
This document was created from the closed caption transcript of the March 2, 2021 City Council Regular meeting and has not been checked for completeness or accuracy of content.

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

<https://www.scottsdaleaz.gov/Assets/ScottsdaleAZ/Council/current-agendas-minutes/2021-agendas/03-02-21-work-study-and-regular-agenda.pdf>

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

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

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

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

CALL TO ORDER

[Time: 00:00:02]

Mayor Ortega: Hello. I call the March 2nd, 2021, city council work study session to order. Deputy City Clerk Cathie Butteweg, please conduct the roll call.

ROLL CALL

[Time: 00:00:15]

Deputy City Clerk Cathie Butteweg: Mayor David Ortega.

Mayor Ortega: Present.

Deputy City Clerk Cathie Butteweg: Vice Mayor Betty Janik.

Vice Mayor Janik: Present.

Deputy City Clerk Cathie Butteweg: Councilmembers Tammy Caputi

Councilwoman Caputi: Here

Deputy City Clerk Cathie Butteweg: Tom Durham.

Councilmember Durham: Present.

Deputy City Clerk Cathie Butteweg: Kathy Littlefield.

Councilwoman Littlefield: Here.

Deputy City Clerk Cathie Butteweg: Linda Milhaven.

Councilmember Milhaven: Here.

Deputy City Clerk Cathie Butteweg: Solange Whitehead.

Councilwoman Whitehead: Here.

Deputy City Clerk Cathie Butteweg: City Manager Jim Thompson.

City Manager Jim Thompson: Here.

Deputy City Clerk Cathie Butteweg: City Attorney Sherry Scott.

City Attorney Sherry Scott: Here.

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

Acting City Treasurer Judy Doyle: Here.

Deputy City Clerk Cathie Butteweg: City Auditor Sharron Walker.

City Auditor Sharron Walker: Here.

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

City Clerk Carolyn Jagger: Present.

Deputy City Clerk Cathie Butteweg: Thank you.

Mayor Ortega: Well, wonderful we have Scottsdale Police Officer Tony Wells as well as Ray Ignialli here if anyone needs assistance. Well, the purpose of our work study is to speak informally and directly with one another as council and help guide staff for the subject that we are dealing with today, which is the general plan. And we did not receive any requests for public comment. So with that, I will then close the public comment. At this point, I will turn it over to Erin to proceed with the discussion, the next topics with the general plan that's 1-GP-2021. Thank you.

ITEM 1 – DRAFT GENERAL PLAN 2035 UPDATE (1-GP-2021]

[Time: 00:01:58]

Planning and Development Area Director Erin Perreault: Good afternoon, Mayor and councilmembers. As you said, we are here to discuss the general plan update. Next slide. Tonight is a series of work study sessions that we have. Next slide, please. And just as a reminder for the public, we're reviewing the Citizen Review Committee recommended draft plan. We're reviewing and addressing public comments and when staff receives council direction, we will be mocking up a council-edited version and that will be made public for the March 23rd work study session. Next slide, please. In terms of materials, I will focus on the public comments as I mentioned and we will be working off the tracked edits plan the Citizen Review Committee draft plan. Next slide, please.

What we got through last work study for the first work study, was the executive summary, Section 1 and a portion of Section 2, which was Chapter 1 that included the character and design and the land use and the major amendment criteria. Tonight, we will be starting with some old business, one was a suggestion from Mayor Ortega, regarding old Scottsdale. And then the second chapter, which is the sustainability and environmental chapter. Hopefully we can get through all of those elements today and also the community and engagement chapter we are working with public comments that we received through February 16th and moving forward, we did not get a lot of additional public comments on the sustainability elements or the community engagement elements. So there's not a lot for me to present this evening on those. Next slide.

To begin with the Mayor's idea, I don't know if you want to speak to that first, Mayor, but it's up on the screen.

[Time: 00:04:23]

Mayor Ortega: Well, thank you. In the vision statement, and then the character discussion, our character elements, what I had referred to as the guiding principles, I mentioned a general topic that would read respect -- respect and sensitivity for the unique legacy, low profile, history and pedestrian scale in the core of Scottsdale, from historic Main Street to Fifth Avenue. The core originated our identity, our unique sense of place.

So at that time, I did not have a graphic and I'm just providing that graphic, which is at your table. It is related to the, let's say doughnut shape in the downtown, which is differentiating that area from the other areas of downtown, for instance, fashion square did not have the direct relationship as you would think. As the historic or this core had. That's what I would like tested for and there's a little bit more discussion on that in my memo. At this point, then we would -- it's kind of old business but I would hope we could advance that to test it in the community.

I will ask Vice Mayor Janik first of all, if you had some comment on that element?

Vice Mayor Janik: My comment would be if you can give me the names of the streets, at the darker pink outline so I know specifically what we are talking about as far as the doughnut shape.

Mayor Ortega: Certainly the area runs north to south, or top to bottom is Scottsdale Road. So that's an

area that, of course is distinctive and then the cross area is marked Indian School. So from Indian School down to Brown, or along Brown Avenue would be towards the east side element and then towards the Cavalier blacksmith shop and the Mission Church area, are that identity and then it runs north on Scottsdale Road and over at about, again, First street towards Goldwater north to the canal area. So this area -- we are not saying that any or all elements are existing buildings are historic. It's just that's pretty much when you are standing there, you know where you are in Scottsdale, Arizona. Just quickly, Councilwoman Caputi.

[Time: 00:07:45]

Councilwoman Caputi: I actually have the lots and lots of comments. I'm sorry. I won't be able to breeze through it. When we brought this up at the last meeting, I think we all did this gasp, just like Councilwoman Janik is saying, what area you were talking about, because when I picture old town Scottsdale, I picture the tiny little square that's actually hold town, you know the First and Main, Scottsdale and Brown, little area where there's actually historic buildings. And then when you were talking about expanding it throughout more of the downtown, which it looks like it's a much bigger part of our downtown if I'm reading that directly and I'm really uncomfortable about that.

I think we had a trend for more density in the downtown core, not just this last council but every council over the last 10, 20, 30 years has voted to have more density. I think and I said this many times, density is appropriate in certain parts of our city and certainly the downtown is the one place where density makes sense. We have decided that we will have limited density and large lots up north. But if we remove density from our city core, it will put pressure everywhere else to have smaller lots and frankly demand is not going down. Elevate as we decrease the supply in the city. And the only thing that the builders can do is lower the quality, which none of us wants. It's simple economics.

There was a comment from C.O.G.S. is that said the primary concern of most of our residents is increased height and density. I completely disagree with that. We all just saw the city survey. And the majority of Scottsdale says their biggest fear is the housing capacity and people being priced out of this city that we love. I want to know how they are moving forward to deliver what the majority of our residents said they want to see more of.

The housing market is crazy tight. There's huge demand for multifamily housing. It's not going away. This proposal that you put in front of us, puts us back to pre-1984 zoning is what I'm told by staff. That's a huge step backwards. I think we need to be moving forward. The city is growing. We have to balance our neighborhoods and opening spaces with nurturing our economic drivers and I think this distorts the market and squeezes our supply and drives up the prices so less people can afford to live in Scottsdale.

We all see that our downtown is suffering. Revenue has to come from somewhere. Scottsdale has high amenity, low property taxes and we make up this difference with the sales tax revenue. I will have to ask you respectfully, Mayor, would you be willing to raise sales taxes in order to keep our buildings small? I can't support the change in zoning. I think it's the strong direction for our city. Thank you.

