

Summary Minutes
City of Sedona
Planning & Zoning Commission Special Meeting
Vultee Conference Room, 102 Roadrunner Drive, Sedona, AZ
Thursday, March 17, 2016 - 3:30 p.m.

1. VERIFICATION OF NOTICE

Chair Losoff verified the meeting had been properly noticed.

2. CALL TO ORDER & ROLL CALL

The Chair called the meeting to order at 3:30 p.m., led the Pledge of Allegiance, and asked for roll call.

Roll Call:

Planning & Zoning Commissioners Present: Chair Marty Losoff, Vice Chair Kathy Levin – arrived at 3:35 p.m., and Commissioners Randy Barcus, Avrum Cohen and Larry Klein. Commissioners Eric Brandt and Gerhard Mayer were excused.

Staff Present: Warren Campbell, Ray Cota, Karen Daines, Andy Dickey, Marlayne Hatler, Roxanne Holland, Charles Mosley, David Peck, Donna Puckett, Ron Ramsey and Cherie Wright.

3. Presentation/discussion of the Capital Improvement Program (CIP) requests for FY17-22, in order to solicit comments and input from the Planning and Zoning Commission on CIP project priorities, and alignment with overall City development objectives and Sedona Community Plan.

The Chair explained that the Commission would be going through the Capital Improvement Program (CIP), which is done once a year. At the Chair's request, Karen Daines, Assistant City Manager; David Peck, Associate Engineer; Ray Cota, Police Chief; Rachel Murdoch, Parks & Rec.; Charles Mosley, Wastewater; Roxanne Holland, Associate Engineer and Marlayne Hatler, Police Commander introduced themselves to the Commission.

Karen Daines explained that we wanted staff available from the various program areas to answer any questions as we discuss the different projects. Karen then indicated that the Capital Improvement Program is a different animal than our day-to-day operations. This is strictly the plan that we put in place to address major capital infrastructure needs for the City. They are large projects that by definition are over \$50,000 and have more than three years of useful life; typically they are a one-time cost. We structure the plan as a multi-year plan. It is a six-year plan in which we are confident that we have revenues to do the projects in the first three years, in those timeframes. Anything in the last three years of the plan likely does not have funding, and the plan before you is still in draft form. This is what the Program Area Managers put together as their requests. Many of these projects are the same projects seen over the course of multiple years, and most of the projects in the first three years have been in the plan before and have identified funding, but not necessarily all of them, because this is not a funded, balanced plan yet; that is the next step once we have the initial public input done.

Karen stated that the departments started putting together these requests in December and the staff team reviewed them in January. In February, our City Manager and Citizen Engagement Budget Committee that helps us to provide public input perspective, comments and direction on both our CIP and Operations budgets reviewed them, and we just went through all of the operating budgets and Decision Packages this week. We are now bringing the CIP to Planning & Zoning and the next step will be to get with our Finance Director and City Manager and start plugging in numbers to see what things we think we can accomplish with the available funding and the projected funding over the next two years, within that three-year horizon, and the other things will end up in those three unfunded out years.

Karen explained that Planning & Zoning is the group that is most familiar with the Community Plan, so that is why we are coming to the Commission, because you are in the best position to comment on how these projects align with the Community Plan priorities and how they conform to the Plan, so that is the major focus for your comments; however, you are also residents of the community, so if you have general comments or comments about priorities, such as if you see something in the out years that seems to be more important than something in the funded years, feel free to ask those questions or provide that input. Your comments will be passed on to the City Council. They will see the City Manager's recommended budget, which includes the Capital Improvement Program as well as Operations and our Streets Fund and Wastewater Fund, etc. at the end of April. From there, they will provide input and give direction on possible changes, additions and deletions, then that will go back to them in May in the form of a tentative budget for their approval with or without changes at that point, and we post it to the public for 30 days with the final adoption of the budget in June.

Karen indicated that in terms of the CIP, the first year is Fiscal Year 2017 and it will be part of the adopted budget. The other five years are not an appropriation or a financial commitment; it is still a plan, so next year, we will do this again when Fiscal Year 2018 becomes the adopted year and we add and move things around as necessary.

Karen explained that the introduction memo in the packet covers the things she just talked about, including the general process and definition of the CIP, and at the end of the document is a description of the different sources of funding, which are somewhat different than how we fund day-to-day operations, because there are different categories of dedicated funding that can only be used on capital projects, so if you have questions about those, staff will answer them also.

