

Summary Minutes
City of Sedona
Planning & Zoning Commission Special Meeting
Vultee Conference Room, 102 Roadrunner Drive, Sedona, AZ
Monday, August 15, 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. and asked for roll call.

Roll Call:

Planning & Zoning Commissioners Present: Chair Marty Losoff and Commissioners Randy Barcus, Avrum Cohen and Eric Brandt. Vice Chair Kathy Levin and Commissioners Larry Klein and Gerhard Mayer were excused.

Staff Present: Justin Clifton, Andy Dickey, Roxanne Holland, Audree Juhlin, Matt Kessler, Adam Langford, Cynthia Lovely, Cari Meyer, Ryan Mortillaro, Karen Osburn, Robert Pickels, and Mike Raber.

Council Member(s) Present: Councilor Jessica Williamson

3. Presentation/Discussion regarding the development of the Sedona Transportation Master Plan. Representatives from Kimley-Horn Consulting will review study objectives, share assessments of current and future traffic conditions made to date, and discuss how City land use will tie into the study and its ultimate findings and recommendations.

Chair Losoff indicated that the purpose of today's meeting is specific to the consultants who are going to talk about the master planning for traffic control, etc. Brent Crowther added that their presentation would be about 10 – 15 minutes with open discussion afterwards. The team was then introduced as Troy Russ, Land Use Planning Specialist, who would be participating by telephone; Theresa Gunn with Gunn Communications, Inc. (CGI), who is on the Kimley-Horn Consulting team to do the community engagement and outreach on the project, and Brent Crowther who is the Transportation Master Plan Consultant Project Manager with Kimley-Horn. Andy Dickey, City Engineer, also introduced himself to the group.

Presentation:

Mr. Crowther explained that their group is looking for a good dialogue and they want to inform the Commission of what they are doing, and then identify what they think the points of contact are and points of opportunity, and then as they go through the Transportation Master Plan, they can consider that, and it is for a lot of awareness and understanding of the Commission's perspectives and priorities, so that can be duly considered as they go through plan recommendations.

Mr. Crowther indicated that they began the Transportation Master Plan in April of 2016, and they are in part of a 12-month process. The purpose of the Transportation Master Plan is first to review plans and recommendations from previous plans. There is lots of study and planning that has occurred within Sedona over the last couple of decades, so one of their initial tasks was to conduct a literature review and document those previous recommendations and which ones are still of interest to the community, which ones are viable, and which ones are really not feasible because of environmental costs, etc. Second, they have gone through a significant effort to collect traffic count and mobility pattern data and use that to paint a picture of the traffic needs, to frame the issue they are trying to solve. The Transportation Master Plan will result in prioritized strategies and projects with low-hanging fruit of what can be done in the near term, as well as some long-term strategies and projects, for the City to consider, that after implementation will improve mobility for both

residents and visitors. Each of those recommendations will have cost estimates, so they can be worked into both short-term and long-term budgeting activities, and they will be prioritized considering their effectiveness, cost, complexity and feasibility.

Mr. Crowther referenced an overview of what the general tasks are that they will be conducting during the study and indicated that he would break it into three phases. The first phase was Inform – that is the review of previous plans and studies, and in May they conducted stakeholder interviews with 17 or 18 one-hour meetings over a period of two days and got a lot of very good input. They are in a process for their Analyze phase now, where they are analyzing and summarizing their traffic and current conditions data, and they have a Technical Advisory Committee meeting tomorrow to present that data. Their next task is to present both a Community Outreach phase, which will form development of alternative strategies . . . The Chair asked who the technical advisory group is and Andy Dickey indicated that it is comprised of city staff and representatives from the counties, and they have reached out to ADOT, but he believes they were converted to a stakeholder. Mr. Crowther explained that the representative that has agreed to be on the team just hasn't been available yet, and those tasks will be implemented over a 12-month period. They conducted their stakeholder interviews in June and have their second Technical Advisory Committee meeting in August, where they are just beginning their alternative strategies development. Their first round of public outreach will occur this fall, and then they will develop their first draft Transportation Master Plan, bring it to the public, and finalize their Transportation Master Plan in the spring.

Mr. Crowther indicated that today they would like to focus on land use and transportation, so he would turn it over to Troy Russ who is with Kimley-Horn, and land use and integration with transportation is his specialty. They have identified three opportunities to integrate land use and transportation, and this is more at the educational level; they are not specific to Sedona at this point. They are understanding the strategy opportunities, so they will get your input and that will help them to formalize a specific recommendation on how they can integrate within the TMP.

Mr. Russ indicated that he is a 23-year veteran in the planning world and he likes to start the story with some cartoon to remind people that it is not about necessarily moving people as much it is about creating place. Transportation investments are very powerful and far-reaching, so he has an editorial from the *Charlotte Observer* talking about transit. They had just passed a sales tax and the editorial was "Transit: Hell, No Thanks; I'll Just Live with Cars a Little Longer". If you don't integrate land use and transportation, you get that reaction. Why is the opinion of the editorial cartoon that they are going to live with cars a little longer? It really has nothing to do with transit, but it has everything to do with the quality of the place that has been created. They couldn't imagine walking, and if you can't imagine walking, transit is handicapped, so it is the integration of whatever mode of travel or multi-modes of travel, and how well the land use, zoning and Community Plan integrate the needs of that transportation system. That is really what they want to talk about as it relates to the Sedona transportation plan.

