
This document was created from the closed caption transcript of the April 13, 2021 City Council Work Study meeting and has not been checked for completeness or accuracy of content.

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

<https://www.scottsdaleaz.gov/Assets/ScottsdaleAZ/Council/current-agendas-minutes/2021-agendas/04-13-21-work-study-and-special-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: 00:00:03]

Mayor Ortega: I call the April 13th, 2021, city council work study session to order. City clerk Ben Lane, please conduct the roll call.

ROLL CALL

[Time: 00:00:19]

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

Mayor Ortega: Present.

Clerk Ben Lane: Vice Mayor Betty Janik.

Vice Mayor Janik: Present.

Clerk Ben Lane: Councilmembers Tammy Caputi.

Councilmember Caputi: Here.

Clerk Ben Lane: Tom Durham.

Councilmember Durham: Here.

Clerk Ben Lane: Kathy Littlefield.

Councilmember Littlefield: Here.

Clerk Ben Lane: Linda Milhaven.

Councilmember Milhaven: Here.

Clerk Ben Lane: Solange Whitehead.

Councilmember Whitehead: Here.

Clerk Ben Lane: City Manager Jim Thompson.

City Manager Jim Thompson: Here.

Clerk Ben Lane: City Attorney Sherry Scott.

City Attorney Sherry Scott: Here.

Clerk Ben Lane: Acting City Treasurer Judy Doyle.

Acting City Treasurer Judy Doyle: Here.

Clerk Ben Lane: City Auditor Sharron Walker.

City Auditor Sharron Walker: Here.

Clerk Ben Lane: And the Clerk is present.

Mayor Ortega: Wonderful. We have Scottsdale Police Officer Tony Wells and firefighter Tyler Folio here if anyone needs assistance. Well, I want to remind everyone that it is western week in Scottsdale, Arizona. Festivities will continue all week and on Friday, we will have the Hashknife Pony Express arrive here in Scottsdale at high noon on Friday.

MAYOR'S REPORT

[Time: 00:01:23]

Every year around this time, we celebrate volunteers in our community. It's called volunteer week. Due to the pandemic, the city-wide volunteer program has been on hold. We miss our volunteers and look forward to restoring them to service as soon as possible. As one example of their dedication, the photo on the screen highlights the 2020 William P. Schrader Volunteer Impact Award Honorees from the Career Center. Even during the pandemic, this group has devoted to helping the community by offering virtual interview coaching, resume building assistance, and job search coaching without in-person contact. We are grateful for the service of all of the volunteers in our city.

So let me make this official with this proclamation. City of Scottsdale, whereas the city of Scottsdale volunteers play a critical role assisting the city of Scottsdale to execute the mission of simply service for world-class community; and whereas, the city-wide volunteer program enlists residents that matches their talents and enthusiasm with numerous services, programs and departments; and whereas, in fiscal year 2020, more than 5,000 citizen volunteers contributed over 135,000 hours of services to our community; and whereas, citizen volunteers contributed a value of work that equates to \$3.4 million in savings without the additional cost to taxpayers; and whereas, citizens who volunteer benefit from the experience by contributing their public service to make our city a better place while sharing their love for Scottsdale; and whereas, many notable organizations in Scottsdale, such as Honor Health, and the McDowell Sonoran conservancy also benefit from hard-working volunteers; and whereas, national volunteer week has been celebrated each year in the United States of America, since 1974, by presidential proclamation.

Now therefore, I, David D. Ortega, Mayor of the city of Scottsdale, Arizona do hereby proclaim April 18th through the 24th, 2021 as volunteer appreciation week in Scottsdale, and encourage all citizens to join me in celebrating the kindness and the generosity of the citizens who volunteer to serve our community. Witness thereof our Clerk Ben Lane. I know that many volunteers are watching this program now and I would like to applause from all.

[Applause]

[Time: 00:05:09]

So we are in a work study session. It's a less formal setting to discuss the agenda items and other topics. We will not take an official roll call vote, but this is an opportunity to provide direction and to open the dialogue from the council.

We also have a period allowed for public comment, but we did not receive any comments from the public. So accordingly, I will close the public comment.

Our agenda item is draft general plan 2035. It's an update. You may have followed us as we have gone step-by-step through the process. Erin Perreault, the planning and development area director.

ITEM 01 – DRAFT GENERAL PLAN 2035 UPDATE (1-GP-2021)

[Time: 00:06:12]

Erin Perreault: Mayor and city council. Next slide, please. We have three opportunities to discuss the general plan and then we are on schedule for Tuesday, June 8th which is your recommendation -- I'm sorry, your adoption hearing after planning commission has one more nonaction in their recommendation hearing. Next slide, please.

In terms of public notification, we have attempted to -- in terms of COVID -- do as far and as wide as we can. Of course, most of it has been virtual. We just want to give you an idea of all the outlets that we have used to date. We have had one water bill insert. We will have another water bill in the next round of water bill inserts and then all the community groups we have been trying to meet with as well. Next slide, please. Getting into the plan. Next slide.

We are now completely working with the city council drafted plan at this time. We have finished with the Citizen Review Committee draft, and have incorporated a number of council comments over the past work study sessions that have been received as well as community comments during that same time period. The plan is set up in three sections with eight chapters, 24 elements, 17 of which are state mandated.

In terms the draft plan, we have lightened that. So the executive summary will be a companion piece that we craft at the end of this process. The prologue was retained. The foundation for the vision is moved because it's historical to the appendix. The purpose of the general plan has been retained in the plan to explain the purpose to our citizens. And then the community profile was split with the historical portions being moved to the appendix and retaining where Scottsdale's place in the region is and our demographics as well. Next slide, please.

We have also strengthened as council requested, the language throughout the plan, and tried to make the goals and the policies more action oriented. Next slide, please. Moving into Section one which is the reface of the plan, it includes -- preface of the plan, it includes the vision statement, the community aspirations and the community values. Next slide, please.