Karen then introduced Cherie Wright, Finance Director, who had joined the meeting, and Chair Losoff noted that Vice Chair Levin had also joined the meeting. Karen referenced the summary sheets and indicated that they include a description of the projects by category, and their total funding for each of those six years. Each project has an associated detail page where the description and justification is given, and you will see the breakdown of how those dollars are split between design, construction and land in the different categories, and then the funding sources.

Commission's Summary Discussion:

Chair Losoff indicated that the Commissioners should give this CIP a high-level review; we aren't here to get into a lot of the details. We need to look at whether or not it fits with the Community Plan and if the priorities seem to be in order or are we missing anything. He had a question on Community Development, because one of our main priorities is the Land Development Code revision and parking, and we discussed doing some studies on both and that wasn't listed. Karen explained that although that is \$200,000 or \$250,000 for the next budget year, it is on the operation's side and these are just the large capital infrastructure projects; the operations and consulting services are in the operating budget. The Chair noted that there is always a thin line between operations and capital budgets, but that is the way it is.

Commissioner Cohen stated that on ABC, Channel 15, there was a thing on the Sedona Bike Park and it was really a nice piece. Rachel explained that she did not pay for that; it was free.

Vice Chair Levin asked if the department heads or the committee established the priorities, and Karen indicated it was the department heads. Essentially, the department heads put together the requested CIP and put the projects where they thought they needed to be. Sometimes they know of available funding and sometimes they don't, so they put in requests and as we move through the process, we take input from the committee, and we may change things based on committee input, and then the next round is the funding and whether or not there is funding when the department head wants the project. Then, the City Manager does his review and may also make some modifications, and at that point, it goes to the City Council.

Chair Losoff stated that in past years, we saw a priority list, but we don't have it this year. Karen explained that previously we had a categorization of 1, 2 or 3, and it really wasn't a ranking system, it was Category 1 for Health & Safety and Category 2 might have been for Quality of Life, but it never tied to priorities and a lot of that had to do with the funding. We might have had something like drainage or even a sidewalk project that might be a safety or health and welfare issue, but it was funded from General Funds and there aren't enough to fund those. We could also have a project like a park or parks land, which has a dedicated fund from Development Impact Fees that can only be used on parks, and we have a lot of those, so we end up doing parks' projects before something that is health & safety, because we have money to do one and not the other. It was very confusing for the community, the Council, this Commission and our committee.

Karen indicated right now the prioritization is a bit subjective. We can't score the projects individually and see where those relative priorities should be, based on some objective criteria; we just haven't established that yet. Even that wouldn't be a perfect system, but it would help in determining those priorities.

Vice Chair Levin referenced the concession stand that has needed improvements for some time and noted that it is pushed out to 2020 and the Police Department outgrew their facility 20 years ago and should be on the fast track, so at some point you say there are available funds, but there is inherently a system that is driving the ability of policymakers like the Council to make a good decision. Karen explained that the concession stand and the police facility are two good examples. When we look at the parks' projects, it is a combination of Rachel working with Public Works to determine when those can be put in, those are primarily funded from those dedicated DIFs and some CFD, but she looks at the Dog Park, the Bike Skills Park and the ADA and inclusive replacement of the playgrounds, and she hears from the community, dog owners and bike riders. The bike riders raised some funding and came to the City with a petition, and they came out in force and said they were willing to put some money towards it, if the City matched it. Same thing for the Dog Park, we hear a lot about that facility and level of utilization, so those have taken priority over the concession stand, although that was identified years ago.

Chair Losoff asked if we could assume that the department head didn't feel it should be moved into the next couple of years. Karen explained that it is not in the next couple of years, because we only have enough funding to do the things listed and the relative priorities of those other three projects, from the community's perspective, were higher than the concession stand. Chair Losoff stated that there is always the problem of things carried over, and at some point in time, you have to say we have to stop pushing it back and just do it, but he guesses Rachel is not at that point yet. Rachel Murdoch indicated it is not at that point yet. Another example of one of those projects was the Sugarloaf Trailhead Parking; it also kept getting pushed, and she said even if we don't get any shiny new toys, that has been on here forever, so let's do it, and that is going to be where the concession stand gets to, but as far as the excitement, it is in those other two projects right now.