[Time: 00:11:15]

Mayor Ortega: Councilmember Durham.

Councilmember Durham: Thank you, Mayor Ortega. I would disagree with Councilwoman Caputi's claim that the majority of the citizens want more height and more density. It's very controversial -- more height and more density. It's a very controversial subject. There's a lot of opinion on both sides. We have seen votes and actions against more height and density, and in my view, the majority of citizens want to keep a lower scaled downtown. We can compromise on this.

The more important point I wanted to ask the Mayor is what did you intend to be the significance of this core? Would you expect that to be listed in the general plan or in a zoning amendment? Or what exactly was your intention regarding this area?

Mayor Ortega: Thank you. The state that we are at now is the land use elements. It's not the zoning or height discussion. So the character area that I have described is really the base that generates everything that's recognizable as Scottsdale and we are not down zoning or dealing with zoning and taxes at that point. We're not at the stage of zoning ordinance or height changes, but presently, that area is shown as 44 feet. So that is not a change. What is what I'm calling out in a global way is let the people what have told us that they want to recognize Scottsdale 10 years from now or 20 years from now, not because the buildings are replaced but because there's an extra respect for sensitivity. That's all that is called for and that we are asking for at this time. It's what got us here and being able to identify the corner of Indian School and Scottsdale Road is more distinguished. There's other height opportunities everywhere outside of this doughnut but they don't have the character or the origin that I'm trying to call out with this. So thank you for your question.

May I ask the next council person, Littlefield? Sorry, Councilwoman Littlefield, sorry.

[Time: 00:14:01]

Councilwoman Littlefield: Thank you, Mayor. Well, I kind of tend to agree with your assessment Mayor. The old town, downtown area is very special and it's one of the main reasons people want to come here to Scottsdale. They want to see it! They want to see Craftsman Court. They want to go to the galleries and enjoy the old sense of time and place that we have managed in some respects to keep. So I'm quite willing to allow the citizens to let us know, have a vote. Let us -- you know, come out.

I know where you are coming from councilwoman, but my experience has been the opposite and that maybe we are just on different halves of the city, I don't know. But people want to keep that part of the town old town. They want to make sure that we keep that Craftsman Court and the art galleries and the walkability of downtown main street and all of that. They want to have that as part of what the visitors, the clients, the customers that stay in our hotels what they come to see. And I think that if we want to continue to have that tourism business in that part of town, then we need to make sure that we continue to offer what they want. And I'm willing to ask them. I'm fine with that. Let's see what they say. I think they want to see this. I think they want to have that part of town kept old Scottsdale. I could be wrong. I'm not omnipotent.

Mayor Ortega: Councilwoman Milhaven.

Councilmember Milhaven: When you see the differences of money on this council, I think that's indicative of the differences of opinion in our city. To say everybody this or everybody that, if that was the case, all of us would already agree. So I think we all need to recognize that we represent different constituencies. I think what Councilwoman Caputi was referring to was not sort of her mother-in-law's survey of her friends and small circles but rather a citizen survey that told us something different, but certainly, I respect that you all need to honor your constituencies and the promises you made when you ran for election. I do think that we all agree, excuse me that our downtown is special, and it's something we want to preserve. I think the difference of opinion may be where we draw the lines, all right?

I would agree with Councilwoman Caputi, right, if we look at from Scottsdale Road to Brown and Indian School to Second street, that's pretty special and pretty historic and actually, I don't know if we would do it by ordinance or custom whenever there's a design review issue, we go to that little community association and say tell me what you want to do and that carries a lot of weight. I certainly would support whatever we could do to protect those areas of town. I think the lines you suggest are broader than I'm comfortable with.

But from a more technical perspective where do you see putting this into the general plan and what exactly are we trying to accomplish?

Mayor Ortega: There were initial character elements and that's where I requested that that be added. Because so there was the vision and then the three statements -- this would be a third -- a fourth statement in that guiding principle. The other thing I would point out is it's only a doughnut in this large area of about 2.5 square miles. And so that's the placement of it is near the vision statement, saying this is our origin. This is our history and our legacy. And that's important at that level.

And then as a doughnut, the area outside of that, still within the downtown, if it were built out -- and I don't know that that area would ever be built out, type two, type three would bring 20,000 plus people to that surrounding area, even without the doughnut according to the way other ordinances have been written. So that's why that character, as you noted councilwoman is important and I think that should be at the core and the vision of our statement.

Councilmember Milhaven: All right. So I'm looking at the executive summary. So I don't know that this belongs in our vision estimate. It's not clear to me what you are trying to accomplish, and I'm not sure that it belongs in a vision statement. I do think the boundaries are too wide. You know, it's interesting, right, we want to protect western heritage of our community but Atkinson trading went away and Saba's, but Atkinson is a baseball memorabilia store and Saba's is no longer selling western wear and without changing anything, the complexion of that part of our community is shifting away from old west. Be that as it may, I think the architecture is worth preserving because it's kind of neat. I think the boundaries are too wide and I don't think it belongs in the vision and I don't understand what the general purpose is. I think a general statement about protecting and preserving our legacy is appropriate but I'm not sure this is it. Thank you.

Mayor Ortega: Thank you. And Councilwoman Whitehead, please.

[Time: 00:20:02]

Councilwoman Whitehead: Thank you. So I will add complications to this, so I do think that we want to spell out this specific area separate from the overall urban area because it's really different and we have all spent a lot of time walking it, however, I don't want to water down an area that's already specified as type one. I think that's correct. I'm getting input from citizens that they would like to have a character area plan for the Indian School to Brown to Scottsdale Road, that little section.

So I would advocate two different character area plans. One that is specific this area that is designated as old town. So, again, Scottsdale to Brown, Indian School to Second is it? What is -- I think it's second. Okay. So that -- because -- right. So that has -- I would like to see that as a character area plan, but then the area that is the Mayor is recommending also be separated out from the urban character because it is very different. Now, what that goal will be, you know, it has right now, I think all of it is type two. It's a mix of one and two. Okay. So I think that -- and my goal -- do you want to say something?

Mayor Ortega: You can conclude and then I have just -- I'm trying to clarify. I did not use the word "western." I did not use the word "western" or exclusively in this character. The idea is a sense of place. Right? A sense of place. And I have replaced enough buildings in these areas from fashion square, which was kind of a tourist fashion center and so forth, that was -- Scottsdale was noted for, and still is noted for. So it's not a typifying a western and non-western. I just said be sensitive about this area. It's not even calling out type one, type two or anything this between. It's just saying whatever evolves, there we have to know that's where we originated from and that's what becomes recognizable for people who live here and people who come here.

Councilwoman Whitehead: The smaller area is western and it should be protected from the character area plan and if that's agreeable to this -- you know, I will support the Mayor's resolution to take it out to the public, but I just would like to see two separate -- because Fifth Main Street to the canal is really special, but it's different from the little rectangle that is east of Scottsdale Road in my opinion. But I do think that we have to be very cognizant and make sure that any development in the western -- I don't know what you call that shape, trapezoid, the western piece identified on this map, we shouldn't -- you know, it should match it should maintain the sense of place, but it's a lot broader than the sense of place you get in the right -- the eastern rectangle if that makes sense. We are not doing any zoning. We're specifying that this is a distinct place and I do support that.

[Time: 00:24:00]

Mayor Ortega: So at this point, everyone has weighed in and we have a consensus to at least test that and move forward because we have so much other business. Thank you.

