure solution and for me protects the quality and the reliability of water supplies where we can deliver to our resident and reduces the damage caused by the fires and floodings.

So with, that staff recommends an agreement between the National Forest Foundation, and the city of Scottsdale for the next three years for council to adopt. And I would be happy to address any questions you may have.

Mayor Ortega: Thank you. I see none. We will let me do this. I would normally open for public comment. We have none. I want to make that clear, there's no public comment. I would close

the public comment and we will go to Councilmember Durham.

Councilmember Durham: Thank you, mayor. Why does the National Forest Foundation do and not the national park service -- but you mentioned the forest service. Why is it that you wind of doing this work instead of the forest service?

Rebecca Davidson: That's a good question. The forest service is deeply embedded in this work. With the budgets being limited somewhat they desperately require partnerships and additional investments to ensure that the entirety of the program of work can be done each year.

And even still, we often are behind. You are probably familiar with the term fire borrowing. So as fires increase over national forests over time, oftentimes the national forest department needs to dip into other pockets to help support fire elimination across those landscapes.

With partnerships like the National Forest Foundation, and others we are able to fill in a bit of those gap and get something done that couldn't otherwise be done. Does that make sense?

Councilmember Durham: Yes. Thank you.

Rebecca Davidson: Great.

Mayor Ortega: We have Councilwoman Janik and then Councilwoman Whitehead.

Councilmember Janik: I just wanted to say thank you. Thank you for all the work you are doing, for saving the water, for saving the for environment. It certainly is a good vestment for the -- good investment for the city to support this. We really appreciate this. Very nice presentation and very worthwhile work. Thank you.

[Time: 00:25:31]

Rebecca Davidson: Thank you.

Mayor Ortega: Councilwoman Whitehead and Councilwoman Littlefield.

Councilmember Whitehead: Yes, thank you. Very nice. We are very appreciative. Are you struggling with invasive plant species as well. Certainly that's what we are struggling with here. How do you handle that?

Rebecca Davidson: Most of the work we are doing in northern Arizona is that forest thinning work. So it is not so much the invasive speeches as it is overgrown forests but there's certainly work we are doing along riparian areas that relate to removal of invasive species. So on fossil creek, the lower Salt River and even in southern Arizona we are doing a lot to try to address issues associated with invasive species, not so much on the fire risk side, but more on the hydrologic benefit side. We are working with partners to help support that kind of thing as well.

Councilmember Whitehead: Okay. Thank you.

Mayor Ortega: Councilwoman Littlefield.

Councilmember Littlefield: Yes, thank you, mayor. I just would like to say thank you for all that you are doing. This is tremendous in our state that is growing fast, and we have such a water shortage, to begin with, being able to do this kind of work to save our water, basically and be able to use it is tremendous.

Save the forest. That's tremendous. Especially after this past year, it's horrific. This is good use of our money.

Rebecca Davidson: Thank you.

[Time: 00:26:58]

Mayor Ortega: Okay. Well, thank you for also monitoring it Kevin Rose on behalf of the city. Watershed coming off the Mogollon Rim is so essential to keep as clean as possible and the results end up -- if they are not handled correctly, cause more sediment as you said, and that reduces the capacity of the dams downstream, and we have had major -- we had another item come before us about raising off the Verde system, but that was done at Roosevelt dam. And every bit helps.

The fens are very good as well. I know rhubarb goes in some places a little farther north. That's great for pies and good things. With that, I'm open to any other comment and a motion for the resolution.

Councilmember Whitehead: Mayor, I will motion to adopt -- I lost the item.

Vice Mayor Caputi: I had a really fast question.

Councilmember Whitehead: Sorry.

Mayor Ortega: Okay, well, we have a hand up. Vice Mayor Caputi. You had a --

Vice Mayor Caputi: Thank you, mayor. Excuse me if this was in our packet. We had a lot of -- packet. We had a lot of reading this week. Is this a new partnership?

Kevin Rose: No, Scottsdale has been part of this since 2016. So --

Vice Mayor Caputi: So it's an ongoing effort?

Kevin Rose: Yes.

Vice Mayor Caputi: That was my only question. Thank you.

Rebecca Davidson: I will just add that in the presentation, will cumulative results are posed with perspective to the Scottsdale partnership. So all the funds listed in the presentation really are leveraged by the city's partnership.

[Time: 00:28:59]

Councilmember Whitehead: Okay. I think I'm ready for my motion. I would make a motion to adopt the conservation program investment, so resolution 12306, authorizing agreement 2021-172-COS with the National Forest Foundation in the amount of \$210,000.

Vice Mayor Caputi: Second.

Mayor Ortega: We have a motion and a second. Any further discussion? Seeing none, please register your vote. Thank you very much.

Mayor Ortega: We call on the public, and later asking if you have something to bring forward, as long as it's not on the agenda, and within our jurisdiction, we see none. So accordingly, I will close public comment.

The other posted item as shown is item number 30, our charter allows for a citizen petition. We did not receive any this meeting.

So I also will close that matter of -- or a question if there was a petition for consideration. Moving on to mayor and council items for tonight, we are going into our holiday recess. I have one in particular I would like to bring up for council's consideration. So, we are sitting in city hall, it was designed in 1967. It was opened in 1968.

Scottsdale city hall is one the premier buildings in the valley it was designed by Benny M. Gonzalez and it went on it win many awards. This building houses the Kiva, as it does now, and is -- also it included some counters along those columns over there, where the plans were brought in.

So this was the center for all of the city activities tax, license and so forth, and city continued to grow, however -- and add other buildings across the street. So I would like to move that because of its significance, that this building be tamed or go through -- named or go through the process of historic preservation. It has cultural and architectural value for our city.

So I would move to ask staff to initiate an application for Scottsdale city hall as H.P., historic preservation designation.

Councilmember Janik: I will second that.

Councilmember Littlefield: I will second that.

Mayor Ortega: Thank you. We have the city attorney.

City Atty. Scott: Thank you, mayor. Just to clarify your motion. Your motion is to agendaize for the next regular council meeting, placing a potential initiation of an historic preservation amendment on Scottsdale City Hall?

Mayor Ortega: Well, the -- I guess the next meeting would be tomorrow, but I just want to keep it open. So within the next 60 days, because of our holiday and having that to bring that forward as a motion, yes. For our consideration.

City Atty. Scott: That's a great point, mayor. Just for a date to be determined within the next 60 days.

[Time: 00:33:02]

Mayor Ortega: Thank you. Thank you for the clarification. Thank you for the second nodding as well. Is there any discussion on the motion? Seeing none, please register your vote. Wow! Terrific. We are looking forward to that in the new year.

At this point, I would like to take -- I would say, adjourn our regular portion of this meeting. The regular agenda has been posted, and we would be going -- we're going to take a ten-minute break and we're going to lead right into the work study and the work study topic would be for the Old Town character area plan.

So -- and we will reconvene or come out of -- at 5:45. Thank you very much.

[ Break ]

**WORK STUDY ITEM 01 – OLD TOWN CHARACTER AREA PLAN AND ZONING ORDINANCE UPDATE**

[Time: 00:36:07]

Mayor Ortega: I call to order the December 7<sup>th</sup>, 2021, city council work study session to order. Now, for the record, I note that all the members of the council and the charter officers are present.

The work study session is less formal and there's an opportunity for a presentation to be made by the staff on the agenda item which in this case deals with the examination of the Old Town Scottsdale area plan.

It's a less formal method to draw out our open discussion about the topic that is agendaized.

We also have the opportunity for the public to ask questions or make comments in the work study. And typically we have five in a work study presentation. So we will expedite things by having the presentation.

There's no formal vote taken during a work study and it's really a good time to review the topic fully. At this time, we will get the -- have the presentation on the topic of the Old Town Scottsdale character plan. Go ahead, Aaron -- Adam.

[Time: 00:37:55]

Adam Yaron: My name is Adam Yaron I'm a principal planner, and my partner is Brad Carr but we have Bryan Cluff should you have any questions this evening. With respect to the Old Town Scottsdale character plan, this was a city council initiated item that started back in August.