Karen indicated that regarding the Police facility, the Chief did have that in the first three years and it has been something we have been talking about in recent years. We know that it is in need, but we don't have \$9 million of unrestricted Capital or General Fund reserves to fund that project. The Council has given direction to get a citizen work group together at the end of this budget cycle, to look at long-term revenue options in light of long-term capital needs, so we feel that on the operations side, our revenues and expenditures are in line, but there is no on-going source of funding for general capital projects, with the exception of those smaller restricted dollars. The work group will work with our Finance Director and the City Manager's Office to take a long-term look at that picture, and it could be \$50 million in the next 10 years of projects or more.

Chair Losoff indicated that if the Police Department facility is going to cost \$9 million, we can't afford it all today, but this year X dollars, next year X dollars, so you build up to it with some additional funding.

Vice Chair Levin pointed out that she found a number error, where it skipped #15 and Karen explained that a project was deleted and they are waiting until it is closer to final form before renumbering everything.

Commissioner Barcus referenced over \$3 million dollars in “Non-Project, Non-Wastewater Estimated 2016 Carryover”, and indicated that he didn’t understand “carryover” and if the carryover had been put in the Fiscal Year 17 by line item or by budget item. Karen indicated yes; the total in the request for 2017 includes \$3.2 million of carryover. Carryover is essentially projects that were budgeted in this current year that we are not able to complete – either the entire project wasn’t started or some portion of it that we thought we would spend this year wasn’t completed. Barbara’s Park is one that we had hoped to get done, but there were some delays, and one was a grant project and the grantee delayed execution of the contract, and the big one of \$1.5 million is Parks Land Acquisition, and it is from what we consider “old” Development Impact Fees or Development Impact Fees specifically for parks land that were being accumulated over the course of 10 or more years. Council used some of that money to purchase the Brewer Road property, but that is still the balance, so it gives them an opportunity to identify strategic potential future parks or open space. Right now, there are so many other things that Council and staff are working on, we just haven’t invested the time to do that research and take it back to Council to discuss various options, etc. We only have until 2020 to spend it, because there is a legislative restriction on those dollars, so we will be doing that, but the money won’t be spent this year and possibly not next year. We want it in there, because if some opportunity arises like Brewer Road, we need to have that appropriation.

Vice Chair Levin referenced the transportation study and asked what “construction” means in the table for #26 and what the set aside is. She thinks the last sentence in the second paragraph may address it. Karen indicated that is right; we anticipate that as we spend the next year going through the process of the transportation study, small things will be identified along the way and we don’t want to have to wait until Fiscal Year 2018 to implement some of those, so we want a placeholder of \$100,000 for the opportunity to construct some of those things. The Vice Chair then stated that mirroring that on the Ranger Road crossing, it mentioned that we almost reach capacity at that roundabout, which was very surprising, so that will probably be a critical factor in the transportation study. Karen agreed that it absolutely will be; it is kind of high on the radar for the consultants to look at and how that works with the “Y”, etc., but that is not something that will be accommodated within this budget.

Chair Losoff asked if she is okay with that in terms of the Community Plan, and Vice Chair Levin stated, “Absolutely”. Commissioner Cohen then asked when the study would be done; it says “2017 with prior year’s money”, and the Commission has a problem as we look at every project and affect traffic one way or the other. Karen indicated that the consultant was just selected from interviews a week ago today, and they will get a Notice to Proceed; it might even be on the next Council meeting to approve that contract, and then they will start immediately, but it is easily a 12-month project, which is why there will likely be things identified as they do their work, but it is a lengthy process. Next May is the tentative completion date and that will help as you see projects.

Commissioner Cohen stated that there are two other things associated with the transportation study, and he asked if the transportation study will also review the parking study that was done in Uptown, and Karen stated yes. The Commissioner then asked if the transportation study comes out a certain way, will more Police Officers be needed and will that be part of the transportation study, so we can deal with enforcement and control. Chair Losoff indicated that is not a capital budgetary issue, so let’s stay on the budget if we can. Karen then explained that they will be looking at the entire picture; it is a comprehensive plan, so if they decided that we’re not doing a sufficient job in enforcement that could be something that possibly comes out of it.

Vice Chair Levin referenced project #31 on the Chapel Road Sidewalk and asked if that is on the north side of Chapel or the Mystic Hills side. Chair Losoff indicated that the question is if it coincides with the Community Plan and if it is okay; he doesn’t know if we want to get into those details. The Vice Chair again stated that she wanted to know which side of the street the sidewalk

is on. David Peck stated that he is not familiar with it, but it would make sense to be on the Mystic Hills side with all of the driveways and culverts there.