Councilman Durham has submitted some slight tweaks to the statement, which council discussed last week. I will leave up this slide if mayor and council would like to discuss these.

Mayor Ortega: It looks like a football play down the middle or something like that. Please go ahead, councilman Durham.

Councilmember Durham: Thank you, Mayor Ortega. Actually, most of these suggestions come from a constituent who pointed out that our -- the verbs in this vision statement don't really line up. Some of them are in the present tense and some of them in the future tense. I changed -- I think I changed most of them to be the present tense although if it's a vision statement, they could certainly be in the future sense also. And that's what most of the changes are.

In the second paragraph, the exceptional experience, I added some semicolons to make it clear that the distinctive arts and culture references the vibrant downtown. And the third paragraph, I added a verb for sustainability, because there really wasn't a verb regarding sustainability. And in the last paragraph, I have just added those two words, actually, it's just two words, all of which -- so it would be all of which define our unique sense of place and I thought that was very good way to wrap up that last paragraph. But those are basically the changes that were suggested.

Mayor Ortega: Thank you. I have several as well.

Councilmember Durham: Okay.

[Time: 00:11:09]

Mayor Ortega: Hopefully this will be nearly the last pass here. Taking from the attachment five and reading the vision statement that you have -- you provided, I would suggest it just say "Scottsdale is an exceptional Sonoran desert experience." We strike out is known worldwide. So Scottsdale is an exceptional Sonoran desert experience and the premier international tourist destination. I would strike out in the southwest.

And the next -- the next sentence says we value and preserve our distinctive character. I don't know that that's -- I believe character is covered later on. I would suggest it reads this way: Scottsdale will continue to be an exceptional Sonoran desert experience and premier international tourist destination where our western heritage is valued."

There were terms such as distinctive heritage or character and I think if we ended where "where our western character is valued." In that same paragraph, there is what I consider a superfluous sentence that says we will be one of the finest cities which -- in which to work, play, live and et cetera.

That's almost a cliché that I hear everyone say. I would just strike out that last sentence. Of the first paragraph. The second paragraph repeats what was stated for reinforcement that Scottsdale is a special place in the south -- in the southwest. I suggest that we just leave it simple and say our inclusive community will draw visitors, businesses and new residents from around the world because of our natural beauty, the McDowell Sonoran Preserve, vast open spaces, environmental assets -- that would continue with the rest of what you have here, including vistas.

I think we should go directly into inclusive. And we will draw, say, our inclusive community will draw visitors, businesses, and new residents from around the world because of our natural beauty, the McDowell Sonoran Preserve, vast open spaces and environmental assets, high standards for designs, world-class resorts and distinctive art and culture, period. I know that there's recreational opportunities and such, but I think those would be the basis of it. That's in

attachment five.

For three, I believe that -- I would agree with what you have -- what has been written for community prosperity. For me, it's important to use the word "continue," because I think that's what a general plan is. That's who we are and where -- you know, where we are coming from. So I prefer to say, had Scottsdale will continue to be a thriving prosperous city that attracts and grows world-class businesses and leverages technology and encourages innovation and cultivates a well-educated or knowledgeable workforce.

I believe we should use the word knowledgeable. At that point I believe it would be -- it would conclude there. I would take out the sentence that says, our opportunities will prosper above all and Scottsdale is a special place to live. I don't think we need that sentence. Finally, on the last -- the last paragraph, distinctive character. Scottsdale will respect and be sensitive to our history instead of our unique history. Our history.

And western legacy found in the heart of old town, designated historic neighborhoods. So neighborhoods request designation. That's how they are classified. I felt it was important to say, archaeological sites. Many people don't realize that it's from the Anasazi and Salado people. Those of us who know the archaeology of the McDowells, it's pretty important.

And cultural resources -- cultural resources would be like cattle track an important area that's not in the downtown necessarily, but I think it's important. And I see that the other area talking about our outdoor and equestrian experiences probably -- probably -- they might be referring, and I just would ask you to bear with me on this -- would be our distinctive world-class events maybe and that includes equestrian, cars, golf, all sorts of things. And which would say -- which define our unique sense of place.

I think in many ways, that would be a shorter version, which would encompass hopefully the intent that we are looking at here. Our distinctive character grew out of many things, as well as events. Before I was talking about more physical and cultural distinctions in old town. Even the Parada, even the other events, Barrett-Jackson which was founded here and grew here, the PGA, all of those end up being probably the events that are characteristic and uniquely set in Scottsdale.

I'm hoping that is acceptable and I would like to have us do a roundup of that at some point. I see a comment from Councilwoman Whitehead and then Councilwoman Caputi.

[Time: 00:19:04]

Councilmember Whitehead: Thank you, mayor. I like those changes. That's what we do. We get something all written down and start chopping it out, chopping out extra words. I think you did a good job of chopping out extraneous words. I will propose a couple more words for the chopping block.

Under exceptional experience, I don't think "environmental assets" adds anything to that paragraph. I would propose for removing that phrase. Under -- I would like to see community prosperity even shorter than the -- even more cuts but I'm not going to make any specific recommendations. Under -- under distinctive character. I was glad you pulled out the "outdoor and equestrian experiences and recreational activities."

I would say historical neighborhoods, and cultural and architectural resources and events which define our sense of place. But there was something else too, if I see it that I also wanted to pull out. Well, that's it for now. Keep making it shorter and more to the point, makes it stronger. So good job, everybody.

Mayor Ortega: Thank you, Councilwoman Caputi and then Councilwoman Milhaven.

Councilmember Caputi: I said it a couple of times and I will repeat myself. Anything we can do to make it shorter being I'm all for it. I still think it's way too long. I think a vision statement, if you can't say it in a couple of sentences is not really a vision. Anything we can do to shorten, shorten, shorten, I will be in complete support of. And I like those other comments that you just made as well, Councilwoman Whitehead. Again, anything to shorten it would be great. I think we are over thinking.