Vice Mayor Janik: I didn't really say too much at the beginning. I think we need to define different parts of the city and I agree we are all in agreement with the part that's historic old town and then what is outside of it, it should be a separate character area and I think that we need to come together as a community to decide what we want is the sense of place, in that area. So I kind of concur with basically what everybody is saying. So thank you.

Mayor Ortega: Good. So we will test it in the community, and if it is a subdistrict then we'll find out.

[Time: 00:25:15]

Planning and Development Area Director Erin Perreault: So Mayor if I can spend one more minute on it. I have a couple of slides to provide clarity for discussion for the council. What we came back with from a staff standpoint is the highest level. So a generalized defining it separate from the urban character from the rest of downtown. That's what is being proposed at the general plan level. Next slide, please.

What you see here is the character area plan level. So we have had a character area plan for downtown that has identified a special downtown core since the mid-80s. That part is not a new idea. The boundary of that downtown core has changed over the years. But what you see on the left is the existing downtown core in the green areas, and then what you see is the proposed area that the Mayor was discussing this evening. Next slide, please.

What you see is the original areas that were identified as kind of those specialty districts, that pedestrian area for downtown under the original downtown plan on the left in 1986. What you see in the middle were some of the areas that were modified and changed in 2009. So the -- for instance, those things adjacent to the canal used to be type one. They were converted to type two after a public outreach process and council action in 2009. And then what you see on the right again is what we have today which is type three, for example, along the canal, and then east and west of Marshal Way, which is in green still, there's the type two. Those type two areas have been there since 1986 that are east and west of marshal way and west of the Scottsdale Road. What the western or historic old town that you are being -- that you are referring to is that most eastern portion, east of Scottsdale Road. What the downtown or old town plan now does for downtown is -- it does talk about those specialty areas. It does define them today. And we also have a companion piece which is the old town urban design and architectural guidelines and there are guidelines to help preserve a lot of that character that we have today as well. Just so you have the full picture of what is being proposed. Next slide, please.

If council decides to include this in -- at the general plan level and the character types map, the next step, if it's adopted and then ratified from a general plan level, then the next step is we would then do a public outreach with regard to making adjustment at the old town character area plan level to recognize any changes that may have occurred because of the general plan update. So that would be kind of next series of steps that we would have to do with the community. So hopefully that provides some clarity to what we have in place today. Next slide, please.

The next portion we are going to discuss is the art, culture and creative community element. And moving on from this, the last work study session we hadn't received a lot of comments from the community. In the two weeks that followed since then, we have received a number of comments from the community on this particular element. Next slide, please. Overall, we received general support for this element. This is first time we have an arts and culture element in our general plan. We have not had one before in our general plan. It's not state mandated. It is community created and desired.

What we did receive for comments is what you are basically seeing a summary on the screen, is to include more references to the Scottsdale Museum of the West, as well as the art galleries to represent arts beyond k-12 education, but really lifelong learning. We need -- the suggestion was there's a little bit of that in there, but we need to beef that up in this element. To expand definitions for arts and

working artists, which there were some suggestions on how to expand those from the community. And emphasis on the role of nonprofits in educational institutions and not just the city provision of arts. It could be beefed up as well in terms of the content of this element. And, of course, we have heard strengthened language throughout the plan. So that is a comment that we discussed in the last work study session. Next slide, please.

In terms of a couple of specific policies, I want to bring to your attention the first one is ACC 2.2 which basically talks about a new art district creating new arts districts or revitalizing of existing districts. At the time that this draft plan was written by the task force, we did not have a designated Scottsdale arts district in the downtown. That designated arts district specifically didn't happen until the 2018 update of our old town plan. So it was not directed undermining that arts district at all. It's just a matter of timing in terms of what this draft and when the arts district was formally designated by council. So our suggestion from a staff standpoint is to delete this because it created a lot of confusion in the community.

The second policy moving forward was a dislike of people thought we were deleting ACC 2.3, which basically talks about arts from an economic activity standpoint, because we have a new tourism element, the CRC decided to move that economic activity. It didn't get deleted. It got moved to the tourism element. We heard from the community they would like to see that economic activity sentiment also in the arts and culture element and so you can see there we have some suggested language from the community that we would suggest including in this portion of the plan as well. Next slide, please.

So really tonight, these are just some of the talking points or decision points for you to provide direction to staff, but certainly we would recommend including and keeping the new element. It has received support for having an arts and culture element in our plan, finally from a community standpoint, incorporating the additional references suggested by the community, expanding those definitions. Of course, are working on including some of the language or highlighting more of the language about nonprofits and the education beyond k-12, and then adjusting those specific policies. And I will stop there in case there's other suggestions from the council as well.

Mayor Ortega: Thank you. At this point, we will look at possible text changes and input from councilmembers. So I would begin with Vice Mayor Janik.

[Time: 00:32:46]

Vice Mayor Janik: Okay. I agree with deleting 2.2. What I would like to see is that for 2.3, that we expand on that, and I think Bob Pejman submitted verbiage. Arts and culture are integral to Scottsdale character followed by the Scottsdale visioning process of the early 1990s recognizes this aspect. And then we go on to naming the different groups and then emphasize keeping this part of Scottsdale strong because it brings economic vitality to the arts district as well and that's a very important part of our city.

Mayor Ortega: Councilwoman Caputi.

Councilwoman Caputi: I love this section. I think the more art, the better. We have been talking about

that tonight all right, about our culture and heritage. This is it. It's part of Scottsdale -- I mean, that's who we are. Absolutely more language, stronger language, references to the Museum of the West, absolutely. I don't have a problem with talking about other districts. Again, back to the comment of more is better. No one would ever suggest that we should eliminate our wonderful art district downtown. It's a jewel. That's what attracts lots of people. It's an economic driver. We all love it and we want to preserve it. No one is suggesting that we put the art business out of business. As long as they keep doing business.

I don't have a problem with encouraging arts all over our city. Wouldn't it be wonderful to not have to drive necessarily -- I live in North Scottsdale. It would be great to have more art in other places so we don't have to make such a long track. I don't know why we push down the emerge of other opportunities to have art. That seems antimarket force to me. It feels a little weird. Of course, strengthen our downtown arts, increased arts everywhere we can and absolutely keep an arts element in the general plan. I think this is great and keep it in and make it as strong as we can. Thank you.

Mayor Ortega: Great. Councilmember Durham.

[Time: 00:35:41]

Councilmember Durham: I agree with all of those suggested changes. I sat in on one of the phone calls last week or the week before, and there were quite a few comments, more comments than anything else on this and the arts section needs to be strengthened. I agree with all of these comments and also with Vice Mayor Janik's proposal to make this section even stronger.

Mayor Ortega: Councilwoman Littlefield.

Councilwoman Littlefield: Thank you, Mayor. I agree also. I went through all of these chapters and very carefully word crafted some things because one of the problems I had with the original was that the verbs, the language was too weak. We needed a little bit more in the way of strength. I do agree that ACC 2.2 could be removed. And I do agree with the suggestions that Councilwoman Janik referenced with the comments that Bob Pejman sent to us, with what he believes would help to strengthen the arts district and the galleries. And one of it is consider establishing new districts that celebrate the city's tradition of arts and culture and support the revitalization of existing arts-related districts. That's what he says he wants to have removed. He wants to add a new goal, which would maximize the potential of the existing downtown arts district, consisting of the privately owned art galleries, related businesses, the artist schools, the city museums, including, I would put the Museum of the West, Scottsdale arts. I would also put in Scottsdale symphony and for generating economic activity. And then the final one that he had in here was to approve developments or redevelopments that do not cause a negative economic impact on the existing take holders and I think that's something we could look at also.