Commissioner Cohen referenced the Mystic Hills Lift Station set for 2020 and indicated that the citywide master plan, the reclamation plant, and the screen and filter are spread out over a number of years, then the plant itself is in 2018, so is the timing good in terms of what we need to do, particularly with the older ones? Roxanne Holland indicated yes, the Wastewater Master Plan is spread out over numerous years, the same as the Transportation Master Plan. We're currently selecting a consultant to do the master plan study, and then projects will be scheduled based on the results of that study, so that is why that is out in future years. Commissioner Cohen asked if the timing could be changed if the study comes in differently, and Karen stated yes, because we revisit this each year. Karen then asked if the Commissioner's concern was that there is an odor problem now, and Commissioner Cohen stated no, his concern is if it is working okay and if we are doing the filters, etc., soon enough. Roxanne indicated that currently we are doing okay; we've allocated funds for each project based on the severity of the need, so next year we definitely need improvements to our headworks, because it is failing. We need to keep those injection wells on track; that is the effluent management, and there is one to two wells planned for each year. It is also necessary for us to dispose of effluent and right now we are having trouble disposing of everything. Commissioner Cohen commented that it looked that way from the 1.2 million gallons per day, and we have another hotel coming online soon and another drug store, and they use a lot of water. Roxanne explained that we have a lot of capacity to treat everything that is currently being built now or in the near future. The odor control was pushed out, because currently the odor control is not an issue. We haven't had too many problems, but as things increase at the plant as flows increase and visitors at the wetlands increase, those complaints could come in and we can adjust that if needed and odor becomes a problem with our new digester.

Commissioner Cohen then asked about the police shooting range upgrades and Karen indicated that there are some upgrades planned in Fiscal Year 2017. The Commissioner stated that they do need that road pretty quick and some of those upgrades, because it is an important training facility. Karen added that \$272,000 is currently proposed for 2017. Chief Cota then clarified that particular dollar amount is focused on making classroom improvements and certain infrastructure improvements. Along with that is funding to create a design for an alternative route in; the money isn't actually to build the road as much for the design of an alternative route.

Commissioner Klein stated that it seems that there are some inconsistencies between a couple of things on the summary and when you go to the project number. For example on the summary page for MS4 – Storm Water Sampling, it shows \$188,000 in Fiscal Year 2017 and that is project #45, but if you go to the project #45 description, it says Storm Water Master Plan Update and #46 is the MS4 Storm Water Sampling, and it shows the \$188,000 in Fiscal Year 2018. David Peck indicated that is his mistake, and Karen indicated that Fiscal Year 2018 is accurate. The project detail is accurate; this is still a working draft and we are constantly making changes. When we had our latest internal meeting with the budget citizens group, one of the topics of discussion around the MS4 was that this is a mandate from ADEQ that we think it is coming down at any time; however, we think there will be some latitude in when they will require it. They will give us notice that they have adopted it, and it is a bit controversial with some cities in the Valley, so we moved that and David updated for the drainage worksheets, but we didn't get to update the summary, and as we work through this, things will shift a bit, but the projects themselves are still there. David added that it happened on a few of them in the drainage category.

Commissioner Klein then indicated that he didn't know what the requirements were from ADEQ, but it seems that if you are talking about the levels of E. coli in Oak Creek where a lot of people swim, that is something that you would want to be monitoring as soon as possible, because you could potentially be exposing the City to liability if people are swimming in Oak Creek and getting E. coli. He then asked about moving the \$188,000 to Fiscal Year 2017 instead of 2018 to cover any potential problems that could occur. David Peck pointed out that most of the E. coli comes from wildlife, and we really don't have much control over that, so this is more of a monitoring thing for

ADEQ, and we are still waiting on them to find out what we need to do to meet their requirements. The Commissioner then indicated that even though it comes from animals, if you have a high level of E. coli in Oak Creek and you don't know about it, the City could potentially be sued if someone gets sick from that, so it seems that this would be something that you would want to do as soon as possible to potentially limit the City's liability.