This the wordsmithing over every last little word. I think we are trying to make a vision, a basic general vision and we are getting caught in the weeds here. We kind of need to move this forward. Councilman Durham, this is hard for me to follow. I think I would need to see -- I would need to see it all written out. I don't know if some of these make sense. I would have to see it. This is a little confusing. Is somebody at some point going to make sure that grammatically everything makes sense. I don't know if some of these S.s to me.

I think I it should be a semicolon and you think it should be a colon. I think we will never end and we'll come back and do that same thing all over again. Shorter is better. I like the changes. That's all I have to say for now. Thanks.

[Time: 00:22:06]

Mayor Ortega: Thank you. Councilwoman Milhaven and Janik.

Councilmember Milhaven: I'm disappointed that we are continuing to wordsmith. There are lots of things in here that have bug me that have been at best awkward. So thank you for this. But beyond that, I'm disappointed we continue to wordsmith it. I do agree it should be shorter, but if we're going to introduce changes, I can follow some of what you said. I couldn't follow others.

What I urge my colleagues is one, someone once said, Frank Lloyd Wright said a camel was a horse built by committee.

[Laughter]

I think this vision statement -- or was a camel built by a committee. I think returning this vision statement into a camel, I think we have to recognize that we don't all have the same writing style and it may not be exactly how we might say it but as long as it's the essence of the point we are trying to make, that we should be okay with it.

And so I'm -- I'm -- I thought we were sort of there, and so I'm sorry that we continue to wordsmith it. So if folks want to make additional changes, it makes a whole lot easier. When Betty hands something out and says here's what I'm thinking. If you can hand out your changes. I encourage my colleagues if it is -- if it's essentially getting to the essence of where we want to go, I think we need to let it go.

Mayor Ortega: Okay, Vice Mayor Janik.

[Time: 00:23:35]

Vice Mayor Janik: I concur with all the statements that have been made. And if you ever taught English, would you know that everybody has their own style, and I think we are at the point where we all agree on the vision, the main message which is great. And I would hope that Erin can follow what was suggested and we get final, final if possible unless there's really something glaring that you object to. So I think all of these are good changes and very good suggestions. Thank you.

Mayor Ortega: I see no further comment on the vision. So let us continue, Erin. Thank you.

Erin Perreault: Next slide, please. On the next slide is the community values pages and the only suggestion there is since the text about old town was elevated to distinctive character as a community aspiration, we have now currently deleted that out of the values, so that it's not redundant. Next slide, please. Moving into the character and culture chapter. Next slide.

The character and culture chapter has state mandated elements, as far as land use and the arts, culture and creative which is culture created and new to the plan. Next slide, please. The character and design element has a variety of goals with regard to development appropriateness, design of buildings, quality design, public spaces and improved character through landscaping, lighting and so forth. I will stop there to see if there's any suggested changes in the character and design element.

Mayor Ortega: Councilmember Milhaven.

Councilmember Milhaven: Thank you. On page 30, I'm still struggling with the subpoint that we put in there about the old town urban core and what is particularly concerning to me. It says the -- toward the end of that paragraph, the downtown is the lowest intensity of development. I would argue north Scottsdale is our lowest intensity development and I would also have some

concerns that elsewhere, we call downtown a growth area and now we say it's the lowest intensity.

The two concepts contradict each other and this sentence also contradicts the downtown overlay and the plan. I concur that Indian School and brown to Scottsdale road and then the elements of main street are certainly areas that are important to be low in density. That's recognized in the character area plan and the overlay. I'm uncomfortable that this sentence as written contradicts what we have elsewhere in the general plan, as well as in our existing ordinances and overlays. I would say it out.

Mayor Ortega: As a counter to, that the downtown core has the core pedestrian areas of old town, the old town core is a resident and tourist destination that includes downtown's historic legacy and heritage, and art galleries and so on. And the core is swished from the overall downtown area. That's what we are doing by recognizing the area that you just alluded to so that the growth certainly in the larger downtown area which is defined and is much larger than the core that we are addressing in this plan. Councilwoman Littlefield.

Councilmember Littlefield: Erin, I think your 57 number is incorrect. You might double check the math on that. And also, what Councilwoman Milhaven said, I think we do have -- you know, whether we want to keep it lowest or highest or in between, I think we have a conflict within the definition of that area. So I think that needs to be resolved one way or the other. I noticed that too when I was reading it and was like, okay, it doesn't make sense, but --

Mayor Ortega: Councilwoman Caputi.

[Time: 00:28:52]

Councilmember Caputi: I agree with that comment from Councilwoman Milhaven. I don't know how we can say the downtown has the lowest density. Downtown is where we develop, right? We are all going to keep butting heads on this. If we wouldn't be developing our downtown, where would we be developing? In our northern neighborhoods?

Of course the downtown is an appropriate area to have greater intensity of development and this idea of a core we are still struggling with this because when I look at the map I'm not in agreement with what I see as the core. I will go back to the character area plan. I mean, old town is a great core to me.

Of course, we should never touch historic old town. I can't really tell the exact streets but the little orange square that we designated as historic hold town that's our cool and we should have preservation in our historic neighborhood but making an amorphous core which we are still arguing about how big it should be, I know I'm not comfortable with that at all. So I will go on record saying that. It doesn't make sense to me.

Mayor Ortega: Councilwoman Whitehead and then Vice Mayor Janik.

Councilmember Whitehead: I would agree with all the councilmembers that spoke, especially since we have the character urban type. I think in the effort to make this shorter which is always better to remove the sentence or to replace it with the historic downtown is the lowest density development in the historic downtown core. That is accurate and it provides an accurate picture of what we have down there or just remove the sentence, and it will make the document more readable.