Mr. Russ then stated that Sedona is a leader in creating multi-level transportation systems, and understanding that transportation professionals were told from basically the 1940s to the 1990s to move cars and nothing else mattered, and that was the instruction given by politicians and citizens as the car became the dominant mode of travel, and there are only two ways to do that – make more pavement or make them more efficient. More pavement means more lanes or more roads; more efficient is system management like one-way streets, roundabouts, or Intelligent Transportation (IT) systems – basically ways to make the cars move more efficiently. It was a dated concept, and moving into the 21st century, we know there is much more than just moving cars. It is really, aren't we here to move people, not just cars? You are seeing big transit investments, bicycle investments, walking investments, be they private or shared, and you see these modes of travel being treated pretty much equally across the nation and how they are improving the quality of the trip, if congestion is your destiny. Studies have shown that the quality of the trip will lessen the impact of people's perception of the congestion or delay, so improving the view or comfort of the user, context-sensitive design in streets, and you know all of it in Sedona –

traffic calming, personal security, what we can do to improve the quality of that trip for all of the folks, and transportation plans are now incorporated. Probably the most powerful thing we can do is move less people fewer miles and that is in land use itself. Land Use and the Zoning Code control the origins and destinations; the transportation system does not. They control the roadway network much more than any transportation system, because you have subdivision regulations and when a development comes online and asks to modify their plat, you can require a cross access easement network, if you have those institutionalized in your Zoning Code, so more than the Transportation Department, the Planning Department and the Zoning Code regulate the quality of the street network, which in turn dictates the quality of the transportation system.

Mr. Russ stated managing and not falling is where you ask what the terminal level of service is. We grade our streets from A to F, and if you have an acceptable level of service of C or D and you change that by changing a policy from C to D or B to D, you have just given the roadway network 20% additional capacity without any physical change. It is just how you measure success. All of those together really represent a Transportation Master Plan, so how you integrate land use and transportation into it has three components to look at for the transportation study. Looking at the mix in density, then the zoning map, and how your basic zoning districts allow various land uses within the code, so Article 6 in your municipal code really regulates district regulations and where the uses are allowed, and the question is are you influencing the origins and destinations and their patterns?

Mr. Russ explained that you are seeing heavy tourism, so reexamining your code and if we should think about where hotels and motels are allowed and should we create them into a mixture of districts only, so a visitor to the hotel or motel has a chance to already be located in a “park once” district. Downtowns create a very nice “park once” environment, but what about other parts of the corridor – heading west on the arterials, have you created and looked at the mix of uses to create sort of a “park once” environment from a use perspective and how the origins and destinations relate? We can’t regulate where the scenic rocks and canyons are located, but we can influence where people dine and, if you are a visitor, those origins, destinations and shopping-related trips or employees’ day trips.

Mr. Russ indicated that they would do a count for a large majority of the trips, not just the commute trips, and Brent Crowther will show you through the traffic data. Connectivity is the sole responsibility of the subdivision regulations, and can we create required cross access easements? Through this Transportation Plan what may be a mere possibility in the near-term for Public Works and Engineering to acquire or create the cross access easements, over time with properties’ redevelopment, the Zoning Code can certainly create the cross access easements, so that the project isn’t daunting for the Engineering Department. There are some near-term solutions that are really out of the Engineering Department, but it is really the long-term transportation strategies that come out of the subdivision regulations and how willing the City of Sedona is to reexamine connectivity requirements as developments along arterials change over time.

Mr. Russ indicated that lastly is design. Sedona is a leader in design, but are you designing your buildings up and down the corridor to support all those who travel? The needs of the pedestrians, the pedestrians who ride transit, and cyclists are very different than those who arrive by car, and are you arranging your buildings correctly and designing the buildings, so you are extending the reach of the pedestrians, transit and cyclists? If a shared bike program is in the future, that is a very important investment, but if you don’t have the land uses and the buildings and site plans designed to be bike-friendly, then with all that investment by infrastructure, you don’t realize the full potential. The Zoning Code is covering the mixture and density of uses, the connectivity of land uses, as well as the design and arrangement of buildings, so it really does influence how a transportation system works, and those are really under the Planning Commission’s control.

Mr. Russ showed a classic diagram of land mix and density of the exact same land uses arranged differently – one of more of a town center effect with a connected network and one of the classic suburban with “D” on arterials and disconnected streets – same land uses just arranged and

connected differently. What does that mean to trip purpose? When you assign those trips that are generated from the retail experience of a hotel or even the commute and work trips, if you don't have a street network, you recognize very quickly that all trips, work-based or recreation-based, have their origins or destinations and are hostage to the arterial, and with all trips going to a single roadway, that road has to perform very differently unless you have a connected network, and it truly is the subdivision regulations that enable it.