Karen Daines then asked David Peck if he knew if this particular project would include something like E. coli as something you would measure, and David indicated that he thinks that is part of it. Karen then asked if the Oak Creek Watershed Council currently measures for E. coli, and David indicated yes, near Slide Rock and Karen added but not down here. Chair Losoff then stated that maybe we should move it up a year, and Karen stated that staff will take a look at that. David then explained that this is more about sampling along the washes, like Soldiers Wash, that run into Oak Creek, not sampling Oak Creek itself. The Chair noted that it is still a health and safety issue, and Karen pointed out that we do have a partnership and provide some funding to Oak Creek Watershed Council to do certain things, so if they are also willing to test Oak Creek within the City limits and not just at Slide Rock, then that might be something we could leverage, since they are already doing it. Chair Losoff mentioned Flint, Michigan and indicated that he doesn't know if we can be too careful with the water supply, but you are hearing that we would like to move it up. Karen noted that staff will check into that other option.

Vice Chair Levin indicated that she better understands David's point that the causal relationship would be from animals, and then from outfall locations, so for Soldiers Pass you are asking yourself if there is cattle there or other similar potential sources for pollution. Commissioner Klein then noted that a couple of other numbers in the 44 to 47 range are not accurate when you look at the summary and the project description, and that was the main thing he wanted to bring up.

Commissioner Cohen indicated that the rehabilitation of the memorial for the former Schnebly Home has no operating impacts on the new toilet, and he then asked if that assumes that the maintenance cost would be in the annual budget and Karen explained that the assumption is that if you see operating impacts associated with a project, then that is the flag to know that we have to also add something to the operating budget to either maintain or provide services if there are staff resources necessary or other operating impacts, etc. The Commissioner then indicated that when you read the write-up on the restroom renovations, you think we better move on that quickly, and then you see that it is out to 2021, so that is a question for almost all of the restrooms in there, including the one at Posse Grounds Park. Karen asked if the Commissioner is saying that the restroom at the Uptown parking lot should be accelerated, and Commissioner Cohen stated that project #1 is the first one, but you go on . . . He read project #9 for the Concession Stand more like bathrooms were necessary, but that was put off to 2020, so he is just asking if the timing is soon enough. If Posse Grounds is being used more and we are putting in the Bike Skills Park, which will add more people, are we upgrading bathroom availability? We also seem to have more tourists than in the past, so the bathrooms in Uptown are important in his mind in terms of timing. He likes all of the projects and thinks they all fit the Community Plan. It is just that some of them aren't soon enough. Karen indicated that is the most common comment that staff gets, and there are a few things that play into that -- obviously the availability of funding and the other thing is capacity. Some of the reason you see carryover in the past is because our Public Works and Engineering Services staff project manage most of these projects, so even though you see PD or Parks, we still have to have someone on the public works side to manage the design, contractor and construction, etc., and there are only so many projects we can complete each year given the staff resources and their capacity.

Commissioner Cohen stated that the one at the park raises a question about health standards and if the current restrooms are going to be adequate or should that be moved up. Rachel Murdoch explained that the current toilets work. When there are events, they always have to get porta-potties as part of their event. She is not certain about how much more traffic there will be once the Bike Skills Park is built, but as far as the facilities everything works, but we will keep monitoring it as traffic increases. Chair Losoff commented that in past years as projects came in you divided them

by various departments, but we have also discussed that as opposed to different departments, like at one time we saw sidewalks in five different areas, and now we try to put them all into one, and the same thing with all of the public works stuff, so we know what they are doing and maybe they could better prioritize rather than be in four different areas, but that is just your process – not the Commission's.

Commissioner Barcus referenced project #7, the Chapel Area Neighborhood Park, because he lives in the Chapel area and is asked by people who live in the neighborhood, but what is the size of a neighborhood park? Rachel stated that in comparing it to Sunset Park, that is seven acres. It would be much smaller than a community park like Posse Grounds, but she would have to go back to the Master Plan to find it. Commissioner Barcus indicated that he heard there are funds available in this account that are earmarked for specific purposes and there is a clock running, so he is trying to figure out how this plan takes that into account for the money that needs to be spent. Obviously, you don't have to develop a community park, but you do have to acquire the land. Rachel agreed and noted that we don't have the money to develop it anyway; it is just for purchasing if the price is right.