Mayor Ortega: Let me ask for staff clarification. Again, the reference to the downtown correlative to the whole downtown area.

Erin Perreault: Mayor and council, it is a reference to the downtown core. The downtown core is more than historic old town currently in the old town plan. It includes all the type one areas. So that's the reference and this language mimics the language that's already in the old town plan itself. And how it describes that downtown core.

We tried to mimic to keep consistency between the two plans since we were adding this to the general plan. So that's the way downtown core is described right now, as the lowest intensity with regard to all of downtown not citywide. So we certainly clarify that with regard to not citywide but as compared to the rest of downtown.

Councilmember Littlefield: Just to clarify, the downtown --

Mayor Ortega: Excuse me, Vice Mayor Janik.

Vice Mayor Janik: I think I'm more confused than I was. I was going to agree with councilwoman Solange that I think we should say historic old town but in context, I think we need to go with what Erin said and just clarify it a little bit more, but it does -- the consistency is important. And I think that I would accept your explanation and then maybe clarify it a little bit.

Erin Perreault: And apologize. I didn't bring my old town character plan, but I can show you what page the downtown core is and we can pass that around to you can see what it is.

[Time: 00:32:44]

Mayor Ortega: Good. And please Councilmember Milhaven.

Councilmember Milhaven: So when you say downtown core, that is only the type one areas?

Mayor Ortega: Yes.

Erin Perreault: Currently in the old town character plan, it includes a portion of Fifth Avenue, a portion of Marshall Way, main street, and then historic old town and so it's got a blue outline on this page in the character area plan which we can pass around.

But right now it currently is aligned with type one as well, which is the lowest intensity development we have in downtown.

[Time: 00:33:16]

Councilmember Milhaven: And it's only type one. Yes, we need to clarify that better in here. Either remove the sentence, that last sentence to avoid any confusion, which might be the simpler, or clarify it.

Mayor Ortega: However, I was here 21 years ago when we wrote this and we did acknowledge a type one area. That has been in effect and it is of record. So when I refer to the downtown core and specificity, it's consistent with the general plan 2001, that voters approved that is mapped accordingly and whether or not there is an up zoning and other character areas types, two, three or four -- sorry, type, two, two and a half or three, that core has been identified for over 21 years.

So there's no inconsistency in stating that that area has the lowest intensity. It's clear in my mind and I think the public understands what old town originally meant and how we move this forward for public vote. Councilwoman Littlefield?

Councilmember Littlefield: Thank you, mayor. I agree with Councilwoman Milhaven, Janik and the rest of those who have spoken. I think a clarification here is not amiss. It doesn't hurt anything. Just put it in so people who aren't as cognizant as we are with other types and plans and layered on top of each other, they know what we are doing and they understand what is saying. I think clarification is a good thing here.

Mayor Ortega: Councilwoman Caputi.

Councilmember Caputi: Exactly. We were all here -- well, many of us were here 20 years ago as well, but not all of the citizens have sat on council and they are not getting in the weeds like this. I have said it before -- God, I feel like I repeat myself every meeting. It's great that we all see things but we have got to get this passed. That's our goal. We can't lose sight of the goal. The citizens have to read this, understand this and vote yes for it. That's our goal.

So if there is something that we can do that is that easy to clarify it for people who may not be so intimately familiar with our zoning and our downtown districts. Half the council doesn't even have the book, right? We should make this as easy as possible for the citizens to understand and throwing in a sentence that makes it clearer, I don't see the harm in that. Thank you.

Mayor Ortega: Councilwoman Milhaven.

Councilmember Milhaven: This is a section that I got a lot of feedback from downtown folks. They were concerned that it changes the overlay, as far as removing the sentence to avoid the confusion or to clarify it. So thank you.

Mayor Ortega: Great. Just to close the subject, appreciate that we'll see a follow through on that. And I believe that by designating an area as the downtown core, we are able to remove the conclusion because everything was blended together in this larger area so moving on, Councilwoman Whitehead.

Councilmember Whitehead: I don't want to be disagreeable. I see the sentence as -- I'm perfectly comfortable either way but I see the sentence as divisive, where if it's gone, we have our character area plan. We have our type ones. Nothing is going to change. This sentence, we want to remove anything that doesn't advance us, doesn't move us forward, but could create division among the voters.

I think it might be a bad idea to remove this and then strengthen our definitions of the correlator in the document. I don't want any sentence that creates division and I see that as having that potential. I will defer to all of you. Thank you so much.

Mayor Ortega: Councilwoman Milhaven.

Councilmember Milhaven: I think we should poll the council on whether to eliminate this sentence. I would say eliminate.

Mayor Ortega: Well, councilman Durham.

Councilmember Durham: I would just vote for the clarification. To explain how it fits within the larger hear and that it's the lowest density within that area. I think it is confusing at the moment.

Mayor Ortega: Vice Mayor Janik.

Vice Mayor Janik: I would vote for clarification because it ties into the character area plan. So I think that's a benefit because we are using the same terminology which I think is good.

[Time: 00:38:42]

Mayor Ortega: Councilwoman Littlefield.

Councilmember Littlefield: I would vote for clarification for the same reasons that councilman Durham and Vice Mayor Janik said.

Councilmember Caputi: I mean anything we can do to make it shorter and less divisive, but obviously, I would defer to what everyone else does. I would strike it, but -- we are a microcosm of everyone else is going to be feeling. We are just representing what we are hearing. I agree. That's a great point.

As we get edgy on certain issues those should be the alarm bells that we want to smooth this out because we want it to go through.

Mayor Ortega: Councilwoman Whitehead.

Councilmember Whitehead: I like it short. I really don't -- as long as it's clear, I'm okay either way. So -- and I -- but actually defining the color, it's used throughout. So maybe having a definition of the downtown core or somehow explaining it in very few words will help us later in the document. So I'm okay either way. Very good.