I had a couple of suggestions on ACC 3. Instead of encourage, I would say promote. And 4.3, again I would mention the Museum of the West. You were mentioning the Smithsonian. I think Museum of the West would fit there. Down below, again, I like a lot of what they have done in this and I think working with the schools and the Ute organizations to exposure to the arts. I think that's great. That's something we can work with our schools and see what we can come up with that. I noticed that

that was okay. That was okay. That's all.

I think -- I think they did a great job on this, I really do. And some of the things I want to add in or things that are new from when the general plan was done. So this is part of that update from, what, 20 years ago or whatever. Thank you.

Mayor Ortega: Very good. Councilwoman Milhaven.

Councilmember Milhaven: I'm all good.

Mayor Ortega: Councilwoman Whitehead.

[Time: 00:39:31]

Councilwoman Whitehead: It was approved upon with citizen input and with what my colleagues said. I do absolutely strongly support the addition of a section on k-12 education, recognizing that excellent k-12 education is -- even though it's not -- even though we the city, we don't govern k-12, it's store to our value and quality of life. I do have examples. I didn't print them from different general plans. Las Vegas and some place in Texas. So I will get that to staff. Yeah, I'm good.

Mayor Ortega: Councilman Durham.

Councilmember Durham: The open of 2.2, consider establishing new districts. Is that going to survey? I think the second half should be separated out as an independent point, but I think it's a concept of establishing new districts should survive on its own. It wasn't clear to me if we were saying this it should or not.

Planning and Area Development Director Erin Perreault: From what we heard from the community this was a desire to delete the entire policy. So that was what we were bringing forward to the council. We can get different direction from the council if there's something you want to preserve.

Councilmember Durham: I think as Councilwoman Caputi suggested, there's nothing wrong with having other districts. I had a chance to visit an art gallery down on Thomas Road a few weeks ago. And it would great if art districts could spring up in other parts of town. So I think it's appropriate to leave the first half of that 2.2 on its own, and then obviously we discussed in other places the revitalization of the existing districts.

Vice Mayor Janik: I do have another comment on that. I thought maybe if we just said instead of consider establishing how about welcome new districts. I don't know that the city needs to be totally proactive in doing it but certainly we should be happy if it occurs. So I think maybe welcome new districts that celebrate the city's tradition of arts and culture. I think that would be a very nice statement. Thank you.

Mayor Ortega: Very good. I concur with the offerings on comments and actually, as a standalone arts and community works, but I have no problem if it's redundant in tourism. I think it just plays -- they play together. Thank you. Please continue Ms. Perreault.

[Time: 00:42:50]

Planning and Area Development Director Erin Perreault: Next slide, please. In terms of the open space element, the one thing that the citizen task force does and the Citizen Review Committee, they identified four types of open space in Scottsdale where previously we only identified as three, and so the fourth type is identifying the preserve as it's its own space and developed open space and continuous open space because we connect to regional systems as well are also identified in this chapter. Next slide, please.

In terms of what we heard from the community. This is a mandated element with state mandated content and we have some community created content in all state mandated elements as well. We heard a desire to environmentally sensitive land and recognition mentioned in this element from the community. We did receive a number of comments on goal OS-2, and OS-7 being somewhat similar so we could certainly take a look at that when looking at this element. And some comments on policy OS-2.3 and I will give a little bit of detail on the OS-2 and OS-7. Next slide, please.

From a state statute standpoint, what you can see on the top of the screen is the state statute language. In terms of the OS-2, the organization of the goal fulfill the Scottsdale McDowell Sonoran Preserve initiative that is certainly not state mandated. That's a community desire, but the rest of that goal was the task force's intent of meeting see under the state statute language and that's with regard to regional open space systems and connecting to those and promoting those. Next slide, please.

What was confusing is that we have a designation in the general plan, that a that state mandated, which a portion it is but fulfilling the McDowell Sonoran Preserve, it is not state mandated. We would recommend taking that identifier off, but we also had some general plan language suggested by the community. We wanted to focus on the state language more specifically in terms of promoting regional system of integrated open space and recreational resources. And then some adjustments to the policy underneath that, still keeping the land acquisition of the Scottsdale McDowell Sonoran Preserve to connect to that regional system in, there which was the community's desire to include those from a task force standpoint and then adjusting language voter approved land acquisition for the Scottsdale McDowell Sonoran Preserve. Staff felt that since it was confusing, there these were good suggestions and we would recommend making these changes in this portion open space element.

In addition, we did hear a number of comments about policy OS-2, that was adjusted during the CRC process and so what we did here is really some overwhelming and drafted in the plan so you can see that on the second doctor or the third bullet down, the original language is ensure development adjacent to the Scottsdale Sonoran preserve and respects the unique location and minimizes impacts to the natural environment and contributes to the community's visual access to open space in the mountains. So there's a desire to bring that back into the plan and staff certainly agrees with that. So that was the major input we have received to date on the open space plan. All the other input we is received previously, the Citizen Review Committee by far included already in the plan for your consideration.

Mayor Ortega: Thank you. We will have some discussion on the open space element and Vice Mayor Janik?

[Time: 00:47:58]

Vice Mayor Janik: Thank you, Mayor. Under the open space, page 3, paragraph 1, I would recommend that we include the environmental sensitive land ordinance is most forward-thinking ordinance in preserving our environment, something to that effect so that we can emphasize that, that we live with the environment as opposed to separate from it. The other comment I think I will let Tom talk about page 94 with the reordering. Okay.

I like the fact that we are leaving in OS-2.3. Under OS-2.5, it says recognize and consider wildlife corridors. How about recognize and protect wildlife corridors. It's a little bit stronger and I think that's what we want to do. Here there and we want to protect them. I want more than considering it. I want it protected. And then OS-3.3, it's kind of same thing, put back ensure instead of encourage the preservation. It's a little stronger.

I read vista corridors and of course, I had to look that word up. I'm wondering if maybe we could do a little bit better job of explaining what a vista corridor is. And then OS-4.5, ensure usable open space in new development and ensure -- actually we don't need 4.7, because it's included in 4.5. And I think -- do you want me to go ahead to page 101 or am I going too far? We are at OS-8.1.

Planning and Area Development Director Erin Perreault: That's still in this element.

Vice Mayor Janik: Okay. I had a lot of trouble the continuous open space canal. Is there any way we could use more distinctive colors or maybe even use dash dot, dash dot, and maybe, dash, dash, as the next and circle, circle, circle, whatever, but I couldn't figure -- I couldn't see it. So thank you. And I think that's it.

Mayor Ortega: Councilwoman Caputi, do you have comments?

[Time: 00:51:17]

Councilwoman Caputi: Yeah, I like all the changes. I think they are great. Restoring the language on 2.6, I had pause on the OS-2.1, I'm glad others spoke on that, having that directive to complete, making it a directive as opposed to a choice was difficult for me. It's like tricking the voters that it's a state map dated directive. -- mandated directive. We need to make the decisions based on what is best for the citizens. They have to weigh in. It should make economic against. Keeping that a choice is important to me.