The city council at that time initiates an update to the Old Town character area plan. And a text amendment to affected areas of our zoning ordinance within the downtown, downtown overlay and PBD zoning districts, as well as other affected sections as applicable, and directives to staff to update the Old Town Scottsdale urban design and architectural guidelines as necessary upon the completion of items a, b and c as listed on the screen.

In terms of the project timeline, this project started back in August with an initiation and since then we had work study session and nonaction meetings with both city council and planning commission.

Through the months of October through December, we've had six open houses on October 18<sup>th</sup>, 25 and based on council direction. We had virtual open houses available online on our project web page that were posted on October 26<sup>th</sup> and remain ongoing and so this evening, we'll have a work study session to report our citizen input findings received to date.

We will be presenting to planning commission on the 15<sup>th</sup> in a similar fashion and then we'll come back before both city council and planning commission for a work study session and nonaction meeting ahead of a possible recommendation and adoption hearing in March of 2022.

In terms of update considerations these were requested by city council and discussed with the public, update considerations to those items for our Old Town character plan and zoning ordinance, would be the vision and values for the Old Town Scottsdale area plan, the provision of quality new development and redevelopment, the development types, designations, locations, and transitions, focusing on height, density and intensity of development and their transitions and where they -- where those locations are mapped within the planning.

The use of development flexibility, in the application of amending setbacks and stepbacks, the provision of interconnected open space, including streetscapes, landscaping, and amend the areas with trees and shade.

The zoning ordinance, base development standards and where those base development standards could be maximized through bonus provisions and finally zoning ordinance, bonus provisions as to whether or not they be maintained, provide greater and better defined public benefits and reexamination. Bonus payment calculations.

[Time: 00:41:01]

Now, with respect to our public outreach to date, we have had a variety of different ways in which we tried to engage the public, most prominently we've had direct mailing to more than 2500 property owners. That's all properties within our Old Town boundary.

We've also noticed through a variety of email and print locations provided on screen to more than 140,000 different ways in which we tried to engage the public. Additionally, we reached out directly to community groups to engage their membership in our public outreach efforts, through COGS, Experience Scottsdale, Scottsdale Chamber of Commerce and Scottsdale Realtors and Scottsdale leadership.

In terms of public participation opportunities, as I stated we had in-person open house events that focused on specifically development times and development flexibility. I know all of city council had made it to up with the live sessions. Thank you for doing so.

We did offer to the public nine open house events, but based on registration and ultimately the participation, we've had six total events occur on October 18<sup>th</sup>, 25<sup>th</sup> and November 15<sup>th</sup>. And in terms of self-guided online open houses that focus differently on visioning, open space and quality of design, this has been live as I stated on our project web page since October 26<sup>th</sup> and remains ongoing to date.

Within the report it was originally cited that we had six participants reported, however, that was at the time of publishing of the report that you had and so we had three additional participants in those self-guided open houses, as we'll get to the end of the presentation, I will focus on what we are going to be doing to try to enhance those public outreach responses and what our approach is going to be moving forward.

But to provide some background on those in-person open house events and where folks came from. We had 117 participants and 43% came from outside of Old Town as Old Town boundary. Old Town business owners represented 25% of total participants.

15% of total participants were Old Town property owners and notably 10% were participants that provided addresses outside of Old Town, and so those stakeholder interests were not mapped on the screen, but this is to give you some idea of the spectrum of participation that we had at those in-person events.

As we will now discuss the public input received and where we might make those possible

adjustments if we wanted to respond to the public input, we would be focusing on our Old Town area Scottsdale plan, our zoning ordinance, our downtown in-fill, and our architectural guidelines.

You will see on the next slide, references to where staff has noted where we could respond to what we'll be presenting on the screen, and I will make note of that that as we go through the screens.

What we heard is quality development remains a priority for the community but specifically for Old Town, focusing on building setbacks, open space, and street space continuity to enhance the pedestrian environment. There was continued support for quality design within the surrounding context.

[Time: 00:44:34]

In this effort, if we were to respond to the public input receives, we could bring forward possible amendments to our zoning ordinance, and urban design and architectural guidelines. In terms of development types designations their locations and transitions what we heard was support for development types to guide the development and their respective locations.

Downtown core, and historic Old Town, those areas shown in green on the right side portion of the map as downtown core and then in green, but bounded by a yellow and black line, historic Old Town are important areas that should not be changed based on public input received.

This was also a sentiment to provide more transitions between development types, especially adjacent to the type one development types of where we have the hierarchy of type three adjacent to type one, and there was community sentiment to ensure that there was meaningful transitions in those areas.

This was also interest in removing the type 2.5 development type expressed by participation received. In this effort, if we were to amend or respond rather to public input received we would be bringing amendment to the zoning ordinance and urban design and architectural guidelines. With respect to development flexibility, what we heard was continued support for development flexibility in general.

There was continued support of public benefits as a tradeoff for development flexibility, and there was as well support for reassessment of those public benefits to ensure that the tradeoff of bonuses are equal to the public benefits received.

Finally, with respect to PBDs or plan block development applications there was a desire from the community that this should only include contiguous parcels. What that statement means a contiguous PBD is represented on the left graphic here with the orange of the museum square application, where in this instance, the site in its entirety is only separated by a half street and the zoning boundaries would essentially touch each other.



Whereas, you have in comparison the noncontiguous P.B.D., where it's not adjacent or contiguous in the full development site as well. In terms of the provision of interconnected open space, what we heard is continued support for open space as an amenity in Old Town. Which should be a provision of redevelopment efforts.

In this instance, amendments would be brought forward and the zoning ordinance if we were to respond to what we heard on this item. With respect to infrastructure, economic and development as a background for city council to consider. There was a work study on this item back in late September where there was a consensus to analyze benefits and costs of development infrastructure needs and impact fees to determine if the city is being reimbursed sufficiently and implements the consistent structure for fees and continues to be flexible in adjusting the fee schedule.

City council will address this item through public work study sessions in early 2022. There wasn't an expressed desire from council to continue discussion on this item with respect to the Old Town Scottsdale character area plan and zoning ordinance update. With respect to the naming convention, at that same work study session in September there was an expressed consensus to retain the name Old Town.

[Time: 00:48:11]

We note possible updates to the zoning ordinance as there's still some references to downtown and not Old Town. And that's an item where there could be some improvement based on council direction. In terms of zoning ordinance base development standards and bonus provisions what we heard was support for current base building height maximums.

Providing more transitions between development types, especially building transitions again from type one to the greatest intensity of developments of type three, maintaining character downtown core and historic Old Town. This was varying support for existing bonus height standards.

Some expressed the current bonus maximum heights are too tall, while others supported existing achievable bonus heights or could be appropriate. There was support at the pedestrian space as an expected benefit and Old Town property owners did voice concern about any reduction in current bonus or base development standards that could limit their redevelopment potential.

With respect to the current base height maximum heights and bonus height maximums is what you all saw in the public outreach meetings that we had. It's just kind of an evolution showing on the farthest left side of the graphic, where we were when the original downtown plan came into effect and where we are today.

So with respect to base height maximums, you see an incremental change in height over time,

from 1984 to 2018. Stratifying now out the new typology of type 2.5 and maintaining the same heights that were amended to in 2012. With respect to the current bonus maximum heights, you see a greater change over time, certainly more so over the original downtown plan of 1984, but you see the maintain maximum heights being the same essentially between type two and areas of what is now type three in the 2018 plan, now in expanded areas where you could achieve a greater maximum predicated on a developer amassing land area that would justify such a request. And for council to consider such.

With respect to bonus provisions in terms of main tape, provide -- maintaining providing greater defined benefits redesigning, we heard continued benefit for bonus development standards favoring benefits of public open space, major infrastructure improvements and pedestrian amenities.

Current public improvements listed within the zoning ordinance as fielded from the members of the public was too generalized and there was some support for adding new listed benefits such as contributions to public safety, renewable energy and elevated quality design.