Mr. Ross showed a corner street in Johnson City, Tennessee that has a park right across the street, and he asked the owners of the townhomes how often their kids walk through the park, and they felt it was not a safe condition for their kids to walk right across the street, but what if it was rearranged. He didn't change the density at all; he just rearranged the site plan and went from an inward-focusing development that had no relationship to the street to an outward-focusing development that had a relationship to the street, and just by the redesign of those buildings, without touching entitlements or how much land a person could hold, they created an environment where they could consider walking across the street to the park or biking somewhere or picking up the bus and riding somewhere.

Mr. Ross summarized that land use mix, connectivity and design are really what he wanted to get you thinking about and how this Transportation Plan and the Zoning Code can work together to create a vision. Transportation plans really do influence the ultimate character of the City of Sedona the other way around. If you have an eight-lane suburban arterial, you are going to have a land use that responds to it. If you have a two-lane beautiful town arterial, you are going to have a land use that responds to it.

Mr. Ross indicated that in concluding his overview, he wanted to ask these questions and test your willpower temperature to actually include connectivity requirements; how confident are you in your design standards? You have a beautiful downtown standard, but are you comfortable with your design districts and the zoning of the multiple design districts in creating a multiple environment, and then how confident are you with your current subdivision regulations? They are only as good as the connectivity plan, and it is up to the transportation plan to identify future connections, so if there is redevelopment, then you can require the next redevelopment to either accommodate that connection through a right-of-way dedication or at least through a cross access public easement in the subdivision regulations. He would love to hear the Commission's responses and he will be taking notes to see how this study can really implement what you think we should be looking at from a land use perspective.

Commission's Comments:

Commissioner Cohen stated that we have three roads in and we only have control of what comes in on each of those roads from a certain place. We have a competitive suburban area in the Village, which we take into account as we look at what we're working toward constructing or not constructing. We have no control over tourists, and we have various times during the year when traffic is very heavy from tourists coming in and various times when there is not much, so how does all of that fit into the land use and density piece?

Mr. Ross explained that if we needed to improve the efficiency of the three arterials, you can increase the efficiency by managing turns -- closing left-hand turns, managing the number of right-hand turns, and introducing turning controls without widening the road, and you can squeeze more capacity by making them more efficient. If you make them more efficient, you and the Council will be hearing lots of complaints about not closing this median, my business depends upon it, and that is where the cross access easements over time can become very helpful. As the commercial properties along the arterials redevelop, and you won't find a land use-based data in the millennial; they will change. That is one thing we know about cities; land uses do change, so you can slowly implement an access management plan for your arterials to manage the number of turns, because the turns are what create friction, and the subdivision regulations can help the engineering division look at the access management. You are right, nothing immediate can come out of this, but there are certainly long-term solutions.

Commissioner Cohen indicated that today's solution is tomorrow's problem, and he is talking about the roundabouts. We have two roundabouts that slow traffic down rather than pick it up. One is at the "Y" and the other is at the Tlaquepaque area. He then asked if they had studied those yet. Mr. Ross asked if those are specific transportation investments and indicated those need to be evaluated as to what those serve in your community. He is not talking about the transportation investments; he is talking about how the land uses complement that, so he will defer to Mr. Crowther to answer about the roundabouts.

Mr. Crowther stated that they have collected data on those two and they have a video not queued off of how those are functioning. They grade traffic from the LOS (Level of Service) A, meaning free-flow, nobody around when you want to go through, so you are uninhibited, to the LOS F, meaning the absolute worse condition you have ever been in. Commissioner Barcus interjected every Saturday, and Mr. Crowther then stated that they collected data both on a weekday and a weekend, and the LOS for the "Y" is a D; the LOS for the one at Schnebly Hill Road is an F. There are various reasons for that; roundabouts do provide continuous flow, but what is largely happening is when we have pedestrian crossings, etc., it creates an interruption that is causing some of the spill back in the queues. Roundabouts are very efficient and, from a delay perspective, they can operate more efficiently than traffic signals if you have a lot of turn movements, etc., as opposed to straight-through movements, so there are a lot of advantages to roundabouts from a mobility, access, maintenance and safety perspective.

Mr. Crowther explained that roundabouts do have their maximum capacity, just like any other roadway. Chair Losoff then noted that it sounds like they have already identified what we who live here think is a problem, but if we want to just focus on land codes, it may be difficult, because as a Commission, we talk about a lot of issues. With the land codes, he understands where you are coming from and it is one part of a lot of things. We are a town of maybe 6,000 people, so connectivity, walking and biking is all very important, but he is not sure that is the most important thing given our situation as a City, when we talk about multi-modal issues. Some of the neighborhoods are so far apart, connectivity isn't an issue; the issue is the volume of traffic with three million tourists, and from the land code perspective, we would be interested in your observations as you finish your study, as to how we should change the land codes to accommodate some of these issues – whether it is "park once" or pedestrian overpasses or underpasses, etc., but from a land code perspective, he thinks we exaggerate that biking connectivity and walking issue compared to the big picture, when it comes to the overall traffic problem.

Mr. Crowther asked if the Chair's perspective is that walking and biking does not account for or divert enough trips from traffic to make a difference. Chair Losoff stated that he is going to rely on what you come up with, but that would be his observation. In his neighborhood, people don't bike; they are probably too afraid given their age group, but they walk a lot and jog a little, but he doesn't see them biking a lot, so he doesn't know if that is an issue. Connectivity is there, but that is not true of a lot; he understands that, but he would be more interested in leaving his house in a car and in how he gets through town to the other side of town without massive back-ups.