The other comments I tend to agree with other than just to put out there into the public space once again, I just feel so strongly on every section that we need to remember that the general plan is an aspirational document. It's not a regulatory -- it's not regulatory. It's not zoning. It's an aspirational document that describes our dreams and our vision for the future of the city, getting bogged down on the haves and the shoulds and the musts and the woulds, I think. Let's just leave it at that. It's aspirational, let's just remember. It's aspirational and it's a lovely vision. And I'm proud to have the preserve and I love that we have an open space section. That's great. Thank you.

Mayor Ortega: Councilmember Durham.

Councilmember Durham: And the open space, it referred back to the land use categories that run page 74, that came in the character and culture section. There were three categories of open space on page 74, but there were four paragraphs -- four categories of open space on page 94. And you know, it seems to me we ought to recognize all four back on page 74 as well. And it might also make sense to establish some kind of priority system in terms of their development from least to most or something like that. You know, starting with the Sonoran Preserve which is number one on page 94, but it -- it's currently number 3 on page 74.

Another thing that I thought could use consideration is that the Sonoran preserve and -- the Sonoran preserve is OS-1.1, and continuous open space is OS-1.4. Both have goals dedicated to them. Goal OS-2 is dedicated to the Sonoran preserve, and then goal OS-3 is dedicated to the continuous open spaces. There are no goals specifically to either OS-1.2 or OS-1.3. And just in terms of logic and symmetry, there probably ought to be a goal dedicated to each of those categories. That would define what a natural open space is, differentiate it from a developed open space. I mean by looking at the map I can sort of tell what each of those categories is, but I think it might be --

Mayor Ortega: Excuse me, councilman. I'm getting a request from the city attorney.

City Attorney Sherry Scott: I'm so sorry to interrupt. We are having a hard time hearing you on the audio -- hard time hearing you on the audio. It's not capturing you very well. So everyone out there listening to you, if you could talk a little more closely into your microphone.

Councilmember Durham: Okay. Is that better? Yeah. That sounds better. So just to reiterate what I was saying, this ought to be a goal and OS statement for each of the four areas including the natural open space and the developed open space that don't currently have goal statements.

Mayor Ortega: Okay. Thank you. Councilwoman Littlefield.

[Time: 00:56:47]

Councilwoman Littlefield: Thank you, Mayor. I have a question, Erin. Is there didn't and I just haven't read page by page through this entire thing yet. Is there anywhere in this general plan that actually gives a definition description of what ESLO is.

Planning and Area Development Director Erin Perreault: We don't have a lot of ESLO language in here because it's the general plan level. That's what we heard from the community in terms of wanting some more of that description in here. We can certainly provide that as well in the glossary too, a definition of what it is.

Councilwoman Littlefield: I think that would be helpful because we are using the term, and a lot of people may not be familiar with it and at least it would give them a dictionary definition of what it is we are talking about here. So -- and it is something our citizens have said they wanted and so we need to be careful on that. That and one of the things I had, let's put a definition in there.

On page 94, I think however -- I think three and four should be changed in its order, because you have

continuous open spaces and then you have developed open space. You are going from the preserve to natural to continuous to developed and I think that makes more sense as we get more and more building in the lands that we are holding as open space. I think it would make more sense to change that order. I would also like to include -- put it back in on 2.3, what was taken out. I think that's kind of a good thing to have in there. I would put that back in and restore it. 2.5, I also would like to see the word "protect." Instead of consider. You consider something, and you don't have to do anything, but if you have to protect something, then that -- there's a little bit stronger emphasis on what happens. I also -- on 3.3, on page 96, I like the word ensure. I would put that back in where they had it. And I think that the -- utilizing the following vision significant roadway designations should be applied.

I think that makes sense also, just to put that in so it sects down. -- so it connects down. 3.4 designate -- as you can tell, I don't like the word "encourage." The use of drainage easements and vista corridors. Again, I agree we ought to have a definition on what a vista corridor is so people know -- is it an alley that you can see to the end or what is it? So I think that should have a definition also.

Next page, 4.5 and 4.7, I had the same thing, get rid of the word "encourage." Put do or ensure or whatever people think is best. Also 5.4 on the following page 98, ensure. And on the 99, I had 6.4 designated important natural areas parks and other open space systems as primary elements. So when we come across that, people know what it is. And they won't have a problem with it.

I really liked the goal OS-7. I liked all of it. I thought it was very well done and very well written. So I liked the change on the last one. I -- I just think they did a great job on that. I too would like a little more color contrast on the mapping, just maybe I'm a little color blind. It would help to distinguish, even if it's just contrasting one space next to the other space so that you can see the lines better delineated. And that's all I have. I think that this was very well done. This was a good section and I think it will add a lot of strength to our general plan. Thank you.

Mayor Ortega: Councilmember Milhaven.

[Time: 01:01:15]

Councilmember Milhaven: I'm agreeable with all of staff's recommendations but I would comment to Councilwoman Littlefield, on 3.4, for the most part, I'm ensure versus encourage, but if you say encourage the use of drainage areas, vista corridors as recreation, and you say ensure that's almost like saying we want you to use all of your washes for recreation. Because if you say ensure the use of washes for recreation, that says we want to -- it reads to me like we want all of our washes to be used as recreation, rather than saying where it makes sense. Just -- that's the way I'm reading what you are saying. I'm not sure that that was your intention. Thank you.

Mayor Ortega: Councilwoman Whitehead.

Councilwoman Whitehead: Thank you, Mayor. I agree with Vice Mayor Janik said right up front, that, you know, we need to spell out and define ESLO and NAOS because that's a huge part of our open space. But I just want to refer -- and I do think this is a nice section but I have some recommended changes in addition to what my colleagues said. But I just want to read one piece of a sentence on page 93, which says as Scottsdale nears building out, sustaining existing open spaces and creating new open

spaces will be even more important. So everything in this general plan and especially pertaining to open space must come back and move this recommendation forward. So based on that, I will move on to some of my suggested edits.

I agree with councilman Durham that the four categories should -- there should be consistency between earlier in the document and these. I think that on the continuous open spaces, one of the reasons why we have NAOS is wildlife corridors and we have to identify that in the continuous open spaces. I agree the order would be better the way somebody said, maybe Councilwoman Littlefield, I like the order. It seems like everybody focused on the -- well, I won't even get there yet.

I want to confirm, OS-2.1, complete the land acquisition for the Scottsdale McDowell Sonoran Preserve. That's remaining the same; is that correct? Okay. Thank you. Because this was voted on by voters. So it's not council's job change it. And I agree with the put back of the wording on OS-2.3. I agree with councilwoman Littlefield, recognize and protect wildlife corridors. Okay.

Now for goal OS-3. The last work study session, I would like to add 3.0 or whatever number you want to assign it, and that is the creating the downtown pedestrian path plan, the emerald necklace. We have buffered roadways and desert scenic roadways and preserve scenic buffer that seemed like a good place to also design NAOS, because that's another category. OS-3.5, I think I'm not first one to say this, locate parks and unique landmarks and -- it says when possible. I mean if it's not possible, we are not going to do it. Can we get rid of "when possible." Okay.

So goal OS-4 -- so this is an interesting one to me, because we -- it looks like it was done by -- I keep bashing work done in committee, because we try to get everybody's priorities in but ensure that open spaces and public ownership remain accessible to community members for compatible recreational use. I'm not sure what that means. I think what we are trying to say is public open spaces remain accessible and open to the public, which kind of ties into a discussion I was having with staff today. And so what I would like to recommend is that we put some kind of directive that -- that limits the closing or -- the closing off any public spaces. I'm not sure how to say that, and I will work with Erin if my colleagues agree with me on this. We have a lot of public spaces. If we turn it around and lock it down and lease it to somebody who is a private entity and this happened in DC Ranch park, for instance, that -- that's not a good thing. So we want a policy that protects public open spaces as public. And I think that's what was the intent of this. Am I correct, Erin?