With respect to the downtown infill incentive plan, the background on this item is that city council remove references to the infill incentive district in the newly ratified Scottsdale plan 2035, however this remained a redevelopment tool for the city and allows for development standard amendments and fee waivers and other applicant requests.

In terms of our next steps in our public participation process. This evening, as represented on the screen is our work study session, we're going to be going to planning commission on the 15<sup>th</sup> to have a similar reporting of public input received.

[Time: 00:51:44]

We'll have ongoing self-guided online open houses available online at [Scottsdaleaz.gov](http://Scottsdaleaz.gov), keyword Old Town updates. We will also be having more focus group events and community group meetings based on what we heard from city council at a couple of work study sessions ago about perhaps taking government to the people and really meeting with their membership on items that still would dictate additional public input and we'll be coming back to both planning commission and city council later on in January and February.

And then before planning commission for possible recommendation ahead of a possible adoption hearing by city council in March of 2022. That completes staff's presentation. We're available to answer any questions and certainly allow for council discussion. Thank you very much.

Mayor Ortega: Thank you. At this point, what I would like to do is open for public comment, and then, of course we could have questions from the council itself. Let's start with -- we have five in-person, Don Henninger and Marilyn Atkinson.

Don Henninger: Mayor Ortega, vice mayor Caputi, members of council, I'm Don Henninger, 2802, east del Camino drive, I'm also with Scott. The Scottsdale commission of today and tomorrow. I know we are early in the process and there's a lot more work to be done. I appreciate you reaching out to the public on this matter.

My hope is that you will continue to cast a wide net and hear from as many people as you can. The vast majority of Scottsdale residents like the direction in which the city is headed. They are happy. They are also quiet. And their voices often are not heard.

I hope you look for ways to engage even more of them in this process to really understand what residents want. I really appreciate the hard work the staff did to get feedback from 117 people. That's a lot of hard work and effort that went into that, but let's remember, there's well over 250,000 people who live in Scottsdale.

And we can cast a wider net, I hope to hear from more. The future of downtown is critical, and the ongoing evolution is important. And one word that keeps coming up in the conversations that I have with people and that word is flexibility. And we heard Adam mention that as well in his report.

As you consider updates to the plan, I hope you will keep in mind that there's a risk in turning back the clock and putting blanket restrictions on the kind of growth and development we want to consider for the city.

The risk is that turn off the spigot of possibilities that will never see the light of day, if you implement rules and restrictions that deter investors from even considering Scottsdale as a place they want to invest in.

[Time: 00:54:36]

A healthy city has to continue to attract investors who bring their best work forward, which we have always required and always received in Scottsdale. We should not put the city in a position that discourages investors from even considering Scottsdale as the city where they want to invest in.

Downtown Scottsdale is the economic heartbeat of the city, and let's not close and lock the door for potential creative quality possibilities that continue to keep the city prosperous and healthy. Let's not cut off our nose to spite our face. Thanks for the consideration.

Mayor Ortega: Thank you, Marilyn Atkinson. And then French Thompson.

Marilyn Atkinson: I had I'm Marilyn Atkinson. Good evening, mayor and staff. And councilmembers a want to talk season a little about the bonus point system. It's a little bit unclear when we were at the Old Town character area plan study. It was a little confusing as to what factually is in the bonus plans. -- what actuality is in the bonus plans.

For example, if you have an art bonus within that art bonus do you have parking that can be given? Do you have any type of height that can be given in exchange for it? So it would be nice at the next meeting that they have for the downtown group, that those are clearly defined and they should be defined.

Can parking be reused in each area and total up. It's very unclear. So that was one thing that kind of bothers me. I think it's very important to keep the downtown special and especially the Old Town, and historic Old Town. We have now on the plan where the building is supposed to transition down a little bit to meet the lower height. At left that was and did exist.

We also incorporated at some point that they pick up some of the define elements from the older areas. It's important to have recessed windows, setbacks and stepbacks is that -- how do you get that in a bonus point? Does that give you more height? And I think for the best reason for Scottsdale is to keep it to keep it nice.

[Time: 00:57:38]

So that's I think we want to keep is special and this -- these workshops are helping to let the voices be heard of those of us who own property and are merchants, and have merchants and we just really hope that the council listens because in 150 feet is just not suitable or appropriate for down there. So that's any comments and thank you very much.

Mayor Ortega: Thank you. Next French Thompson. And then Daniel Isaac.

French Thompson: Good evening, Mr. Mayor. Vice Mayor Caputi, councilmembers. I have a lot to say. First off, I would just like to have a minute of silence for the potential death of the Old Town as we know it.

[ Silence ]

So in about a minute, a really loud bell is going to ring and tells me I have one minute left. I do have a lot to say. I just want to remind all of you that when south bridge came -- south bridge 2 came for a referendum for a vote for the city of Scottsdale for the citizens so vote for the poster child of density and height, it was pulled because they didn't want that vote to happen.

They want anybody to see how many citizens were voting against height and density it's this city council and this city staff that have the ability to be able to keep the downtown alive, the Old Town alive. I don't see any reason to add bonus height to this stuff or density. There is not any reason for it.

I see all sorts of development all over this entire valley that doesn't have the height and it doesn't have the density. Most of the citizens who live here in Scottsdale didn't move here to be in an urban city.

There's that bell I like. They didn't move here for that. I didn't move here for that. I don't think these citizens -- if you gave them a chance to vote, do they want more heat island stuff or congestion? I would bring that to a city vote, literally city wide. There's no reason to added height bonuses. There's no reason nor more density per -- for more density per acreage.

This is a thing that's going on with people in the background, the developers, the real estate people, oh, by the way, I thought I would tell you, I don't really appreciate outside real estate people coming in and threatening our city with lawsuits we don't do what they want.

So I just want to tell you, I don't appreciate that. So I hope they are listening and don't come back in and start threatening our city if we don't do the height and density that they want to make money. Thank you.

[Time: 01:01:41]

Mayor Ortega: Daniel Ishac, and then Don Rosenberg.

Daniel Ishac: Good evening, I'm Dan Isaac, 1535 east onyx court. I want to thank the mayor, the city council and the staff for allowing the public to provide input on this important matter. I attended one of the sessions and what struck me the most was that while there was some concern with over development, the vast majority of comments that I heard were in support of flexibility and using leverage to ensure that developers contribute to the cost of infrastructure and future improvements desired by the city -- desired by the city, such as more green space, roads, bike trails, et cetera.

One thing that concerns me is that any short-term focus in putting additional restrictions on development, ignores two facts that are indisputable. First, the city, and, in fact the entire valley is in a desperate shortage of housing. Whether it's housing, condominiums or apartments. Especially affordable housing for teachers, healthcare workers, or public safety personnel.

Second, the city will need increased revenues not only to add to the services that this great city provides but to upgrade repair and replace existing infrastructure as it ages. The council recently worked to allow development of the Miller. That work showed ow collaboration led to an aesthetically pleasant design, improvement at the street level for pedestrians and some units reserved for those working in the city.

Yes, we need to preserve the historic part of Old Town but much of what is designated as Old Town is not historic and is needed to address housing needs and resources. The character area plan is not something that should be completely rewritten just because a new administration comes into power. Yes, it should be tweaked. But a different vision than the past several administrations does not warrant throwing out something that's served the city very well.

If anything, it needs to be liberalized to address the reality that Scottsdale is not accessible to

many of those who work or those who visit us and the city's revenue demands will only be increasing.

Let's do what we can to limit short-term rentals prevent designs that don't fit in with the community or the surrounding areas, veto buildings without reasonable setbacks and so forth, but let's encourage thoughtful development and redevelopment in this city. It is crucial to ensure that our city continues to thrive. Thank you.

Mayor Ortega: Okay. Last comment. John Rosenberg.

[Time: 01:04:45]

John Rosenberg: Thank you, mayor. Thank you, Vice Mayor. Thank you, council. My name is John Rosenberg, I'm a long-time Scottsdale resident and I'm a long-time Scottsdale business owner. My address is on record.