Karen Daines explained that the difference between projects #6 and #7 is that the \$1.5 million for park land acquisition in project #6 is in 2017, and that was also in 2016 and it was in 2015, and if we don't do it in 2017, it will be in 2018. That appropriation gives us that opportunity if we were to identify five or seven acres on that side of town that would be a good location. The Parks Master Plan basically said Sunset Park, Posse Grounds and your pocket parks are all on this side of town and you need to have some park-type amenity on the other side of town, so within the next year we will be going to Council to discuss this and probably give them some options, and since the clock is running, within the next couple of years we will be to the point of identifying land and making some purchases, but whether they agree that a Chapel Area Neighborhood Park is more important than a Creekside park or something else . . . Karen referenced the \$909,000 you see in 2021 and 2022 and Commissioner Barcus stated that is the placeholder for the development. Karen agreed and added that if we could secure the land, we need to do that even if we can't construct it.

Chair Losoff explained that in 2012 a consultant did an overall master plan for parks, and we may have seen it at one time. The Community Plan Committee saw it, but it has come up a couple of times and we saw general portions of it. If you like, at one of our meetings, we could have a presentation. Commissioner Cohen asked if it would be helpful to the Commission and Chair Losoff indicated that it might be. We have a park on Brewer Road where the City acquired the land, but we need one in the Chapel area. When this came up before, P&Z pushed it way out, because we didn't feel it was a high priority in the Chapel area, but it is still there. Staff can discuss having a presentation on the Parks Master Plan at one of our meetings.

Karen Daines asked Commissioner Barcus what he was hearing from his neighbors and if they would like that kind of amenity. It would probably be similar to Sunset Park or a little smaller, as opposed to Posse Grounds or the Brewer-type that would be more of an event park. Commissioner Barcus indicated that most of the feedback that he hears is there are no 5-acre parcels left, so are there other options that could be considered, especially because of all of the trail access points in that area. Could a neighborhood park be somehow morphed into trailhead parking, because parking probably is the single largest issue for the trailheads in that area, unless you look at the Chapel? He hiked around Twin Buttes today, and as he came over the Chapel Trail, he counted over 50 cars waiting for a parking space in the Chapel. Chair Losoff added that his friends in that area echo the same thing; they don't want a park, because they don't want the traffic, etc., and all of the Sedona area is a park. Commissioner Barcus stated that there seems to be plenty of outdoor recreational activity on that side of town and the limit seems to be available parking for residents and visitors to park safely and legally. Chair Losoff stated that people seem to be excited about the Brewer Road Park and if that comes in, it would be great for that side of town.

Commissioner Cohen indicated that it might be helpful if Rachel gave an introductory Parks 101 session on the different kinds and purposes of different parks, and how that fits the Master Plan.

Karen explained that the Master Plan talks about what a community park and a neighborhood park is, so that could probably dovetail into one overview.

Chair Losoff stated that if any Commissioner is specifically interested in the plan, they can ask Warren to get a copy of the plan; however, it was pointed out by several participants that it is on the website. The Chair then stated that we will just plan on a presentation on the Parks Master Plan.

Chair Losoff summarized that as he looked at the overall, it seemed that the issues pretty much tied in with the overall Plan. It is more specific from an overall point of view, but it does fit in with the walkability, infrastructure in terms of public works, etc., and health & safety is addressed, so he doesn't know what else the Commission could offer. There were a few specific recommendations, but other than that, he thinks staff has the Commission's advice and consent with the Capital Budget. It is a hard process, and you have done a really good job in putting it forward.

Commissioner Cohen noted that the Chair didn't ask if the Commissioners didn't like a project; that is not in our purview. The Chair clarified that they could comment. Commissioner Cohen then stated parking meters in Uptown; he lives in the Uptown area and they are already parking on the residential streets, and the parking meters look like they are going to be pushing folks up, so it would be an intelligent thing for the City to hold off on parking meters until we get that transportation study. Our Police Chief is going to get more grey hairs once those meters go in with more accidents, etc., and we haven't even seen the result of Tlaquepaque yet. Commissioner Barcus then stated that Commissioner Cohen's concern is not unanimous and he disagrees diametrically.

Karen Daines noted that particular one has been moved from year to year. We waited to do new wayfinding signage, the new public-private partnerships to add parking opportunities in off-street lots, so it was finally to the point where the Council was ready, but there was an internal meeting yesterday to discuss the parking on the side streets and what we can do to address that. We want to get them to not park in the neighborhoods and not on the street, although those are employees parking there, so to incentivize employees to park in the municipal lot and some of these other options, and we are working on that. Parking meters did go to Council 1½ months ago and we are implementing.