Mr. Crowther explained that as a review of the previous plans and studies, there have been several studies that talked about neighborhood connectivity, and referencing red lines on a map; they show the potential neighborhood connections that would allow somebody in West Sedona to get to Uptown or other parts without going to S.R. 89A.

Chair Losoff stated that there is no question they would be helpful. There was also a determination that we're restricted to three roads in and out, but are we restricted? Andy Dickey explained in other words is a bypass viable? Chair Losoff then indicated that he would think, as a study, you would not have any biases and you would not be thinking you are restricted to the three egresses, are you? Andy Dickey explained that they looked at that as part of the evaluation of past studies and there are possibilities out there for potential solutions like that. Chair Losoff indicated that he understands in modern traffic analyses new roads aren't always the answer, but given our circumstances here in Sedona, he would hope consultants come in objectively and we aren't

sticking you with just S.R. 89A and 179, and we are going to look at other alternatives. The Chair then stated that Commissioner Cohen indicated that we are restricted; however, Commissioner Cohen clarified that he stated that is what we have, but we have some alternatives that are crazy. For instance, Thunder Mountain is a fantastic shortcut for just around here without taking S.R. 89A, but the problem with Thunder Mountain is that it is two lanes; it has speed bumps to slow traffic down, and it is residential, so people whose homes are around it are going to be affected severely, and those are the kinds of things we need to look at.

Commissioner Barcus indicated that from everyone he has talked to in the community, this whole project that you are doing is pretty tough of mind. It is going to be helpful for the community to understand, for the year-around residents, what proportion of traffic congestion comes from the people who live here; the people who elect people for the City Council. A lot of the land use, connectivity and design is a moot issue most of the time for those of us who live here, because we have off-seasons -- winter and summer, and the sidewalks get rolled up at 5:00 p.m. in the evening factor, so we have specific periods of time during the week, during busy seasons, and certain times on the weekend, when traffic seems to be complicated. It will be really helpful to explain that in 50 years with proper land use mix, connectivity and design, you may improve traffic by a small amount and it will be incremental 50 years from now and he won't be here.

Mr. Ross agreed from a land use perspective, there are long-term solutions, but he also wants to manage everyone's expectation that we are not going to solve it from a transportation or land use perspective. Commissioner Barcus clarified that he was not talking about solutions; he was just talking about . . . , Mr. Ross interjected that he understood what Commissioner Barcus was saying; he is trying to say it is going to be a balance and what these longer-term solutions, or what you are saying is a 50-year plan, will start to outline are choices that your residents will be able to make. They have a choice to get through on these cross access easements or to do another mode, which is a minor issue compared to these cross access easements. Giving people choices is really a good solution, because for your community's destiny, the challenge is congestion and growth and how you balance your livability with that core desire of congestion. It is simply balancing priorities and the land use is what dictates the priority. Do you want it to be a walkable thriving downtown or do you want to get more cars into it to be more car-oriented; that is the choice and a lot of that lies in land use, not in transportation.

Commissioner Barcus noted that a lot of year-around residents already make choices. He doesn't go to West Sedona from the Chapel area on weekend mornings, because he doesn't want to take two hours to go six miles, so there is a tremendous psychological factor that is already in play in this community, and yes, over a long period of time by doing great connectivity and land use design, etc., it is going to improve year-around residents' connectivity, and that is great; that is one part. He wants to know how big that part is and what part is the rest of these failed intersections and failed roadways, and this grading system, and how can we manage the psychology of those visitors, because there are already a lot of people who are frequent visitors to Sedona, but don't live here, and they already don't come on the weekend. They know and come through the week, so we have all of these psychological factors that are already in play; they are not physical or engineering factors and they are more difficult to model, so he would like for someone to address where we are in those things.

Mr. Crowther indicated that he thinks the Commissioner is asking what percentage of our trips is from residents versus those from visitors versus those who are not here. The Commissioner agreed and added that he also wants to know how you are doing your projections of those. Mr. Crowther noted that he will be presenting that data tomorrow to their Technical Advisory Committee, and Commissioner Barcus clarified that he is not asking to hear the data; he just wants to know how you are doing it. Mr. Crowther stated so. . . Chair Losoff interrupted to request that Mr. Crowther go back to the first couple of slides and then stated that from an overall point-of-view those are good. He then repeated that he would hope they are not being biased by three roads in only or you've heard the comments from stakeholders that you can't direct traffic away from their business; they have to park in front of their store or they will go out of business, etc., so he would

assume you are going beyond that to give the Commission an objective overview as opposed to feeding into those comments. Andy Dickey indicated we are in a data gathering phase now.

Chair Losoff stated that what the Commission wants to hear is what we can do, and the land code isn't the only thing. Mr. Crowther agreed, and then the Chair stated that from a P&Z point-of-view, we are in the process of having a consultant, within a month or two, spend a whole year revising the Land Development Code, so he would imagine we would do that hand-in-hand with parts of your study, so he doesn't see that as a problem, except maybe when we get into the nitty gritty, but the land code will be modified in accordance with your study. The land code issue is a legitimate one, but he doesn't see it that high on the list from a multi-modal point-of-view, although he understands we want connectivity and walkability, but is that the cause of the problem?