Mayor Ortega: I would agree with the further clarification. I think it's the purpose of calling out the downtown core as lesser intensity relatively speaking and it's also consistent with the general plan 2001 as well as mapping to help assist. Moving on thank you. Appreciate it.

Erin Perreault: Next slide, please. And next slide.

Councilmember Caputi: I think Councilwoman Janik had a quick comment.

Vice Mayor Janik: On page 37, page 57, we had CD-4.4, guiding landscape maintenance and infrastructure placement in the public rights-of-way, et cetera that has been eliminated and I just wanted to know if it is included in another location because I have that we should have we should re-instate it.

[Time: 00:41:09]

Erin Perreault: Can you repeat what that was?

Vice Mayor Janik: Sure, it's page 57 in the original document and you have two CD-4.4s and the one I'm concerned about is form and apply policies to guide landscape maintenance in infrastructure placement in the public rights-of-way and easements consistent with the desired streetscape character. I have gotten several emails that we need to enhance the look of Scottsdale. I think if we put it in our general plan, we will be better able to accomplish that.

Erin Perreault: Thank you.

Mayor Ortega: Moving on.

Erin Perreault: Next slide. It includes goals and policies on land use, as well as the general plan amendment criteria and the future land use map. Next slide, please. This is the future land use map. Next slide, please.

We are required to include our land use mixture from a state statute standpoint. Next slide, please. In terms of our major amendment criteria, we have modified the change in land use criteria one that we have currently. Which is our land use matrix.

So it's been expanded from four categories to eight categories and includes the desert world concept in that matrix. Next slide, please. We have retained the criteria for area of change or the number of acres that it takes to trigger a major amendment.

Currently, it's 15 acres generally north of the canal and south of the canal is written and the proposed draft plan is 10 acres citywide. Next slide, please. We retained the character area, criteria and water and wastewater infrastructure criteria that we have in the plan today. Next slide. And there have been three additional major amendment criteria added. One is a change to the criteria itself or the land use criteria amendments. Another is a growth area criteria.

So a change to an existing one or the designation of a new one would trigger a major amendment discussion. And the general plan land use overlay criteria, if we changed existing overlays or proposed a general plan new overlay, that would trigger a major amendment as well. Next slide, please. The Citizen Review Committee was moving forward with maintaining our land uses that we have in the 2001 general plan. We did receive a number of citizen comments asking the council to consider a desert rural land use to protect larger lots up north. Next slide, please.

As you can see, those exist. They are zoned currently as r1/130 and r1/190 and exist north of deer valley road. Next slide, please. This is just a breakdown of what those parcels are as proposed in the plan. Next slide, please. Of course, when we designate a new land use, we need a definition to go with that land use which includes a density, because this is a residential land use. Next slide, please.

In terms of other highlights we enhanced on ESLO, and NAOS. We included clarifying language regarding the preserve and that's the preserve definition in the land use section. We have removed the infill incentive district definition and changed the text that describes the authority on review and with regard to appeals of major amendments. So I would open it up to see if council has any other additional changes to this element.

[Time: 00:45:55]

Mayor Ortega: I see Councilmember Durham and then Milhaven.

[off microphone comments]

Mayor Ortega: You might check your mic.

Councilmember Durham: Thank you. Reading through this again on page 43, we list some of the land uses, such as resorts, desert preservation and so on, with you we don't get to the specific categories of land use until page 51 and those are marked as future land use.

And I was just thinking does it make sense to explain those land uses closer to the front, you know, around 43 or 44, especially because those land uses are referenced in the mixture chart on page 45? But we haven't yet gotten to the definitions of those various types of land uses. Thank you.

Mayor Ortega: Councilmember Milhaven.

Councilmember Milhaven: I know I'm in the minority on the land use matrix, but I know we have gotten significant feedback from the community that's concerned about creating the rural neighborhood designations. We have all heard that the legislature is considering passing something and in the interest of trying to put forward a plan we think we could get approve, I wanted to reopen that conversation with my colleagues to say, um, this is -- making this change we may have a fight on our hands trying to get the general plan approved if not some legislative action or legal action and just want to reopen the conversation.

I would also point out that, you know -- that the key different here in creating this is it makes the process take longer and requires five votes and it increases the cost of someone rezoning their property. And one of the other buckets that Erin mentioned is 10 acres or more. If someone has 10 acres, it would be a major amendment. Most of those parcels are probably 5 acres.

What we are talking about are really individual property owners with -- 5 acres is a lot, but relatively speaker, when we are looking at rezoning, it's a small parcel and perhaps your concern about major general plan amendments could be captured by the 10-acre criteria and remove the desert rural recognizing that it's probably just small property -- individual property owners that would be impacted by the change.

Mayor Ortega: Vice Mayor Janik and then Councilwoman Caputi.

[Time: 00:49:17]

Vice Mayor Janik: Thank you, mayor and thank you councilperson Milhaven for bringing this up.

I want this general plan to pass. I have spent so much time on it along with Councilwoman Littlefield and councilman Durham and this is very controversial, and we have the state land department against us. And I just talked to Brad Luhndal who met with rusty bowers down at the capitol and he's dead set against this.

So rather than spending a whole lot of time discussing, it I'm wondering if there's a way we can investigate other possible ways to accomplish what we want without having to get everybody so upset and so very much against this. Those are my comments: I have a big meeting with C.O.G.S. tomorrow and they are very much in favor of.

This I want to make sure that they are aware of what is going on and see if collaboratively we

can come up with something that I guess would be more agreeable to everybody, starting at the state level. That would be my comment.

Mayor Ortega: Councilwoman Caputi and then Councilwoman Littlefield.