I cofounded the leverage commercial real estate about 30 years ago and clearly I was 10 at the time. And I cofounded mode property management 14 years ago. I want to start by saying I'm not a developer I'm an entrepreneur whose firm and team have helped other businesses and entrepreneurs buy, sell, lease, and manage buildings in Old Town over the past 30 years.

I have been fortunate enough to be able to purchase the buildings now occupied by my firms, and I have been able to purchase several other buildings in Old Town over the years. These are big investments for me.

And as you can imagine, these buildings were not immune to the struggles that most buildings faced through the downturns including the great recession. We, like most building owners struggled. We spent money we didn't have and we pushed through those difficult times so that we could continue to maintain these properties and provide comfortable office and retail spaces for dozens of other businesses.

I don't know if I will ever want to develop or redevelop these properties. I'm not a developer as I said. I don't know if anybody else will ever want to redevelop these properties if I ever sold, which isn't any time soon. But I trust that if I or someone tried to redevelop these properties the current system of staff review, development review, planning commission, necessary neighborhood outreach, and ultimately council approval is already in place to ensure that it is done properly, meaning the current system works.

Here's what I do know. There are 550 office and retail properties in Old Town. I know that many of these properties or owned by businesses that occupy them. They are owned by the businesses that occupy them and it's quite importantly the largest investment that that entrepreneur holds. 70% of these properties are at last 40 years old. The IRS only allows commercial depreciation of 39 years.

Basically saying is that this is what buildings become functionally obsolete. I know that my page is turned downside. Many of these buildings will require, some if not many upgrades to be maintained for many more years. There are certainly many historic properties to be protected, the majority of the other properties are not only not historic, but they are old, dated and in many cases functionally obsolete.

I note the property values are currently at or near all-time highs, yet if the city decides to move towards a down zoning, you will be taking value away from these properties. You will be hurting these business owners and entrepreneurs with their largest and most important investments. Ironically these are the individuals who just want to run a business, just want to improve their buildings and improve the area. Why would you punish them?

We need to leave the current character area plan in place, the system we currently have works. Thank you.

[Time: 01:07:57]

Mayor Ortega: Okay. We are concluded. Public testimony. At this point, I want to clarify and then we can have some discussion and comments. What we are doing, we are testing. We have the results of the first test of the questions in the public realm, and then we have some feedback on those that are in our discussion today.

We do not have action of any ordinance change, but we do have a good faith discussion about whether or not the current land is functional and whether or not it -- how it could be modified with future -- other questions in the community.

So staff is waiting for more input from us, I'm ready to list several things that I think should be considered. Some of them are redundant from our May discussion. And I would like to proceed with some of those points that initiated this reexamination of the Old Town character area plan. The questions we are bringing forth and any consensus that we have will be openly discussed here and then it will be tested by staff as they outlined.

The major responses that I have seen are that there is an inherent flaw or conflict when a type one is placed next to a type three. This is a matter I brought up back in May, and it is illustrative of the flaw between what was presented in both the architectural guidelines and the setback criteria and so forth.

So the plan said, let's do a type one to a type two to a type three, but it's not mapped that way. And many cases that becomes -- I call it flawed. And that's a basis of some of discussion of all of these extremes that we are going to.

So when you put a type 140 next to a type 3 160-foot, it's pretty glaring, it agitates the public and cause for grave concern by all by our city: So when I talk about height and density, as we have spoken, I think our council has, and I have some legitimate concerns about height and

density and mapping and the third issue about mixed use.

So the so in terms of going over those four basic items, as discussed the current zoning is C1 and C2 or C3 entitled for 36 feet with a DO overlay. That's where any rezoning in the future is going to be modifying that base zoning.

The situation is that -- and I want to be very clear about this, that whatever action was taken by the previous council, whatever entitlements were granted through this body two years ago or prior, they are in effect.

That has not changed in our discussions or decisions. Also the discussion is within this original downtown area. There's other issues about PUD, mixed use outside of this area. There are other growth areas and medium growth areas and so the question we have is how can we put forward some issues to be tested.

[Time: 01:12:27]

Does it mean that all of those C3 areas wanted to build C3 to 150 feet? No. So in regard to whether or not a business decision is made, for going up and exceeding some height, is applicable and there's a range of size of properties to do so.

The other thing that has changed since we initiated this in May is in May the city council voted a new parking ordinance, and the parking ordinance is citywide and we can review those details but the parking ordinance applied to mixed use and it talked about mixed use. And it applies in the downtown area. Under a P.U.D. or planned block development in Old Town.

That's an overriding criteria that set the stage and definition for mixed use. The mixed use elements as we know them got modified by the general plan. So the general plan, what changed between today and May, the general plan got digested, processed and brought forward. And the general plan has specifically other elements to it, or excuse me, ranges of percentages.

We have to realize, again, the general plan 2001 was so obsolete, it showed the 101 as conceptual. It wasn't even built then, right? And 2001, general plan was so obsolete and the new one that's been adopted 20 years later, actually shows the 201 and that is a very distinctive -- 101 and that's a very distinctive difference in the updating.

One the things I requested because height and density are related, is I asked for the percentages of the land use city-wide, it's all balanced with residential, mixed use, and commercial institutional, et cetera.

I hope we can get that up on the screen in a little while, because I did ask for it to be part of the presentation. Here you can see the different land uses, again when they were discussed through the process and this council then put forward the mapping and it was approved by the citizens. If you look down into the nonresidential column as listed to the left, it says commercial.



Commercial shows 1%. 1% of the land area in Scottsdale is commercial. We would describe that as C1, C2, or c0 in our zoning.

And if we relate to that number, you see what the burden is and how important our commercial sector is in Scottsdale. Other categories have to do with institutional you know, parks and educational and other factors. What we have seen in the last five years maybe even six years is an erosion of the C1 -- excuse me, the commercial component of our land use.

[Time: 01:16:12]

We can't manufacture new C1, C2, C3, but what we have seen on Scottsdale Road is the erasure of C1, C3 property and replacement with bedrooms, apartments. We are slowly becoming a bedroom city with thousands and thousands, apparently about 9500 bedrooms and more proposed in our Old Town area. That is the big picture.

The big picture is to be sustainable, I'm pushing back because of the height and the density questions, and they touched on the other infrastructure questions. Now, the big push was that the bar chart showing where changes have happened, where time two actually got reduced in height, between '08, it was -- it was 84 feet, and it got chopped down to 66 feet.

The idea that things can change in categories we made is -- is proven that we have to examine those needs. So as we go testing the other thing that happened in the Old Town -- sorry in the general plan was a definition of high density. High density in the 2001 plan was anything over eight units. Didn't have a cap. Didn't have a middle.

It could have been 200 units per acre, but it was anything over 8 units. We now have a new definition. High density is 24 units. That's the equivalent of the R5 zoning that we have, but the point that I want to draw here is that true mixed use whether it occurs in an individual project on a block or wherever it occurs, it's still part of the portfolio of the city's viability and the scarcity of our commercial again, I don't want to -- I have to make that point again.

So when it comes to density now, we have a high density discussion which the people voted on before it was anything over eight units and at one point there was a project on bishop lane that wanted, I believe 190 units per acre. There was no definition and they tried and maybe they withdrew it, as far as I know.

We've had other projects coming forward in the 87, 90, 100-units per acre. Those are killer densities that are just way beyond, even Phoenix doesn't allow GCU to go over 50 units an acre. Those are dorms, right? So it is a critical area that when we talk about height and density. So let me get to the specifics.

First of all on the height, going -- I'm suggesting that we test in the community leaving well, the type one -- there's only definition for tile one area, the green area that's been consistent. That should be at 40 feet. It's going from 36 to 40 feet that helps you get another height in your retail

for whatever you are working with.

The second question is for type two, I'm recommending again you test, type two would be 52 feet. 52 feet in type two some of the information we are getting back was 2.5, it's irregular and it seems like if we get 2.5, 2.5, and I agree with that. I think it was just ahead for one particular property to suit them.