Planning and Area Development Director Erin Perreault: When the task force discussed I think their focus was on disability, for all walks of life and all ages. I think that was the intent of including that in here.

Councilwoman Whitehead: I would like to expand it to accessible to all members of the public. So if there's a gate and a fence around something, then it's no longer accessible. Now there might be reasons that we do that, but it should be -- we should have rules that govern when we can and can't lock out the public from public spaces they are paying for. Also throughout this, in the discussion of what we require of development -- of developers. So for instance, McCormick Ranch or DC Ranch, all of these communities, Sweetwater Ranch, we the city -- people always say, well, my developer gave me a park. Actually your city gave you a park. When we negotiate with the developers, we have public open space. So throughout this, there are examples where it says encourage usable outdoor open space and

new development. What we want to say here is require because we're getting rid of that -- that's from last meeting, we are getting rid of these optional words and requesting that they abide by this -- these guidelines. So -- and insert public. So outdoor public open space. And I would say that's true throughout this chapter.

When we discuss what we're negotiating, from a private entity, it should be public open space. And I wanted to add a section -- I agree with Councilwoman Janik about 4.5 and 4.7 could be combined but I want to add a section that says -- because we are -- remember, we are trying to expand public open space. So expand public access to public venues such as WestWorld and the stadium. So we want to maybe add that in. Showing people how we are going to do that.

And then I was going to suggest a section where we add public/private partnerships to expand public spaces and maybe we -- the example I have -- I don't have the right wording, but the new garage down at -- at -- it's slipping my mind, McDowell and Scottsdale Road, that is called -- you know, the A.S.U. facility. Skysong. Thank you, Councilwoman Caputi. So Skysong, one of the negotiations we did is they are building a private parking garage that will serve on nights and weekends as a public farmer's market or some kind of function. So a section that says expand public places through public/private partnerships.

OS-5 under 5.1, add wildlife corridors. OS-7, I had a lot of changes, but I will try to -- so I will try to limit those and talk to you separately. The OS-7.5, the renovate, renew and upgrade. We popped into a tree canopy plan at the beginning of this document two weeks ago or three weeks ago. So just I thought OS 7.5 could be summarized with the tree canopy plan. I agree with my colleagues all the open ended words should be fixed with un -- the unopened ended words such as protect, interconnectivity this actually -- OS-7.6 is very important to me. And I would like to see stronger language. What has happened in the past is by accident the city has gotten rid of easements, trail easements. So somehow we really want to say protect and prohibit abandonments of right-of-ways that are -- have public access easements on them, or some kind of -- And then OS-6, OS-6.4, I put love this, but -- instead of recognize, protect important natural areas. So "protect" instead of "recognize." And I think that's it. Thank you.

[Time: 01:12:44]

Mayor Ortega: Okay. I would just add some comment. One thing that I heard repeatedly was respect, be sensitive, protect, and whether that element is related to the open space, natural open areas, or even development near those areas should respect and I heard the -- the term "sense of place." And that's the same term I was using for downtown, just being able to know, it's applicable in the Sonoran desert and you would know where you are, under the sun that way. So that's -- the other comment, perhaps, what Councilwoman Whitehead was looking for is some sort of development agreements considering open space shall be more attuned to again, respect, sensitivity and protecting or outlining those areas. It may already be in some form but I think whether you are talking about a large subdivision or development, there's probably a development agree with that, that would be compatible. Okay. Thank you. Let's move on.

Planning and Area Development Director Erin Perreault: The remaining elements that we have, including the environmental planning element, the conservation element, the water resources almost,

energy element, and the community involvement element, we have not received substantial community public participation on, beyond what we had already received during the CRC process. So I don't have any hot button items or big ideas to go over with you on those elements. I would welcome anything that the council may have as far as suggestions at this time.

Mayor Ortega: Good. Let's again start with Vice Mayor Janik.

Vice Mayor Janik: Make 106, EP-1.2, we have to protect the natural environment, and educate landowners and developers on their preservation options using the environmentally sensitive land ordinance as our guide. So give them a positive way to read about it, what it means. And encourage that. And in 2.1, I might add ESLO.

Then on EP-17, page 111, I would like to see the term tree canopy and maybe instead of tree plans or in addition to it, where we develop the core programs such as shade and tree canopies that increase and maintain shade, et cetera. I think -- I think that's a very meaningful term because I think visually we know what a canopy does and when you see a tree canopy, it's quite beautiful and it provides shade and comfort. As often as we could interject that terminology, I think we should. And that's it.

[Time: 01:16:29]

Councilwoman Caputi: Great job. I love this section. Really kind of a silly comment for the document overall. Could we label the pictures? I love a lot of these pictures but I'm so disoriented. I'm like, is that whatever park? Unless you were really familiar with your city, you wouldn't know what any of these are. That would be great.

And then I have a more general comment, not specifically to this section, but because this reminded me we use education, Ed unite the citizens and the community a lot. We talked in the arts section about collaborating with K through 12. I don't know when the opportunity to put this out into the conversation is going to come so I will do it now. I feel very strongly that we should have an education element, a standalone educational element in our general plan. I know there's probably other councilmembers who agree with me. Councilwoman Whitehead mentioned the Las Vegas general plan. I printed out a couple of them and it's so impressive. I mentioned it to the city manager that I would get him a copy. They do an awesome job of making a standalone education element. It's 12 pages long. It's such a good template for what we might want to do. I agree with Councilwoman Whitehead that education is a direct component of our quality of life and add it in here sprinkled in. I think it needs to be a separate element and I would be happy to participate in that activity. Three kids in our public schools and I'm passionate about this topic. So. That's what I have for now.

Mayor Ortega: Councilmember Durham.

Councilmember Durham: I didn't have any additional comments on this section.

Mayor Ortega: Councilwoman Littlefield.

Councilwoman Littlefield: Thank you, Mayor. Actually, Councilwoman Caputi, I agree with you. We have all of this education here and there and around and about and we do a lot of education in

Scottsdale through our conservancy and all different kinds of areas, arts. I mean we should have an element that tied it all together. I think that makes a lot of sense. And it gives us -- it would give us an opportunity too to work with the schools here in Scottsdale and with our youth to have them know what it is, where they are, and why this is a special place. I think it has a lot of imagination that could go into that and be developed very interestingly.

On this element, I had a question and it is because I'm a native from here and lived here almost all of my life. Every time I read through this, I see the population numbers. Every chapter they get a little bigger and we will have more and more and more people. Do we have any idea of how much growth we can support as a city? We're land locked. We can't grow land-wise, but how many people can our water supply support? How many how much is realistic? How much is great and how much is too much that we start losing our quality of life because we can't support that number of people? I notice every time I read through, it's a different number. I'm not against having people come here, obviously I want that, but I'm a lit bit concerned that if we don't have some sort of idea of how many folks how much do we have the water levels for. The water levels are dropping. How does that affect what we do? Is there any type of relationship there between that? And that's just not a particular element. It's just a general overall how do we measure that? And do we measure that?

Vice Mayor Janik: Are you finished.

Councilwoman Littlefield: No, but I can answer that.

Vice Mayor Janik: I don't know if you remember when we were at the retreat, how much water each human being consumes and how much water do we have and what do you project is the match population and the number was 300,000. And maybe it's right. Maybe it's wrong, but I was happy that someone identified a number. So that would be my answer. Okay.