[Time: 00:50:42]

Councilmember Caputi: I agree with what Councilwoman Janik is saying. We have to get this plan to pass and we all recognize there are a couple of spots where we will chafe because these are the places that are very controversial and the question that Councilwoman Janik just brought up, how else can we accomplish what we're trying to accomplish? And I guess that's my question. What are we trying to accomplish with this desert rural designation. I got a couple.

Comments about having the largest desert designation so we could maintain a rural private lifestyle for a couple of folks up north. I don't understand how we are depriving them of that, right? This is all about arbitrarily abridging people's land rights and I think that talking to the actual landowners they are mostly in opposition to having these changes. We're not really respecting their property rights. These are Scottsdale landowners. 1 to 5-acre landowners and we're kind of telling them what to do, right with, their property. We have looked other cases. They wanted the down zoning and we said sure why not? That's what you want. We'll give it to you.

Same thing with the Kimsey, the locals. We all spoke with the local businesses and residents and they said we really need this. We want this. And so we're listening to the people and we are saying, yes, of course but in this situation, we're telling these landowners what we can and can't do with their property. Who aren't we annoying at this point? I don't quite understand what we are trying to accomplish. We are just making it exponentially more expensive and difficult for people who do want to do something with their land and what they want to do with their land is pretty much up to them.

I just don't understand why we would be placing these restrictive rules on people, rather than letting them say what they want to do with their own land. Thanks.

Mayor Ortega: Councilwoman Littlefield and then Whitehead.

Councilmember Littlefield: Thank you. I will ask you to have a little patience with me here. I have a long speech on this particular issue because it has been extremely concerning to me. The only change that this would make is to require a positive vote of five councilman as opposed to four councilmen for a rezoning to happen.

They don't have to have expensive lawyers or any of that stuff. They just need to come to us and get the vote there's no impact whatsoever on the current zoning or existing property rights or entitlement, nor does it impact any state beneficiaries the state land trust. In fact, most of the state trust land in north Scottsdale has already been rezoned and rezoned to r1/132 or r1/70 it

would require the five votes on the council instead of four. I doubt they would have a problem.

The sole purpose of this designation category change is to try to preserve the larger lot sizes in order to maintain a little bit of the equestrian lifestyle for which Scottsdale is known and recognized worldwide. It is a huge tourist draw!

It's a known cache which brings many of our very wealthy visitors here from around the world every year. Because the threats of the state legislature have so concerned me and may impact Scottsdale. I pulled our charter. The city shall have all the powers granted to municipal corporations and the cities by the constitution and the laws of the state and by this charter, together with all of the implied powers necessary to carry into execution all powers granted.

To adopt and amendment a comprehensive general plan as provided by Arizona law, regarding the future physical development of the city to serve as a guide to all future council action concerning land use regulations and expenditures for capital improve. The council may by ordinance implement said general plan by adopting land use regulations including but not limited to the official zoning map and zoning and subdivision regulations.

[Time: 00:55:31]

Also to adopt plans for land use areas within the city for the purpose of refining the general plan. That's exactly what we are doing to provide for the environment of the city of Scottsdale. Except as prohibited by the United States constitution, the Arizona constitution, the laws of the state preempting the charter, the every name and nature whatsoever. The enumeration of particular powers by this charter shall not be deemed to be exclusive and in addition to the powers enumerated herein or implied hereby or appropriate to the exercise of such powers, it is intended that the city shall have and exercise all powers under which the constitution of this state it would complement for this charter specifically to enumerate.

We have the power to do this, and one of the problems I have is a major general plan amendment we deem beneficial to the city and the future, we have the power to do that, whatever it may be, whatever change it is. This retention of our charter guaranteed right goes beyond a single plan or change before us tonight. I believe this is an attempt to weaken the rights of all charter cities in the state, by using this major general plan amendment request as an excuse for further control to further control the actions of all charter cities.

They have wanted to do this before and they have tried to do it before. Whether or not this major general plan amendment is approved, if the state continues to threaten the legal rights of this city, that this city has by charter, we should go to court and fight for those rights. We shouldn't allow ourselves or any other charter city in the state, to become mere vessels of the state legislature and unable to govern our own land. I'm very, very concerned about this.

I think this is a ploy on the part of the state legislature. They may not want it. We may decide we don't want it, but if they continue this course of action, I think we need to respond with action.

Thank you.

Mayor Ortega: Okay. I see Councilwoman Whitehead and then Councilmember Durham.

[Time: 00:58:09]

Councilmember Whitehead: Thank you, mayor. I think we have to really focus on -- we have to focus on what our objective is and I think our objective is very clear. There's incredible value in retaining this equestrian lifestyle in north Scottsdale. Otherwise, we are just another cookie cutter upscale neighborhood that could be in Toledo. It could be anywhere.

So I think there's incredible value and need to protect these equestrian areas, however, I don't think we should get married to the path that we have chosen to get there. And so whereas the legislature may not view us as a partner, we have to view the state as a partner. We are not in it for the fight. We are in it for the win.

I think if you really look at the major general plan amendment criteria will that get us to where we want to be? I don't think it will. Because it will cost the landowners more money. If they are determined to sell to toll brothers, they will wait and they will get the five votes. Maybe not in council.

I'm not convinced that the desert rural -- which I'm the one that proposed -- I'm not convinced that's the best path to get us to where we want to be. And as far as going to court, I mean it sounds good, you know, let's go take'em to court, but in essence, I would argue that our job is to protect tax dollars and to win.

I think we might find a better path through incentives. We might find other ways to get this accomplished and to do -- and to actually learn more and lose fewer tax dollar process. As well this is not an idle threat. We only have to look at short-term rentals. The city of Scottsdale limited short-term rentals while that was taken away from us with the legislature and the governor.