Finally the type 3. The type 3, again, is submitted up to 150 feet. I believe that type three should be 66 feet with a bonus of six feet allowing a top of 72 feet. What is 72 feet? 72 feet is twice 36 feet. We have lived for 50 years with 36 feet and that doesn't mean that other buildings haven't been built taller. They have.

[Time: 01:21:21]

Someone may be able to get an exception on a particular project, but if you are looking at 100% increase on the vested of 36 feet, you are at 72 feet. What is that comparable to? I mentioned it back in May, it's comparable to the triangle building. It's comparable to the -- well, I voted against it, but the Miller project.

So just to give you an idea to say that well, we will go 160 feet or 150 feet plus parapets, is double the 36-foot allowance. This can and will be tested. Its not outrageous. It has to be tested because it would satisfy the time one area.

I have designed buildings in this area for 38, almost 40 years. It's doable in type one. Now on the density -- on the density question, what happened in 2018 was that -- and by watt I that whole -- the way, that whole process started in 2018, and they voted on it in September 2<sup>nd</sup>. Sorry, excuse me, July 2<sup>nd</sup>. July 2<sup>nd</sup>.

Our process has started actually in August, and we may be voting on this by May or June. So we are placing a very adequate review of this. Well, why are we doing this? Because there's been a lot of aggravation.

With these either hypothetical projects or really straining and aggravating going way beyond the infrastructure questions. Now, we are going to be dealing with the infrastructure. Not one of these height questions adds another lane of traffic to our system. And we would be in type three doubling that.

So as we further discuss these issues, we will be looking for a consensus to test these out. The final fourth item has to do with true mixed use. This issue, I brought up again being back in May, there's no definition under our ordinance at the present time other than saying it could be residential, commercial, office, or hospitality, but there's no mix to preserve some walkability and our precious commercial.

The commercial 1% is what carries and pays our property -- excuse me, our sales tax revenue,

whether it's tourist related or in any way related, it certainly is the pa of our character downtown -- part of our character, downtown and all of those other services. So what are we doing?

We are trying to find a balance to say that it should go so overboard and create from what we have seen the last four or six or seven projects were so overweighted with residential, that they -- they killed that other aspect. This is part of the sequences -- the consequences that we are dealing with and we have it in our parking ordinance that is mixed use, a PUD would maintain 20% for commercial purposes.

So if it starts with 100% commercial, and then go four floors, we would expect -- or five floors we would expect one floor to be commercial, not to just revert commercial property 100% to the other.

So that's in the parking ordinance the way it is now and we -- as we process this, trying to keep it at a high level so that there's a balance and we don't just roll over for the apartments and not have the walking around identity.

We will get to the consensus as we get to other councilmembers' points or if you would like to, again, raise anything that wants -- you want to be tested by the staff, we're not making final decisions here. I see Councilmember Milhaven.

[Time: 01:25:47]

Councilmember Milhaven: Thank you, mayor. I want to thank staff for the great work. Did I get to attend as you mentioned we all did the great work that you did. It's very complicated material, and things that people feel passionate about.

I think did you a nice job simplifying it so people would understand. I'm also grateful for the great work that you are doing. We have talked a lot, folks here talked during campaigns about listening to citizens and doing citizen outreach and we heard presentations at one of our last meetings about all the efforts we are doing to make sure that we are hearing from adequate representation from our community so thank you for looking for ways to reach out and take it to the people and see what they think.

So I'm very supportive and grateful for the great work have done. I think we need to keep in mind we have heard from less than 200 people. So if there's been a lot of aggravation, it sounds like it's about 200 out 240,000 people, sorry, I can't help myself.

But I would like to point out to my colleagues that we are agendized to talk about the presentation and -- it's the presentation and the discussion on public outreach. So I think we all are pretty well aware of what each other's philosophical positions are on development and redevelopment and so I would hope that folks could contain their comments to commenting on the public outreach process and perhaps a few things that the mayor would like to test in the

public outreach. Thank you.

Mayor Ortega: Thank you. Councilwoman Janik.

Councilmember Janik: Thank you. I just wanted to say that I think this is -- what the mayor has presented are some good headlines that we do need to test with the public. I know I attended one of the meetings and I think the comment I heard about the bonus heights and whatnot is limited bonus height.

There's still flexibility, but 150 feet is pretty darn tall, and I know there's been a lot of comments about, well, a lot of people want no move to Scottsdale. We need to meet that demand. If we meet the demand of everybody that wants to move here, we won't be Scottsdale anymore.

So we need to be careful that we keep our character in what Scottsdale means and we need to make sure we keep our tourists coming here, because that's what keeps our amenities high and our taxes low. So I think that we can come up with a good compromise.

I definitely agree that with the apartments that we're going to be building and have built, that we need to make sure that we do keep that commercial element. I know it's been hurt because of COVID. I get that and everybody went online, but when you start bringing in more people, I think you do need to be mindful that you need a balance and I think 20% is a about number to look at to start with.

[Time: 01:28:39]

The other thing that I think we need to be realistic about is fees for bonus heights. I think they need to be increased, probably double, because when you get that bonus height. You give tremendous benefit to the developer, which is fine but then the city has to provide all the services that the additional component adds.

So I think we would like to get some information on what other cities do when it comes to bonuses, and how they charge for bonus height. And what Marilyn Atkinson, I groundwater he with that as well. I think we need to have a better definition of, okay so this is your bonus, but what are the tradeoffs? What does this the city get back for that?

And make it more equitable and there's a lot of ways to go on that. I would like to see a little bit more work on that. I guess my last comment would be on transitions. We had exceptions upon exceptions. You can't have a one next to a three, and have the designated step ups and setbacks that we all agreed we needed.

So all of a sudden you are getting your bonus height and now we are saying e oh, now you don't have to have the setback and if there's one thing that really bothers me is when the setbacks are reduced because I feel like I'm in a tunnel and that's not what Scottsdale is about. Scottsdale is about views. It's about open spaces.

It's about our wonderful weather, but we all have to work together make sure that we keep that and we don't lose it or we lose our identity and then I'm afraid we might lose our tourism. So those are my basic comments thank you.

Mayor Ortega: Councilwoman Whitehead, discussion of what we would like tested in the community relevant.

Councilmember Whitehead: We got a lot of comments. I would say it's more than 200. When people comment, it reflects other people's views. It's a testament to who we are as a city. Most cities I don't think get near as much engagement from their community. We all love Scottsdale.

Also, what I hear when I'm in the community, is a lot of agreement. We have tend to focus on what we disagree on. So I think that's an area, an opportunity and I encourage people to cross mingle and find those areas of agreement, because the more we get done together, the more that we agree on and get done, the more we celebrate, the more common ground we're going to find.

So just generally, you know, at this point, the constituents and I groundwater he, we want some -- I agree, we want some more specificity than what we had in the first part of the process. I wanted to thank staff. Those were incredible sessions. And it was amazing that citizens sat this for however many hours. That was amazing.

So what we have to really focus on what we are, and be the best at that, and not try to be something we're not. So we are a world-class destination, no matter where you are in the world, people have heard of Scottsdale. We are not a major employment center. We're just not. And at tempts that we made at do -- the attempts that we made at doing, that we ended up with a bunch of call centers.

[Time: 01:32:02]

We are a boutique office center. We are a tourist destination, and we are an incredibly cool city to live in. So that is where we really need to focus. Less is more. So I think that we have a lot of tall buildings in the pipeline. I listened to the 2018 character area plan meeting. Three times.

What was said and what ended up in the plan don't match and this is our opportunity to fix it. So what are some of the areas that really need to be fixed. Obviously we had a record number of approvals of development projects but we are certainly not flushing cash to upkeep our city. Our city is the not sparkling destination it should be.

So we really have to prioritize upkeep and investment in the city, and there are a number of ways to do that. We have to have a tree plan. We need to fix our alleys. We need to have -- I would like to see a discussion on reinstating the grants for business owners to fix up their storefronts.