Councilwoman Littlefield: I wasn't done.

Mayor Ortega: Oh, I'm sorry. Please go ahead.

[Time: 01:21:32]

Councilwoman Littlefield: That was just a question that I had because we ought to have some sort of knowledge about that. Again, this is a good area to stress as well, which I would like to see happen, bring it are forward by name and description and how it applies in this chapter and guidelines for it. I had a little bit of a concern with EP-6 for clean, alternative fuels by preferred parking for fuel efficient vehicles. This whole page this goal, EP-3, I support it but I think it goes ail little too fart I don't want people to be turned off from Scottsdale because they can't drive their car. I don't want to have people think, oh, I can't rent a car from the airport and go to Scottsdale because they don't want to have a car. That's not where I want to be and that's not how I want our citizens to be. We have a citizenry that's an older population and they are -- they are used to having their automobiles. Again, I'm not against electric cars. I'm not against moving forward with some of this, but I don't want to have our citizens feel like they have to, that they are pressured to do that. So I think the terminology could be tweaked a little bit. But I'm very happy to see this moving forward as a part of a goal.

And the other -- the last thing I had in here, I do not like the idea of reducing the street width to limit unnecessary asphalt. I understand asphalt is hot and it creates heat islands and all that kind of stuff. I just came to work today and there was a huge humongous accident at the corner of cactus and the 101. There were cars turned and police and fire and I think the entire departments were out there. I'm a little concerned if we want to reduce the asphalt, that's fine but we need to increase the sidings, the curbs. I don't want to be in a position where we are causing more and more accidents because our streets are too narrow. That's just the thought I had. These cars were upside down and it was very ugly and nasty.

Mayor Ortega: And give us a page number.

Councilwoman Littlefield: 111.

Mayor Ortega: Good cross reference for us.

Councilwoman Littlefield: And also the mandates hazards, all of the bikers and skateboarders, would be in jeopardy if they didn't have the space to travel.

Mayor Ortega: Councilwoman Whitehead.

[Time: 01:25:01]

Councilwoman Whitehead: I have been speaking with the Scottsdale environmental advisory commission members and so this is the area -- first of all, I want to say I absolutely agree with council woman Caputi and I support her to help staff to put a section or an element, an education element in I had suggested it in one area. I don't really care where it goes. I want to give her my full support on that. I took notes on everything Councilwoman Littlefield didn't like and I didn't like the parking preference because I felt it was unfair. If you can't afford an electric car, park in the back.

I have extensive notes in my work with staff and the commissioners. I want to ask this council to allow me to move forward and then have with the commission input and with staff input have a draft of these changes to you on -- at the March 23rd but we are trying to make -- we are trying to streamline the goals to so we are removing qualifiers. So rather than promote efforts to improve air quality, we would write improve air quality. And then the policies will point to specific policies that advance the goals.

Let' see if I have an example. Instead of saying reduce the waste stream, we might say implement a compost -- a horse manure compost program at WestWorld. So we and our citizens when we are reading this as not a boring document, but it's an a-a moment. So identify some of those policies at a higher level and then streamline and minimize duplications.

And so Councilwoman Littlefield's comment about the narrower roads. I think it should be part of the transportation section and it should include specifications, this is what our public works does, they narrow lanes not really the asphalt and expand bike lines. If I have -- rather than go through, you know, ten pages of specific recommendations, if I have council's support, I will continue to work with staff and the commission and come back with recommendations. It keeps -- it keeps this in its essence. It just reduces the words and gets more specific, but maintains the heart and soul of what is in here.

Mayor Ortega: Thank you. And I would wrap up that section that saying the definition of a roadway is typically from one lot to another lot, the area in between. It could include sidewalks, bike path and so forth. So the environment definition of -- in the transportation is property line to property line. As the citizens think it's where the asphalt is, it is broader than that. In our ordinance, would we want to wrap up discussion on these changes generally, I was hearing people were felt it was fairly strong and then this was a request for some general definition and I had no problem with looking at that and coming back with more specific language. I believe the environmental commission already had some input. So this is just another review on their part, as well as staff.

Councilwoman Whitehead: No, they have not formally provided input. They are working on it.

Mayor Ortega: Okay.

Vice Mayor Janik: I think we should give Councilwoman Whitehead to proceed with formulating action plans and eliminating some of the text and let us review it. So thank you.

Mayor Ortega: Okay. Let's continue, Ms. Perreault. A question from Councilwoman Caputi and then Milhaven.

[Time: 01:30:43]

Councilwoman Caputi: I don't have any problem going back and making the language more specific, but just a question to staff, because I feel like a broken record here but is the general plan the place where we put policy to that drilled down detail?

City Attorney Sherry Scott: Mayor and Councilwoman Caputi, the general plan is, you are correct, a policy statement. And there's no black and white legal rule that I can give you about what's appropriate in a general plan versus not, as long as it's clear in the plan itself, and to the community that the plan is, you know, this vision for the community in a policy document. The plan can be more detailed. The difficulty is when the plan starts reading like a regulatory document. That becomes the legal issue in that case. It's clear it's a vision document and not a planning document, then council will have disconnection about how they want to approach their general plan and how much detail they want to put in it. I'm sorry I can't give you the magic formula from a legal standpoint.

Councilwoman Caputi: Well, I'm all for adding horse manure to the plan. Thank you.

Councilmember Milhaven: If you work closely with staff which you said you are planning to do and let them vet the recommendations and balance, you know, are we too specific or getting too regulatory so that when you come back, then we have a better sense of what we could consider or not consider. So thank you.

Mayor Ortega: Well, Ms. Perreault, should we continue?

[Time: 01:32:44]

Planning and Area Department Director Erin Perreault: Next slide, please. The next slide is the conservation element. Again, I don't have any specific public comments to make. Most of the comments that we have received have been incorporated by the Citizen Review Committee and the plan that you have before you. So certainly open to any other ideas that council may have on this element.

Mayor Ortega: Let's continue with Vice Mayor Janik.

Vice Mayor Janik: I think this was very well done and page 114, it's the same thing, conservation 1.1, instead of seek local and regional, promote local and region, private and public partnerships. A little more of an action verb. I would restore 2.7 on page 115. And I think that is it. Thank you.

Mayor Ortega: Councilwoman Caputi.

Councilwoman Caputi: No further comments.

Mayor Ortega: Councilman Durham.

Councilmember Durham: No further comments.

Mayor Ortega: Councilwoman Littlefield.

Councilwoman Littlefield: I also like this one a lot. I think they did a great job on it. I would say, promote, again, 1.3, seek local and regional cooperation, get rid of the encourage. 1.5, protect. I like that. And 2.3, maintain natural washes as wildlife movement corridors. Just protect the washes where there are wildlife corridors and that was basically it. I liked everything else. Oh, I didn't have a suggestion on how to rework this, but on the conservation 5.1 on page 118, it seemed kind of weak to me. But I didn't have any brilliant ideas on what to do with it, so -- I leave that to staff and to the commission. I thought it was a great element.

Mayor Ortega: Councilwoman Milhaven.

Councilmember Milhaven: I'm good.

Mayor Ortega: Councilwoman Whitehead.