Mr. Crowther indicated that it is no silver bullet or any one solution that is going to solve it. It is not only land use or connectivity, and in their approach with what they are calling a toolbox set of strategies as they go into their strategies development, they will be looking at traffic operations, signalization improvements, roundabout improvements, etc., and advanced technologies and travel information. They will be looking at multi-modal transit, bicycle and pedestrian, parking, way-finding solutions, etc. The most interesting data sets that they have collected to present to the committee tomorrow are about understanding mobility patterns. They procured data from a vendor that has contracts with Verizon and other major cell phone carriers, since 90% of us have cell phones in our pockets as we travel around town from zone A and to zone B. This data has algorithms that say this cell phone made this trip for 30 days in a row, resides here for 8 hours at night, and then goes here for 8 hours during the day. The algorithms say that is a commuter that lives in this zone and works in that zone.

Commissioner Brandt stated that the planning is great and other than that, he is all ears to hear what this management plan will bring about. We need to look at where we add sidewalks for connectivity, all the way to 50 years out and what roads we limit to people that either live, work or have a hotel room there, and if you don't have one of those, then you need to park and ride, so from one extreme where you can just stroll around to the other extreme that actually is restricting mobility, so the people already here can enjoy themselves, and everything in-between. Sidewalks are relatively easy and the other end of the spectrum is very difficult, but there are pieces that we can do now to set-up if that needs to happen, and he thinks it does need to happen. He doesn't know when it needs to happen, but it needs to happen, so what do we do now to make that transition a smooth one. That is where he is at with the whole big picture; he can't think of just one individual thing. The land use part is important, but we are already doing that with the special planning districts through the focus areas. We are already trying to make nodes, and it is great if those destination areas would work individually, but people are still going to want to go to Uptown and go here and there, but they don't only have Uptown to go to if we improve those to little nodes where the tourists can go and have everything they need, and maybe they go to Uptown once, but they always go that spot, or the locals, in that there is enough of a draw for people that come to that spot where there are shops for the tourists, but the locals also go to the restaurants and that shop; they don't have to go to Uptown or wherever. All those things are interconnected and where you are now is to figure out all the pieces.

Commissioner Brandt then added that one other thing is that it was pointed out that we don't have to limit it to the three ways into town, but there is maybe four if you consider Dry Creek Road as a way into town. Phoenix, a metropolitan area, probably has maybe nine or ten ways in and out and all of the other roads go to wilderness or loop back around and come back to the city. If you think a city of four million only has that many ways in and out, we can work with what we've got and not put in new roads and tear up the environment.

Chair Losoff referenced Mr. Ross's question about should the zoning code be reexamined and indicated that as the Commission goes through its review of the land codes, the Commission will keep that in mind. He then repeated that we are in the process of working with a consultant to get

into the land code issues and that will be a one-year project that will probably coincide with the TMP time limit.

Commissioner Cohen indicated that we are a city of 10,300 approximately and we've been a city of 10,300 for a long time, so the resident population hasn't grown, and he then stated that his question goes back to what Commissioner Barcus talked about. We have two different populations in terms of traffic flow, so are we going to be able to come up with a plan that deals with those populations?

Andy Dickey explained that we are actually collecting new data, and we want to look at current counts of traffic data and project that into the future based on growth rates, so not only do we want to update our volumes to current numbers, but also project that into the future. The Commissioner then asked if we are 85% developed within the city limits, we have 15% to go, so it would seem that either the use of the land changes to increase the population or decrease population, and then our major thrust in looking at population densities are the tourists Commissioner Barcus talked about. Commissioner Cohen then asked if there is a different kind of projection, for instance, bicycles for transportation could be very different depending on how we look at the populations; Commissioner Brandt's concern about sidewalks could be different in terms of whether they live here or come in from Phoenix for five hours, etc. How do we approach that and is that part of the design?

Andy Dickey indicated that it is; what you are talking about is the difference between development potential versus tourism increases, and we do look at what we believe a feasible growth rate is for that tourism increase in traffic as well. We have day trippers as well as our hotel capacity that we have to look at, and it certainly is different than just looking at development potential.

Chair Losoff commented that tourism may be affected; a couple of weeks ago in the *Arizona Republic*, "Six Places Not to Go on Weekends" or whatever, don't go to Sedona on weekends during the summer months. It was in their Travel section on places to avoid, so it is a problem – perception, psychologically, however. Commissioner Cohen added that a few weeks ago, somebody told him it took 45 minutes from approximately the Dairy Queen in the Canyon to Uptown Sedona; never take that route without a full tank of gas.

Chair Losoff noted that they are into information gathering and asked if they have a whole book, and Mr. Crowther stated that he does have a whole book and many more files to back it up. Chair Losoff then asked if they are identifying the problem, and Mr. Crowther stated exactly, and one of the big conversations we need to have, and they will be having it up with the TAC, is the tolerance for congestion. In order to identify the solutions that will be effective, what is our definition of effective? If you want to solve congestion, there are some very grand and large scale improvements that can be made – roadway widening is a large scale improvement that is very controversial and expensive, etc. It's very inefficient to roadway widen to address your weekend four-hour peak, because then the other hours in the week it sits empty, so it is an important discussion as to what is the problem that we are trying to address and what is our definition of addressing it successfully?