Cracks sidewalks we need to fix up signage and then we need to talk about changes in that were mentioned in 2018, but never made it into this plan. So public open space, that's something that unites us. We need to formalize that. That was a big discussion point. That's what made the canal front so special. It was an height for open space deal. They got height, and we got open space.

I would like to recommend some that the bonus includes a 10% public open space commitment. We've Doppler radar that with a lot of projects that have been approved and they are very successful and it makes the entire city more valuable. The -- I agree that we need to reevaluate the bonus heights.

It was awkward. It seemed there were some mistakes we need to direct correct that. I think lower heights we have a lot of tall buildings in the works we won't be the employment center, but we also don't want the most hotel rooms. We want the best hotel rooms and I really worry about cannibalizing our current tourism industry.

Again, I think we need to relook at that. I agree with the mayor on his PBD comment, and I believe Councilwoman Janik, we need the valuable commercial spaces at the base of apartments. I think that's a great change.

I would like to see an Old Town stakeholder group be brought back. There was a stakeholder group that met monthly and take holders are talking about it and figuring out what works for you all before you come to city council and staff I know is willing to do that, host these stakeholder groups.

[Time: 01:35:35]

I would like to see public art, the 1%. Perhaps we need to broaden that. I have gotten a lot of feedback on that where it can be used for other things. One gentleman mentioned affordable houses. There might be other uses for that 1% art fee, and that fee also, which wasn't done, we need to make that public art publicly accessible, if it's going to be approved. Those were some of my comments.

I think what makes us valuable is the fact that we're unique. We're Scottsdale. We're not Tempe. We are not Phoenix. It helps the region and it helps us stay economically viable. I think let's just focus on the many areas we agree on and get some stuff done. And also make our city the sparkling destination that I think is in our mind's eye. We have some real work to do, and it's going to take public and private partnerships to get it done. Thank you.

Mayor Ortega: Councilmember Durham and then Councilmember Littlefield.

Councilmember Durham: Thank you. I think in the report you provided it and in my experience at the meetings I think that there was some ambivalence towards the current bonus system. The

tables I sat at thought that the present heights were feign but did not like the bonus system. And I think when we review the bonus system, we definitely need to restrict phone uses that have a greater public benefit.

In the past, we have given bonuses for trash cans and crosswalks and some other things which I thought were not significant enough or important enough to justify a bonus. So I would be interested in trying to poll people to figure out what is a good bonus. I think open space would obviously be very high on that, a contribution to open space and pedestrian walkways.

Councilmember Whitehead mentioned the grants for businesses to redo their facades. So I think all of those are good ideas. I would like us to see try to create a list of benefits that we think would be worth a pone us and I think that list -- the bonus system has not worked well. I think on the Kimsey, we did have quite a good bonus in the terms of saving the triangle building and I thought that was a good example of how it ought to work.

But I don't think that example has been followed for most part. So I would like to for us to defendant out various ideas on what would be worth granting a bonus. What are the types of improvements we would like to see that would be worthwhile in granting bonus height or density. Assuming we keep a rating that would be a part of the bonus system. Thank you.

[Time: 01:39:15]

Mayor Ortega: Very good. We have Councilmember Littlefield, Vice Mayor Caputi.

Councilmember Littlefield: Thank you, mayor. I agree with a lot of what all of my colleagues have said. I agree with what the mayor said that we need to look at and basically, the parts of the discussions that have come up are interesting, I think they need to be looked at. I would also like to thank staff for the work that you have done. You have done a tremendous job. Thank you.

I don't -- one the things that I was looking at as I looked through this entire thing is first off, this review of the Old Town character plan should not be used to modify or lower in any way the quality of construction that's don't either in downtown or Old Town. Nor should it be used to modify or lower the ambience of our Old Town western theme. So those are things that I think should be on the top of the list.

As for the suggestion that we allow flexibility in the plan. That needs definition. What are we talking about when we say flexibility? It should be defined more clearly because flexibility in and of itself could be just about anything. It should not mean that we relax our standards in any way. Vertical development, tall development needs a better definition.

They all talked about that here and I will let that go. But it shut the bonuses, the higher heights should only be used to satisfy community need, not just the need of a developer to make more money.

So there has to be a community requirement need that needs to be fulfilled if we do height. Another the PUD should be part of the Old Town plan. We need stronger definitions of bonuses as was presented by Tom. How people can qualify for them, and how and where they may be used. Bonuses may not be appropriate in all locations. So that's something that we need to talk about. I would like to remove some tiers.

We don't want to destroy the ambience of the west's most western town. That's what many of tourists come here to see. They want to enjoy that. If we destroy that and make it a downtown like any other downtown, like Phoenix, tourists will simply go somewhere else, where they can enjoy what they want to see and there will be nothing different or unique or special for them to see here if we get rid of what we are or what we have.

I'm sure of the lady tourist who came to enjoy old up to ambience because her Old Town was destroyed by high-rise development. That can happen here. That should be a number one concern that we have to not let it happen, we need to preserve our special character, and we need to do that at least to start by limiting height.

Don't need to all become cowboys and wave guns in the air. We need to maintain the look and field of Old Town. Western Old Towns were not high. So I'm talking about Old Town here. Closing the streets which was something that was discussed earlier especially Scottsdale Road. We have been there. We have done that and it simply does not work.

[Time: 01:43:04]

It drove people away from the brick and mortar shops and the stores and old up to and downtown and it would do the same thing again if we did it again. The definition of insanity is doing the same thing over and over again and expecting a different result. You will get the same result.

Our city is long and narrow and designed for automobile, for travel and traffic. It's how people in Scottsdale want to get around. Our job is not to determine what people should want in the way of travel and enforce it. Our job is providing the infrastructure necessary to accommodate our visitors and residents so that they can come and feel welcome here, wherever in Scottsdale they want to go. Height and density have a big place in that.

We need to have open roads and adequate parking and that's something we addressed. We probably need to continue to address. I do support several ideas I read in my emails from the citizens and the residences from Old Town and downtown.

We need to clean up the alleys throughout the area and then we need to establish a city schedule for regular maintenance of that cleanup in order to keep them clean. A one-time brush through is not going for help for a long time. Some to have safer walking. So that's something that we can look at. Basic maintenance and upkeep.



We should plant for trees. I agree with Solange Whitehead, trees shrubs and flowers add a lot of pizzazz to the area. They add color and they add beauty. We should also establish regular watering schedules if we plant them, we need to keep them alive. Dead plants don't do anything for us.

We are intertwine lighting through them as well, through the shrubs through the trees, through the walkways. Perhaps seasonal decorations. I went through it the other night with my husband, it is dark, and it is not appealing or inviting. We need to lighten it. We need to make it so people want to go through.

[Time: 01:45:50]

Perhaps interlacing throughout the trees and shrubs. Right now it's too dark to be appealing and maintenance and schedules would have to be set up on an ongoing basis to make sure that the lightbulbs are still shining and all of this is still working. These are not expensive.

Particularly cost, but they are not tremendously expensive, but I think they would add a great deal to our downtown and Old Town both.

Thank you.

Mayor Ortega: Vice Mayor Caputi and.

Vice Mayor Caputi: It's great that we are seven different people. I think the fact that Scottsdale is special and should stay special. We all want Scottsdale to be special. We have different ways of getting there.

Councilwoman Milhaven, I'm sorry, I can't keep this as short as you would like me to. I have several things I would like to say, but I will keep it in mind. We seem to be pushing forward with ideas that interfere with the free market and private property rights and we are opening up the city to expensive lawsuits.

The state legislature is punishing cities for restrictions that add to construction costs and drive up housing prices and --

Mayor Ortega: Excuse me, Vice Mayor. We are not going to talk about legal issues and that's not a part of this discussion. Nor my legislation that may change in the interim. We are looking at specificity regarding the Old Town character plan, so that staff can have some direction in this matter. Legal can provide any responses to your concerns but that's not the topic --

Vice Mayor Caputi: But you are talking about the zoning. You called out some very specific zoning changes.

Mayor Ortega: I don't think I could be more clear. We are not changing the zoning at this time.