Chair Losoff noted that we have a joint meeting in a week or two and they will hear that loud and clear, so in other words (jokingly) shut up. Having the experience yesterday of coming down from Flagstaff and getting by Dairy Queen and sitting there for a good 55 minutes, he would like to see something in the budget to have a traffic policeman or somebody moving traffic. There are two stoplights and they stop traffic, people are walking across and you can't move. Chief Cota indicated that we had been working on exactly that with Engineering to implement a plan that was tested over President's Day weekend, and that plan will be in operation again this weekend where our personnel will be doing exactly that. We plan to do that probably over six known weekends this summer and during any anticipated additional heavy traffic areas. He will let the Commission know when those six weekends are, so they can plan their trips then. The Chair then noted that he is from Chicago and this is nothing. Commissioner Cohen commented that in Chicago and Los Angeles, there are other kinds of routes; however, Donna Puckett added that those are just as bad.

Chair Losoff asked if the Commissioners wanted to comment on trash hauling, and Karen indicated that the Council would have a work session on that next Wednesday. Commissioner Cohen then indicated that he will be there, but he won't say anything. The Commissioner recalled when in the Council's last meeting, Karen was asked why we were spending \$20,000, what we are saving and how long. Karen explained that the request was to go to a voter referendum to get authority to spend \$20,000 and we have over a \$40 million annual budget, so if we did that, it costs \$30,000 to put on an election, so it would cost more to ask to spend \$20,000.

Chair Losoff indicated that one of the Commission's powers and duties is to periodically review the Capital Improvement Budget and, as provided in Arizona State Statutes, the Planning & Zoning Commission reviews the CIP to determine the conformity of the proposed Capital Budget with the

adopted Community Plan, and that is what we are basically saying today. We are pretty much in agreement that it conforms to the Plan. With the exception of maybe one or two specifics in terms of health & safety that were raised – he thinks we are okay with it. The Chair then asked if there was consent on that and Commissioner Cohen asked if the Chair wanted a motion.

Karen Daines indicated that consent was sufficient and thanked the Commissioners for their time.

- 4. FUTURE MEETING DATES AND AGENDA ITEMS**
- a. Thursday, March 31, 2016; 3:30 pm (Work Session)**
 - b. Tuesday, April 5, 2016; 5:30 pm (Public Hearing)**
 - c. Thursday, April 14, 2016; 3:30 pm (Work Session)**
 - d. Tuesday, April 19, 2016, 5:30 pm (Public Hearing)**

Warren Campbell indicated that the joint work session is on Thursday, March 31st and the agenda had an incorrect start time; it is at 2:00 p.m. The Chair indicated that there was a joint meeting with him, Audree, the City Manager and the Mayor to discuss an agenda, so we should have that ahead of time. Warren indicated that he would follow-up on that.

Warren stated that on Tuesday, April 5th, we potentially will have a work session for a conceptual hearing for a project called 1520; that is the address of the property next to the KFC/Taco Bell. Chair Losoff recalled that this came up a couple of years ago, when they wanted to put in offices and a restaurant, but they decided to revise it, so they basically are starting all over again. Commissioner Cohen confirmed with Warren that the work session would be at 5:30 p.m., and Commissioner Klein indicated that he would not be available on the 5th. Warren then added that we also might be following up on the community benefits on the 5th.

Warren indicated that there is nothing scheduled on April 14th and 19th at this time, but those are still open meeting dates. The Chair then suggested seeing about the Parks & Rec. presentation. Vice Chair Levin stated that she thought the Commission passed the Community Benefits Policy on to Council. She then asked why that is coming back, and Warren indicated that he believed that there was something that needed to come back, but he will check as to why.

The Chair indicated that he thinks the joint meeting is in the Vultee Conference Room, and Warren indicated that he would check.

- 5. EXECUTIVE SESSION**
- If an Executive Session is necessary, it will be held in the Vultee Conference Room at 106 Roadrunner Drive. Upon a public majority vote of the members constituting a quorum, the Planning and Zoning Commission may hold an Executive Session that is not open to the public for the following purposes:**
- a. To consult with legal counsel for advice on matters listed on this agenda per A.R.S. § 38-431.03(A)(3).**
 - b. Return to open session. Discussion/possible action on executive session items.**

No Executive Session was held.

- 6. ADJOURNMENT**
- Chair Losoff called for adjournment at 4:40 p.m., without objection.

I certify that the above is a true and correct summary of the meeting of the Planning & Zoning Commission held on March 17, 2016.

Donna A. S. Puckett, *Administrative Assistant*

Date