Commissioner Barcus commented let's be fair, because if we are looking at this A - F range and we do an improvement to address F, it will have a trickle down impact and improve all the others, except for maybe A at 2:00 a.m. We can talk about super peaks, but during peak times, which are daily, we have back-ups in certain parts of the community, so let's not reject that. Four hours out of every day is 28 hours in a week, because this is multi-dimensional. If we do nothing, this problem will solve itself, because people figure out where to go and not go at certain times of the week, and it is common knowledge. You can walk through his neighborhood and figure those things out. Other people will figure it out and if the City doesn't figure it out to manage the flows, somebody else will figure it out, and it may have adverse consequences when it is figured out, so planning may be difficult, but it is worse to do no planning at all, because it is going to get figured out.

Commissioner Brandt asked how that could be adverse, and Commissioner Barcus stated that it might be a worse outcome if we do nothing, because the technology might advance. He can look

on his phone and see if the traffic is backed up to Dairy Queen or all the way to Slide Rock, so if he is in Flagstaff, he is going to look. The technology is there and if we become logically astute, then we have let people still make choices based on information rather than permit a really bad outcome.

Commissioner Brandt noted that Commissioner Barcus already lives here, so he could go wherever he wanted; however, Commissioner Barcus stated that he is not sure that is the case. Chair Losoff indicated that the tolerance question will be interesting. There are a couple of issues on the tolerance level; for example, his background is from Chicago; he can tolerate a lot of traffic in town, but he is not going to be too happy about the tourists coming in if he has to sit, so his tolerance level is probably high for some traffic, because he sat in traffic for an hour to cross the street in Chicago or Atlanta, etc. Another issue of tolerance would be just how much are we as a City willing to tolerate in paying for things. When it is all said and done, we can talk about land codes, etc., but how are we going to pay for whatever you suggest, and are we as a City tolerant to do that. Are we willing to pay a City Tax, Special District Tax, nothing, etc., to support the expenses?

Mr. Crowther indicated that the question about tolerance and cost are very interrelated, and with the Level of Service criteria that he referred to earlier, almost every city in America designs to D, but downtown New York and some other cities are beginning to throw that out and say congestion is what it is and let the problem begin to solve itself, but if you try to go to Level of Service A where you are the only one on the road uninhibited completely, it is enormously expensive, so that is why the tolerance is very connected to the cost question. What are we designing to? You can design your way out of anything, but are you willing to make the trade-offs, whether they be environmental, sense of place, cost, etc.?

Commissioner Cohen asked when they present the plan if they will be presenting a multiplicity of options that the City Council can choose from with the various factors, not just cost, but other issues. Mr. Crowther stated correct, the prioritization and recommendations, and it will ultimately be up to the City Council to adopt and program out recommendations on an annual basis. Andy Dickey added that would be incorporated through the Capital Improvement Program (CIP) budgeting process.

Chair Losoff noted that just about every project the Commission deals with has a traffic component, which has been very frustrating for the Commission for the last many years, but we don't see any issues with those questions. We're all willing and able to do the things that you are suggesting, and some of it will be starting shortly, some of it we are working on already. Our Community Plan talks a lot about pedestrians, and can you park here and take a shuttle? Absolutely not, the baby's diapers are in the car, etc.; those are all tolerance levels, so it will be interesting to see what you come up with.

Theresa Gunn pointed out that the trade-off was the inconvenience of parking once and shuttling versus sitting 45 minutes from A to B, so what is your tolerance to either sit in traffic or have a little bit of personal inconvenience by parking and traveling? Those are some of the things they are hoping to capture in this fall phase of community outreach. Kind of reframe the conversation, instead of looking to solutions, talking about the data they have on existing conditions and how tolerant they are to change their patterns to adapt to the weekend congestion – is that a nuisance you are willing to put up with or is it a problem that you want to spend money to fix? Those are some conversations they need to have before Mr. Crowther can start giving you ideas.

Chair Losoff referenced his high tolerance level, because he was used to it, but indicated that today he was traveling on Forest to S.R. 89A and two buses were unloading with 40 people each and they were crossing the intersection, so he couldn't get through. Commissioner Cohen added that there are those that come from the Hyatt and cross the road, and they don't care about the stoplights. Chair Losoff then commented that he would like to see their book with all the percentages, etc.

Commissioner Cohen indicated that they started by reviewing previous studies, and then asked how much of the previous studies showed stuff that would be helpful now, but we didn't do for whatever reason; how much from previous studies that we did do are today's problem, and how would we resolve some of those. It would be interesting to hear, because we've done a bunch of these over the years. Andy Dickey stated that part of what the TAC has been looking at is the previous studies and what would be feasible to incorporate, so that is part of what we have been doing and we will continue to look at and analyze as we move forward.