We are not actually legislating a change. We are testing the difference between the character plan.

Vice Mayor Caputi: And downtown zoning ordinance.

Mayor Ortega: I don't want to get into that other area of concern.

Vice Mayor Caputi: City attorney. Am I not allowed to talk about it?

Mayor Ortega: You -- again, it's my understanding what is -- what is posted, we have to stay on the subject, and the subject is not legal opinion regarding legislation, legislature, or threats of lawsuits, as you just mentioned. I want to be real clear about that, because we have to stay on track so that we can continue to process in an orderly way.

Councilmember Milhaven: I would like to a point of other, a point of order in the rule of procedure to allow Councilwoman Caputi to continue her remarks. I would like to make a point of order.

[Time: 01:48:45]

Mayor Ortega: Well, we are not voting in this session. So you are asking for a vote, and that's not possible.

Councilmember Milhaven: Council rules of procedure include --

Mayor Ortega: All we are doing is giving our consensus on the topic so that it can be tested not voting on anything. So it's not actually proper to vote on a point of order. The -- so that's my interpretation and I rule on that. We are not entitled to vote on any matter in this work study.

I appreciate the comment and I say if you have concerns, you can check with the city attorney in a proper time and a separate forum. That's my suggestion.

Councilmember Milhaven: I'm sorry, the rules of procedure allow for councilmember to call for a point of order in disagreement with the presiding chair's decision about the proceeding, and then the council can vote as to whether or not to uphold the chair's decision to shut down that discussion, to say it's inappropriate to allow the discussion -- to allow counsel sim -- Councilwoman Caputi. I would like a vote to allow Councilwoman Caputi to continue her comments.

Mayor Ortega: I thank you for that comment. Our rules of procedure 10.6, state that the chair grants the speaker any one of us members a speaking point, provided that they stick to the subject and this subject is far off from what is on the table and that's why I'm recalling that it is not proper or in order to discuss legislative matters, outside lawsuits or such. That's -- I will ask the city attorney. Perhaps you can weigh in on this.

City Atty. Scott: To clarify your rules of procedure, you are correct, Rule 10.7 and 10.6 do provide the presiding officer with the ability to ask another councilmember to confine his or her remarks to the issue under debate and to refrain from any personal attacks or indecorous language.

I'm reading you the whole rule for appropriate context. It provides and Rule 2.9, a councilmember once recognized shall not be interrupted unless called to order by the presiding officer, or unless a point of order or point of privilege is raised by another councilmember.

So I believe you called Vice Mayor Caputi to order when interrupting her. Now you have a point of order that has also been stated on the record by Councilwoman Milhaven. The rules provide that once a point of order is raised by a member of the council, when there is a disturbance or raise a question of whether there was a breach of the council rules that it does not require a second and is not debatable and amenable and cannot be reconsidered once raised a point of order requires a ruling by the presiding officer. And if held in order.

Our if that ruling is decided -- is thought to be wrong by a member of the council, the presiding officer may be challenged by an appeal from any member of the council if the presiding officer fails to act any member may move to require the presiding officer to enforce decorum. An affirmative vote of the majority of the council shall require the presiding officer to act.

[Time: 01:52:55]

So the sort answer, mayor, I think you were correct in your interpretation but Councilwoman Milhaven was also correct that if she wanted to challenge your decision she could put it to the vote of the council.

Mayor Ortega: Thank you for clarifying that. We will have a vote to uphold my decision that this is not appropriate as I detailed. All of those in favor say aye to uphold the chair. No one can speak as far as the point of order.

It appears -- the vote is to uphold the chair and my adjudication as I have stated. And we have no. So that means we will Mr. Durham, so you vote no and therefore, Caputi -- Vice Mayor Caputi can continue with her discussion.

Vice Mayor Caputi: Thank you, mayor. Changing the zoning requirements is going to trigger prop 207 lawsuits this will be from our local business owners not from out-of-town companies. We saw this when we were considering making that desert rural category in the general plan and we all backed away.

So changing the character area plan will be even more serious. Zoning unlike the general plan is not aspirational. The city of Flagstaff recently tried to place restrictions on density and immediately hit with \$51 million in prop 207 claims from local landowners. We can't reduce the

rights of owners to use their property, this reduces the fair market value and violates the law.

And mandating a certain amount of commercial or density will decrease the mark value and leading to laws and that's why it's applicable. It doesn't work. The city of Phoenix tried to mandate commercial space and residential building along the light rail route. There's now empty retail everywhere along that route. We need more people living and walking downtown to sustain this model.

No one will drive downtown into the first floor of a residential business and shop in a flower shop or go to the dry cleaners. We would need to build way more residential for that model to work. Commercial requires tenants. This' no market to additional retail right now. So want to have it but we can't make it happen.

[Time: 01:55:50]

The city of Peoria just came to this exact same conclusion along grand avenue. We can have zoning that calls for these things as the mayor suggests but if there's no market, no one is going to build it.

Area plans need to be based on reality, subjective opinions cannot rule over market conditions this I didn't would simply kill economic development downtown. I agree with Councilwoman Milhaven, we are not following our own process. We have the no finished with citizen input. We s had extremely low participation and we need to continue the outreach what I heard at the meetings I attended which were almost all of them, was mostly positive.

People seemed to be saying we should preserve historic Old Town and we need to be more sensitive with transitions. Maybe instead of getting rid of 2.5, we need a 1.5. We need to have transition, but definitely better transitions rather than just going from a one to a three, I groundwater he with that. And we also need to seek public benefits.

I certainly agree with that as well. But our current character area plan has been 35 years in the making. We had extensive community outreach. It's been regularly updated. Community based, it's flexible, and it was just updated in 2018. So why would we reverse course now, just as our downtown is starting to get a little bit of vibrancy back?

The downtown is a growth area. It's a primary economic engine for our city. And it allows for us to have less density in other parts of our city. We need to have a critical mass of people living in our downtown working and playing in order for it to be a vibrant, year-round venue for tourists and residents. This is what we all said we wanted in our general plan. Reversing direction now is going to have the opposite effect.

Other cities are very happy to take our business if we send it away, and they are already doing it. Our job on council is to look long-term, what is best for the city. The downtown needs energy and revitalization successful cities do not stagnate. We can't establish so many hurdles that no

one is going to invest here. That is a recipe for blight as we are starting to see in our downtown.

We can't ask investors to build the highest of quality, which we all agree we want, keep them low, set back, step back, provide more parking, 20% commercial, a certain amount of open space. It's just not economically feasible.

We are going to be left with nothing but abandoned lots and rundown buildings which we are starting to see in our Old Town area and lawsuits. So this is a work study session. I appreciate that and I certainly look forward to hearing more from all of us who are impacted as we continue with the process. So let's keep moving forward. We definitely need to hear from more than 100 people. Thank you.

Mayor Ortega: Thank you. Councilwoman Whitehead.

Councilmember Whitehead: Thank you. I think my colleagues' comments are exactly why we have to have these discussions. We don't need to enter into lawsuits. There certainly was no mention on my part of changing any zoning. I'm not aware of any attempts to change zoning.

What we are trying to do is clean up the character area plan which is only a few years old. It was approved in 2018 to make sure we do what was verbally said, in order to make our city the most valuable it can be.

[Time: 01:59:42]

And so there's no attempt here to change zoning, but there is an attempt to find the common ground and get more done and to actually do what we envisioned verbally. And so some of those examples are -- and I want to talk about the blight. That's a big problem. That blight was part of this entire ten years of projects being approved around developers not building those projects.

So the blight preceded any efforts to clean up downtown. It preceded this council. What we are trying to do is incentivize to make it easy for the right kinds of developers to build in the city and create valuable value for more residents, create value for the tourists that have always funded our city and create value for those landowner who want to make an investment in their properties without going necessarily 150 feet high.

The idea that we can't ask for setbacks and stepbacks we can't ask for lower heights. We can't ask for open space. We can't ask for trees and expect to get it. That's false. That's simply false. We have asked for it. The projects I'm the proudest of, I have taken heat from both sides.