And the thing about that loss, once they pass, you cannot fully restore them. You cannot because of prop 207. So we don't want to get into a situation we don't want to get into a match we are going to lose with the state. They have their bill and they are ready to pass it and the governor, no doubt is willing to sign it into law. I would rather avoid that fight and perhaps we keep the two plus -- I can't remember what the designation is. Instead of having desert rural, we keep the category but we make it a minor general plan amendment instead of major general plan amendment so we do acknowledge that these parcels are different and they are different because they are different in that they have horse privileges.

Once you cookie cutter those lots into one acre properties which are really much smaller with a lot of open space thank goodness for our ESLO, we lose the horse privileges. That is my position. I think we heard from enough people.

I think everybody that supports the equestrian properties out where we expect to see them but not necessarily the path we have chosen. Thank you.

Mayor Ortega: I would ask the city attorney Scott to just summarize what is pending and what is the exposure in the bills that are before the legislature. Thank you.

[Time: 01:01:54]

City Attorney Sherry Scott: Thank you. There's a potential amendment that has not yet been introduced I believe senate 1520, it would change the general plan amendment or the general plan statute to include a restriction and I don't have it with me.

But to include a restriction to the section that relates to open space and growth areas that provide that the city cannot in implementing or applying land use element make a restriction that would have a negative impact on private property rights. In other words if it makes it more difficult for the developer to move forward with their potential development, may have value impact on their property, the intention of the state is to not allow that in the general plan. So I haven't seen any final wording.

There has not been an amendment that has been introduced at this point in time. But my understanding from talking to Brad Lundahl is that state is very serious and intends to introduce an amendment in some form that will restrict the city's ability to institute the type of land use element that the desert rural element would be, and would attempt to invalidate that until we send the general plan to voters for ratification. So I hope that answers your question.

I do think that there is a law coming our way that will take away the city's ability to move forward with the current plan with desert rural.

Mayor Ortega: Thank you, Councilmember Durham and then Littlefield.

Councilmember Durham: How would that law be any different from prop 207 which is already in effect? Prop 207 has language that's somewhat similar so what would be the difference between prop 207 and this senate bill?

City Attorney Sherry Scott: I think there's a debate in the community. I heard from many. Not all are lawyers. Some think that problem prop 207, the private property rights law, already invalidates what some members of the city council want to do with desert rural. I am of the view point that prop 207, the private properties rights act does not prevent the city from moving forward with the desert rural land use designation, because prop 207, the private property rights act, we have a new prop 207.

So I'm trying to train myself to call it the private property rights act -- relates to land use regulations that are currently in place. Those are entitlements. Those are zoning ordinances. So just by way of hypothetical, if somebody had a 5-acre parcel in north Scottsdale and they had

already come through for phoning and they had r143 on that parcel and we put a land use designation in our new general plan on that parcel of desert rural, that owner would still be able to move forward with r1/43 zoning. That's their entitlement.

This council knows that nobody is entitled to come forward and rezone. And that is why you vote yes and no on rezoning cases. You have full discretion to do that. An owner is only allowed to move forward with the zoning they have. Prop 207 clearly says that the city cannot take away entitlements in those types of zoning laws. Without running afoul of private property rights and the general plan is different and we had quite a bit of debate in city hall about what exactly the general plan is.

[Time: 01:04:09]

The general plan is a policy document, an aspirational document. It's what the city is hoping the city will look like in the future and it is something that the city uses to make a decision on whether or not it will vote yes or no to rezoning applications that come forward and that's why some people think it limits their ability to move forward with the rights that they might have when they are asking for rezoning but it doesn't.

The general plan simply a guide back for the city to say does the general plan sync up with this rezoning request and if so, the council could still say no to the rezoning request. If it doesn't meet up with the general plan, then the rezone request has to come forward with a general plan amendment.

Be it a major amendment or a minor amendment, because the state statutes provide that the zoning request has to meet up with the general plan. So there are two processes zoning law that actually regulates zoning, prop 207, the private property rights act and the general plan statutes and how it operates as a policy document which really only controls the process and the procedure of the zoning cases coming forward when they need a land use designation change.

Two totally separate animals but the state does have the power, in my opinion, to change the general plan statutes that we are required to operate within, and make a similar requirement in the general plan that we see in prop 207, the private property rights act. Sorry for such a long answer.

Mayor Ortega: Thank you. That's fine. Councilman Littlefield, Caputi and Durham. I may get in there too! Go ahead, councilwoman.

[Off microphone comment]

Mayor Ortega: So let me get in there. There is a bill that pertains to the general plan and it was written for another city. And it would open up more opportunities during the year for general major plan amendment.

At this point, it's only once a year and that's the way it is statutorily written. That bill would allow no limit on when some project may come forward. So that's very likely going to be approved and the amendment to the bill specifically is written and related to general plan structure and procedure and process.

So it is very directed at -- at our case and actually, many other cities are in the general plan process as well. So they would also be reading and seeing what's going on. At -- at this point, I just want to weigh in a bit here, and with respect to how I have -- the input that I have read and the hearing from constituents as well.

I believe that the decision to have an umbrella of 10 acres triggering a general plan amendment is the most comprehensive citywide and that alone is a main game changer. Going further into a 3-acre or 2.5-acre or 5-acre consideration is going -- micromanaging further down.

Personally, as an architect, I designed some horse properties over the years. 3 acres, I have never been asked to be involved with a 3-acre parcel. The parcels that I have worked on with the arenas and turnout areas, even with 5 acres, with some NAOS, just along the margins, basically, they could be 3 feet wide and 6 feet wide along certain areas.

They tend not to be meaningful but they meet the statutory NAOS requirement. So in the end in, terms of being a practical design property, it's pretty much market driven, whether someone can stable 6 horses which is really the most I have seen and done with the bunk house and other provisions.

It's costly and I don't know that that market is there. Now, I am differentiating that between the equestrian events. Those are international, Arabians. That's a whole different character to saying that's part of Scottsdale and it certainly is. And in the case of the property, their daughter was a champion rider and she rode for many champions but they were not necessarily stabled in Scottsdale. So she was a very well rehearsed professional.