Theresa Gunn stated that they are going to be looking to package this for when they do the outreach and have the data as the foundation of the starting of the conversation in the community. Here is what your existing condition are, and then from there talk about tolerance and trade-offs. Chair Losoff indicated that he knows we can't solve the problem, but managing the problem is identifying the problem. We all have our ideas and he can give you his opinions, but not facts, so it will be good to hear from you. Does anything stand out for you?

Mr. Crowther indicated that something that really pops out at him is from the mobility pattern data that shows the percentage of trips on the weekend that are tourists versus residents based on the algorithms. We are looking at probably a 75% to 80% split to tourists during these peak congestions; you make a trip from your home to a restaurant and that is one trip. You go from the restaurant to your next stop, that is a second trip, but you sum those together and about 80% of the total trips, based on the mobility pattern data, are the short-term and long-term visitors.

Theresa Gunn then asked if that is a nuisance that the community wants to deal with, because it doesn't happen year-around or is that a problem that needs to be fixed? If it is a problem, then Mr. Crowther starts looking at the solutions, so what are ways to manage the tourist traffic? Chair Losoff asked if it is a problem for those of us who live here or are we worried about the tourists coming to town. We want to encourage tourism, so that is another issue. Theresa Gunn explained that they are including a tourist survey; they will be working with the Lodging Council and the Chamber to survey tourists and we will work those details out in the next couple of days, so they will have that effort ongoing. The Chair indicated that he imagines that the Chamber went through the roof when they saw that article in the paper. Andy Dickey stated he hadn't heard from the Chamber on that, so he doesn't know if it is a delayed reaction or not.

Commissioner Cohen asked how we are going to look at roads that we don't control. For instance the Oak Creek Canyon; we have no control over that, that is ADOT and at the 260 turn-off from I-17, ADOT has been asked time and again to place a sign, but we don't control that either, so is there a way to look at those roads that we don't have any control over? Mr. Crowther commented which are the major ones in town; you can't do the plan without their rating and perspective, so they met with the North Central ADOT District in Flagstaff in June and got their perspectives. They also have invited ADOT to serve on the TAC as we get into specific strategies during the toolbox workshops. It is going to be a very pointed invitation to the discipline specialists. We have good contacts with those who operate their TSMO (Transportation, Safety, Management and Operations) section to get them engaged on what toolbox range they are willing to participate in. They want solutions; they are fiscally constrained and can't pay for major investments. They invested a lot in S.R. 179, and they are not looking forward to significant new investment in S.R. 179 or S.R. 89A.

Andy Dickey indicated that he supposes we will make that recommendation to them if that is what needs to be done. The Chair asked about our relationship with ADOT these days, and Andy Dickey indicated that he thinks it is good. They understand that we have challenges in getting buy-in from the community at times, so they relate to that, but he doesn't think there is any leftover animosity, specifically on a personal basis at least.

Mr. Crowther indicated that he appreciated the Commission's time and they are looking forward to receiving the Commission's feedback and input as they develop their strategies. You've emphasized that land use is not the silver bullet; there is no single strategy that will be the fix, so it

needs to be a balanced multi-disciplinary cross-sectional set of improvements to make those incremental changes.

Commissioner Barcus asked if it is going to look like a 20-year plan, so if you do these things over 20 years. . . , Mr. Crowther listed prioritization, cost and the anticipated benefit of that, whether it is intersection improvement, etc., and the result of that in performance. The Commissioner then stated that the benefit of the work you are doing may actually help the City work effectively with ADOT down-the-road as well, because it might provide us with more justification. Mr. Crowther agreed and noted that they have the mobility pattern data that showed about a 80% to 90% split between those coming in from S.R. 179 versus S.R. 89A; the vast majority are on S.R. 179.

The Chair asked if it will include controversial suggestions and Andy Dickey stated yes, part of what Commissioner Barcus was talking about that is relevant is that you actually need a study like this for recommendations that would require federal funding or participation with ADOT. They would ask where the study is saying this is necessary.

Commissioner Barcus stated that Sedona is classified as a rural community, because of its size; we live here and think that it is a bigger place, and we do have an outsized impact from travelers, so in your experience is this about normal or more complicated or less complicated. Mr. Crowther stated that from the size of the community, your three connection points – S. R. 89A, S.R. 89A, and S.R. 179 -- for who lives here and who needs to get in and out, those should be perfectly adequate for the population. The complicating factor is everybody else coming in and out and that is atypical; that is a unique issue. Flagstaff has similar experiences on Milton Road going up to the winter congestion areas, heading up to the Grand Canyon or the ski resort, etc. The tourist areas of Northern Arizona are unique in those challenges.

Commissioner Barcus stated it is different than a medium-size city of 500,000 or 1,000,000 where you just put in an HOV lane to meet some of those peak travel periods, and then open it up to all traffic. In Seattle, they had movable breaks and they would do one-way on bridges and in the downtown areas for the in and out traffic, and those have much different modeling. Mr. Crowther indicated that they are very mindful that in the improvements, you don't want to destroy your sense of place and what makes Sedona special, and that needs to be on the top of all of our minds. You don't want to throw the baby out with the bath water. You can solve the problem by getting rid of all cars or all people as one of the equations, and the other is to manage their travel, different modes, make the length they have to travel to their destinations shorter, etc., and maintain that sense of place.