Those are the projects that incorporate that which we believe Scottsdale deserves. And do we get every developer? No, we don't. But do we get the best developers? Yes, we do. And so what we're trying to do is create a character area plan that first of all unites us and doesn't create lawsuits and brings value to the jewelry store owner that is in a one-store building and allowed

another property owner to put items on top of his building and has some new owe tells.

We -- new hotels. This is not about a lawsuit. Our legal team will keep this council in order. We are trying and, yes, we can't ever anticipate what the legislature would do, but what I'm asking from all of you is just to keep working with each other. Again, cross talk to each other, because the best debate is the foundation of our country because I don't have the best idea and neither does my colleague, but when we all talk about our concerns and our priorities, that's where we get the best path forward.

2018, that was done. The character area plan. We don't have the possibility to go back in time. We have the opportunity to go forward and go forward together in a way that keeps our Scottsdale the absolute international destination and also the great city to live in, and enriches our business owners that choose to work there, because that's part of our economy. So thank you.

[Time: 02:02:51]

Mayor Ortega: Okay. I think the point I want to make is being a designer and architect involved in the evolution of downtown and Old Town for the last 40 years, the advantage that we have today is that we have a general plan that was approved. The disadvantage or the gaps that happened between 2001 and the general plan of 2010 left a big gap of credibility or input of the citizen.

Right now, we have a very strong tourism element that was not in the general plan 20 years ago. We have sustainability. These are voter approved, digested and reprocessed and they matter. So that gives us an advantage today to say these are the values that we're Marching forward with. Were the decisions as valid or were they as legitimate? I'm not answering that question.

But I am answering the question that we have a general plan that has more meaning and capability to do it. I would like to look at a roundup of where we are going as a consensus so staff can get some direction. Councilwoman Janik.

Councilmember Janik: Thank you, mayor. It's obvious we have a diversity of opinions up here and I think we all walked in expecting that. My problem is that I want to talk about it more like Councilwoman Whitehead said and I want to try to get consensus from the community. We're kind 6 split, kind of want to bring it all together.

I want thoughtful growth. These most -- most of these things we talked about when we talk about height, I think we need to bring a lot of people in and say well, what do you think? Is it 40 feet? Is it 66 feet for type three? Should we go up to 150 feet?

Maybe find an average between the two? And what about planned development? How much commercial seems reasonable and responsible? So -- and I don't like to do it with the threat of legal action over our head. We will deal with that, trust me. Our legal team will keep us in line. I

want open ideas on all the ideas presented tonight. I think this is a very good first step, working towards that.

And there's one other item I wanted to bring up that is minor and kind of major. I think we should think of the rose garden being a park. And one of the bonuses could be that the funding from the bonus can go to have the rose garden. Wouldn't it be nice to have a nice park along our canal banks? So a lot of food for thought here.

[Time: 02:05:58]

And again by discussing it and continuing to discuss and encouraging others to get involved, I think we can come up with a very workable solution that will satisfy the needs for we need more apartments, as well as keeping our identity. So I think everybody has given really nice input. Thank you.

Mayor Ortega: Councilwoman Littlefield and then Councilwoman Whitehead.

Councilmember Littlefield: Yes, thank you, mayor. It was my understanding tonight that we're supposed to just give input on things that we believe would help the process along as we move forward, as we get more citizen input which I agree we need.

I would like to see, you know, 1,000, 2,000 more people, who come and show an interest and want to participate in how we move forward with our Old Town area. I don't think the in additions on are being made to what are we going to do? We will do step, one, two, three, four, five, and that's what we end up with. That's not what we are here for.

We are here to give input to the staff so they know where we are, and we know where they are. And so that we can work together to move forward and get a better consensus of what we want to do could we walk something? Yes. Laws complicated today.

That's why we have a city attorney to keep us on the straight and narrow and not fall into the pits. We will need to make sure that we don't have those kinds of problems and considerations. I don't want to see a wall-to-wall 150-foot tall building going across Old Town, downtown. Who would want to go see that? You can see that anywhere.

How can we keep our commercial, unique character of who and what we are, moving forward and keep our vital character sustainability of the area at the same time do. We need have hotels to stay in so they can visit all of our neat stuff down there? Of course we do. And we are approving some of those hotels and they have been approved.

You know what we are looking for in the way of commercial development to me, it is my opinion, commercial development in Old Town ought to reflect some of the character that they are in. We don't want to have something that has no bearing whatsoever on the location. Can it be commercial? Can it be arts, crafts, food all that kind of stuff? Of course, it can be all

kinds of things.

What are some things that the citizens say we really like this but we really need to have more of that. That's what I'm looking for. I want to see the results of what you are our citizens are telling us they want to see in their downtown I don't want to have just streets and roads and high-rise apartments.

Do way tonight see a lot of apartments in downtown not necessarily. How about some condos? What is the mix? What -- how about people living there. So we need to have a discussion on all of these different possibilities that can blend together to make a unify whole that's more Scottsdale and more unique so that people will be attracted to so many and that's what time trying to get to, the things I have said are things that we can do, you know, like the lights and the cleanup and all of that stuff.

Not expensive but it would make a big difference on what people see and what they take home with them after they have been here to say do I want to come back? Well, yeah, if we make it really nice, they will. So that's what I think is the purpose of tonight and the other planning meeting that we will be having going forward to change our character and to modify and to improve what we are and where we want to go. And so we have an idea of, you know -- aren't going to know until we get there.

That's the point that we have to get. Thank you.

[Time: 02:10:40]

Mayor Ortega: Thank you. Councilwoman Whitehead and then Vice Mayor Caputi again.

Councilmember Whitehead: Just some comments to staff because we did get more in-depth about them. Vision. Can you put in some ideas or include some specificity on the alley -- the idea of cleaning up our alleys. Thank you, Councilwoman Janik for remembering the canal-side park. That's -- open space again was discussed forever in the 2018 city council meetings.

So let's get some concrete open space and the canal-side park is a city property and if we can identify funding, that is helpful from development as Vice Mayor Caputi mentions. Emerald necklace, if we can have some specificity on emerald necklace. There was an effort to identify and for those who don't know, that is a connectivity, a path, a shady, nice, interesting path system for pedestrians throughout downtown and then Vice Mayor Caputi's comments about the commercial -- the vacant commercial properties is there some guidance you can provide council on -- we know we want some commercial down below.

What are other cities doing that have been successful? What percentage? The mayor mentioned 20%. We want to be successful, right? That's what we are looking for. So some guidance there as we go back. Because the residents would come to our meetings, they won't know. So they will need some guidance on what works and what doesn't work. Thank you.



Mayor Ortega: Thank you. Vice Mayor Caputi, and Councilmember Durham.

Vice Mayor Caputi: We can't have 150-foot buildings wall-to-wall. It was all about how people enjoy having flexibility and I want to remind us all that that is the one great thing about our existing plan.

It does allow us to have flexibility we can get all of these great things that we have been talking about up here, some open space and some different amenities. There are some special spots where you are allowed to ask for the increased height. We would never have a city full of 150-foot buildings. It just isn't in our plan or general plan or in any of our visions.

I want to lay that record straight. It's all about maintaining flexibility no the making things that we can't get great things for the city but that we main our ability to negotiate and flex as we move forward. Thank you.

Mayor Ortega: Councilmember Durham.

Councilmember Durham: Thank you, mayor. One more thing on the list for the planners. Councilmember Whitehead reminded me of it in what she just said. We often talked about activating the alleys for use as dining areas or possibly other activities, music, et cetera. So think about the possibility of cleaning up first, but then trying to use alleys as spots for music, entertainment, dining. So forth.

## **ADJOURNMENT**

[Time: 02:14:20]

Mayor Ortega: Well, it looks like we have come to the conclusion of the work study. Thank you, everyone, one and all. May I have a motion to adjourn?

Councilmember Whitehead: So moved.

Councilmember Janik: Second.

Mayor Ortega: We have a motion and a second. All in favor, say aye. Register your vote. We are adjourned. Thank you. See you tomorrow.