Councilwoman Whitehead: As long as we are defining what is and what is not developed, then I'm fine with 5.1, but if someone sees this as an opportunity to bulldoze their NAOS, then I have a problem with it. Perhaps I can do that offline with you. So I just have a clarification needed there. While I have the floor, I want to say that my work with the environmental advisory commission, also involved water resources and energy. So I won't have comments on those but I will incorporate them on the 23rd. So just so people -- those are the two -- those were three err area -- three areas that they are looking at.

Mayor Ortega: Thank you. We are in a desert, and we are an oasis, but scarcity is rule one. Could we continue with maybe water or the next element?

[Time: 01:36:38]

Planning and Area Development Director Erin Perreault: Next slide, please. So, again, this is a state mandated element and we have not received substantial comments on that, what we have received has been incorporated into the draft plan already.

Mayor Ortega: Are there any comments, Vice Mayor Janik on water?

Vice Mayor Janik: I think my only comment map 122, I think had some trouble distinguishing different areas, because I have a green stick 'em on, it but I didn't write on it. Actually, when I look at it again, I think it looks pretty good. No other comments.

Mayor Ortega: I see Councilwoman Caputi.

Councilwoman Caputi: I'm comfortable with this section.

Mayor Ortega: Councilman Durham.

Councilmember Durham: I don't see any specific references in here to the current situation regarding Colorado River and its declining level. There is the water supply. I wonder if there should be language in here concerning the current situation on the Colorado River, such as Mr. Biesemeyer talked about at the retreat last week and whether there's any goals. I don't have any specific ideas. I'm just thinking whether there should be some language acknowledging our situation.

Mayor Ortega: Thank you. Councilwoman Littlefield.

Councilwoman Littlefield: Thank you. I just wanted to say, I thought the additions to this were excellent. Unfortunately, with modern days of today, we need to have this type of protection and enhancing and keeping our water supply safe, I think it timely and very good to put into our goals and our budgets and general plan. So thank you.

Mayor Ortega: Councilwoman Milhaven.

Councilmember Milhaven: I'm good.

Mayor Ortega: Councilwoman Whitehead.

Councilwoman Whitehead: I would like to see some urgency and high level -- everybody is worried about water. This is an opportunity to provide -- water. This is an opportunity to provide some additional information and then -- and then I might have more comments through the commission, but I'm fine, very good section. Thank you.

Mayor Ortega: My only comment is we have three sources of water, CAP is up with of them, and it's under peril. If they want to mention that there are three sources and one is in particular in peril, I suggest that we have the aquifers and the SRP and the CAP. We got the readout on the CAP water and that's feeding into the central California valley, as well as Las Vegas. There's a lot of demand on that

one basin. Why don't we continue with the energy element.

[Time: 01:40:38]

Planning and Area Development Director Erin Perreault: Next slide, please. So the energy element is the new element that was passed since our 2001 general plan. And it also been added to our 2001 general plan and in addition, it's been added to the draft plan as well. So these are state -- it is state mandated and they are new goals and policy to our general plan.

Mayor Ortega: Let's stay in order. Vice Mayor Janik.

Vice Mayor Janik: Just one quick comment. On page 124, could we just add one more element, and that would be ensure that the energy grid will be functional in times of stress by performing regular stress tests. Thank you.

Mayor Ortega: Councilwoman Caputi.

Councilwoman Caputi: We live in the solar capital. We should take as much advantage to solar power. I didn't see a huge emphasis on that in here, other than a little bit of word -- yeah, we do live in the valley of the sun. That's it. Thank you.

Mayor Ortega: Councilmember Durham.

Councilmember Durham: I have no further comments.

Mayor Ortega: Councilwoman Littlefield.

Councilwoman Littlefield: I would like to keep e-1.6 in. I think it makes sense. Thank you.

>> Mayor Ortega: Councilwoman Milhaven.

Councilmember Milhaven: I'm good.

Mayor Ortega: Councilwoman Whitehead.

Councilwoman Whitehead: We went through so much work to protect energy efficiency. It's like rowing a boat. You might get to the island with a hole in the boat, why not just plug it. You will get there faster. I agree we need to put that back in and also the energy grid, I will take that into account too. Thank you so much.

Mayor Ortega: Thank you. I have no comment. Perhaps we can -- well, move on to the next element. Thank you.

[Time 01:42:59]

Planning and Area Development Director Erin Perreault: Next slide, please. So the community involvement element, it's created by our citizens and important to our citizens. It's been carried

forward into the draft man, and, again, we don't have any additional comments than what the Citizen Review Committee has already added to or considered for the plan.

Mayor Ortega: Vice Mayor Janik.

Vice Mayor Janik: I have no comment.

Mayor Ortega: Councilwoman Caputi.

Councilwoman Caputi: Great. More is better.

Councilmember Durham: No comment.

Mayor Ortega: Councilwoman Littlefield.

Councilwoman Littlefield: I liked a lot, I liked 2.1, provide notification based on characteristics of a specific case. I think that's great. I also liked distribute city information in ways relevant to personal and professional interests. And a lot of those ideas that they have down here, I think we ought to be using as far as getting the information out regarding the general plan. So I -- I think that they are great ideas and I think we ought to be actively taking advantage of having them in here. And last part -- CA-4, I thought that was excellent. Thank you.

Mayor Ortega: Councilwoman Milhaven.

Councilmember Milhaven: It looks good. Thank you.

Mayor Ortega: Okay. Councilwoman Whitehead.

Councilwoman Whitehead: It looks great. In anything defines this city, it's community involvement. Anything great in the city came from citizens pushing for it. So, yeah, I'm good with it. Thank you.

Mayor Ortega: I have one comment, where it says to seek community-wide representation. I understand that in the involvement process, but my broader thought is whether or not the community-wide representation could be some form of district system. And I say that just because this general term says community-wide representation. And what kind of at-large and examination we have, self-examination of distributed representation. That may not be the place for it, but I really do feel that by having input from all areas, that we're achieving a goal, of getting direct input and direct representation.

Councilmember Milhaven: I would like to say we have community-wide representation, because we are all elected at large. That may be a conversation for another day.

Mayor Ortega: Yeah, I totally understand the idyllic representation. So the next one would be a general plan update, and then getting into our conclusion.

Planning and Area Development Director Erin Perreault: Next slide, please. So for the next meeting, we

are going to be ambitious and try and get through the rest of the plan. A number of these elements we aren't getting a large volume of comments on from the community. Of course when I we started this conversation, most the community comments were on land use and character and culture. So we will be bringing all of that back as well as an edited plan to the March 23rd meeting for your consideration. So just to prep you, those are the elements and the chapters that we would be looking at going through next time. Next slide, please.

I just wanted to mention for the Mayor and the council, but also for the public that in terms of the outreach opportunities we do have some upcoming study sessions, one next week and then, of course, March 23rd that we keep referencing, as well as some community group Zoom meetings on those land use items that council directed us to testify in the community. And we also have additional open houses that people are registering for right now. On the right side of the slide, you can see that the community can reach us and give us comments on any portion of the plan on the city's website 24/7. Next slide, please.

In terms of next steps. The last date is scheduled April 13th where we hope to wrap up some your final comments after March 23rd where that's where we will do a lot of the heavy lifting. And then we will be looking at taking your edited draft plan to the planning commission as that's part of their statutory requirement, is that the planning commission make a recommendation back to you on the plan itself. So the timeline for that is scheduled for May 12th for the planning commission to do that on our current work schedule. And that concludes my presentation. Thank you.

ADJOURNMENT

[Time: 01:48:42]

Mayor Ortega: Thank you. With that, we will be adjourning and reconvening in five minutes. So let's take a break for our city council.