Chair Losoff stated that the Commission looks forward to their final study on the land codes; they are important. It's a bigger picture for the Commission and certainly having a master plan will be very helpful. Identifying that roundabout by Tlaquepaque as an F and the addition to Tlaquepaque just opened, so it may go from an F to a G-. Mr. Crowther clarified that is the Saturday afternoon in the spring. The Chair stated that he understood, but if we had a master plan and something was identified as an F, when a project comes in that wants to expand across the street, do the land codes say no or if we want to do that, here is how we could work it out. Mr. Crowther explained that it is not just the level of performance that they are after, but also what are the criteria. An example is safety; they look at the crash distribution. S.R. 179 is a very safe corridor based on the number of crashes that have been reported over the last 5 years, because it has controlled intersections, it is lower speeds with the roundabouts, and those are objectives and benefits that are measurable. If you compare that with S.R. 89A, a five-lane cross section, that is where all of your crashes are, so different priorities – a high speed, faster corridor means more crashes.

Commissioner Barcus referenced the crashes and public safety attribute and asked if there will be a component in the study that talks about the impact on public safety vis-à-vis these traffic congestion periods and are there grades like from A to F for getting emergency vehicles to a house? Mr. Crowther explained that there are Police on the Technical Advisory Committee, and he is not aware of a specific . . . Commissioner Barcus interrupted to ask if there are service levels associated with

public safety that are an element of a transportation . . . Mr. Crowther continued to state that in essence they are dealing with traffic as one of their primary inhibitors in getting around town. They do have advantages with lights and sirens, etc., so they are able to maneuver and . . . Commissioner Barcus again interrupted to say that the firetrucks are big enough to navigate over the median on S.R. 179. Mr. Crowther then stated that he is not aware of a specific public safety level of service criteria.

Andy Dickey added that we would incorporate their comments and recommendations in what we come up with. When we look at S.R. 179, for instance, that is part of our justification with ADOT to try to incorporate the message of an alternate route through Cottonwood to Sedona, when we have high volume weekends on S.R. 179.

Mr. Russ stated that he was excited that the City is going to be doing the code next year; that feeds well into their recommendations. Planning & Zoning knows, but the community doesn't, that when you have a wonderful Community Plan like yours, it means nothing until the zoning changes, so just taking the principles in the Community Plan and applying it with what you are doing next year is a great companion document with what Mr. Crowther will come up with.

The Chair thanked the participants for their time and expressed hope that they would keep their objectivity, which is hard when you start opening it up to the public. You hear from people and want to listen to that one person, but you can't.

Note: Mr. Ross left the conversation at this time.

4. FUTURE MEETING DATES AND AGENDA ITEMS

- a. Tuesday, August 16, 2016; 5:30 pm (Public Hearing)**
- b. Thursday, September 1, 2016; 3:30 pm (Work Session)**
- c. Tuesday, September 6, 2016; 5:30 pm (Public Hearing)**
- d. Thursday, September 15, 2016; 3:30 pm (Work Session)**

Cari Meyer referenced the meeting tomorrow and indicated that the work session items for the Community Plan previously scheduled for August 11th were moved to tomorrow, so we have a public hearing plus those work session items in Council Chambers at 5:30 p.m. Chair Losoff indicated that he would not be available for that meeting.

Cari then indicated that there is a work session on September 1st and a public hearing on the 6th for Vino de Sedona. The wine bar wants to do some outdoor entertainment on their patio. They are allowed to use the patio as a restaurant, but it is for dining purposes only, and they cannot have music without a Conditional Use Permit. There will also be a project update, and we will talk about the Commission's schedule. We have been looking at the schedule, especially with the cancellation last week for lack of a quorum, and if you look at the schedule based on your standards, you have meetings 48 out of 52 weeks a year, so we will discuss if that still works for the Commission or if we want to review how we schedule work sessions with the potential of having more weeks off, and we will discuss that on the 1st or the 6th. The Chair asked if anyone would not be available, and Commissioner Brandt indicated he might not be available on September 1st.

Cari stated that September 15th is the work session prior to the meeting on the 20th, and that is scheduled for the Community Plan Amendments, so we may have another work session on that date. Commissioner Cohen stated that he would not be available on the 20th. Cari then explained that the 15th would depend on how the discussion on the Community Plan Amendments goes tomorrow night.

The Chair then asked about updates on the Transportation Master Plan to the Commission, and Cari indicated that if they are going to have outreach meetings with the community, staff could let the Commission know about those meetings. Theresa Gunn explained that in the fall, they want to go to everybody else's meetings instead of holding a big meeting, so their desire is to go to as

many organizational meetings as they can, and the central component is probably some online engagement where you can view the trade-offs, but we will be doing a lot of outreach and the toolbox workshops, so we are probably looking at a two to three-week period of intense community conversation by having lots of activity, but we will be working with Lauren on that.

The Chair suggested an update to the Commission towards the end of the year; the more current the Commission is, we can help the whole process. Andy Dickey indicated that somewhere around December would probably work well.

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 4:55 p.m., without objection.

I certify that the above is a true and correct summary of the special meeting of the Planning & Zoning Commission held on August 15, 2016.

Donna A. S. Puckett, *Administrative Assistant*

Date