[Time: 01:13:13]

So it's my feeling that will bring us additional exposure that's really definitely going to reflect on Scottsdale both legally and from a practical standpoint. I believe I would rather drop the desert rural. City of Scottsdale has a rural designation. We know it's there.

And with the 10-acre limit, before it goes to a general plan, that's the standard already why there's already that control. And if there's a fear factor that, gee, five votes will be tough or easier with another council, the chips fall where they may. The project has to stand on its own, and it will come forward on its own. It's got to meet the infrastructure and all of these other needs.

So as much as we know, you know, that horses -- and with we say equestrians, it sounds really fancy, but horses, it's part of Scottsdale. I think it's market driven. I don't think it's the main

driver to whether or not we should have desert rural. So I will go back to Councilwoman Caputi and then Councilmember Durham.

Councilmember Caputi: This might be a dumb question but Erin, do you have to be zoned to have a horse on your property? Like, what are the rules for having a horse on your property or not having a horse. You have to have an equestrian zoning? You have to have 3 acres to have a horse.

[Time: 01:14:59]

Erin Perreault: No, you can have a horse on your own property, unless you have CC&Rs that restrict but from a zoning standpoint, we don't --

Councilmember Caputi: That's what I thought, and I don't think everyone has this zoning. So we are talking about just this little smattering of red areas where we are trying to preserve this equestrian lifestyle, which I don't even know what that means but I will come back to my original point which was if people want to have horses on their property and they have a larger property, we're not stopping them.

They can have horses on their property. I just feel like I'm not a fan of government overreach and when we try to regulate the private market, we have all kinds of problems that we shouldn't have. This basically has to follow what people want. If people want large equestrian properties in Scottsdale, if not, they will sell to someone else or do something else with their land, right?

We have to kind of let the market dictate what happens in our city. We can't really overlay with well, you are going to keep your 3-acre property and you must have horses on there. That kind of doesn't make sense to me. I think we need to allow people to do what they want with their property. And not dictate what happens on these parcels.

I'm confused about what -- I don't understand what we are trying to accomplish by forcing people to keep these large horse properties. I agree with everything you said, mayor. Good job.

Mayor Ortega: Councilmember Durham and Vice Mayor Janik.

Councilmember Durham: Do we have any way of separating out the ten acre properties that would be subject to the 10-acre rule?

Erin Perreault: Yes, in previous presentations we had presented that and I can bring that back next week to you.

Councilmember Durham: Okay. My comments on the issue are that we don't let market forces determine development. We never do. We never do. If someone came and said I want 100 story skyscraper in old town tomorrow, we would say no. The fact is we don't let market forces control. Zoning always restricts personal property rights. That's what zoning is.

It prevents me from having an amusement park in my backyard. There's a lot of things I can't do with my property, and, you know, I think on this issue as in many others, I'm most interested in what's the best interest of the Scottsdale? I didn't vote for Kimsey because a lot of people told me to, and I didn't vote for the Sherwood heights because the people there wanted it.

I did both of those because I thought both of those things were in the best interest of Scottsdale, and that includes people being allowed to protect their neighborhoods. It includes the type of development that came from the Kimsey. And so I'm not particularly interested in what a narrow group wants or doesn't want.

I'm always trying to vote in the best interest of Scottsdale and I think the preservation of the equestrian lifestyle is a very, very important goal. We have a cowboy on our city seal and that's part of our heritage and I think we should be trying to protect it as best we can. So I would like to figure the impact of the 10-acre rule.

It may preserve quite a bit of the property but I think it's very important to preserve and I think it's worth standing up for if we have to do that. So I would prefer to explore as -- as Councilmember Whitehead said, I would prefer to explore what our options are in terms of incentives or possible other ways of figuring out what spaces are left. Because I do want to preserve them and it's an important part of Scottsdale.

And so I would not cave in at the moment, I would like to try to explore how we might do this through other ways. And so for the moment, I would not change the desert rural designation. I think we need to be open to ways that we can best manage this through talking with the state and land trust and perhaps others. Thank you.

Mayor Ortega: Vice Mayor Janik.

[Time: 01:20:04]

Vice Mayor Janik: A suggestion that someone made to me that I would like all of you to consider is that you keep desert rural neighborhoods but you make it a minor change, not a major amendment change. That way when the request comes before city council, they are alerted that this is a larger parcel, that we should give it special consideration, because I think all of us like of idea of having equestrian property. I think it enhances our diversity and our city. I think it's really neat.

So by just keeping the designation, then we are alerted to it and then when we vote on it, you know, we can sit -- we can consider it a little bit more. But I would be very, very careful to make it a major amendment. Again, I think we need to work around it and come up with a way to get the proper end result without the hammer from the state. So thank you.

Mayor Ortega: Well, in closing, I would agree for the most part of what was contributed here.

I would suggest the R1/30 be removed from the desert rural. Remember, if there's any development, even a single house on that property, it's got to have an NAOS preservation. It will have preservation.

And frankly, horses could be very destructive to the environment. It does take a lot of maintenance and perseverance to make it work and it's very worthwhile to have that sector. I know people that I worked on a very large Arabian project here in Scottsdale, and for a client out of Chile. And he was amazing. But those properties were amazingly groomed and very, very expensive. Sorry, did you have something else.

[Time: 01:22:08]

Councilmember Caputi: Yes, we all want what is best for Scottsdale. We care patiently about our city. That's why we are here. I think that we just keep forgetting that is private property, right? I mean whether we want what is best for Scottsdale, that's great but people own these plots and you can't force people to have equestrian places if that's not what they want on their own land. So again, I will caution that we can't tell people what to do with their own land. That's why we have restrictive zoning.

I said this before on this council, just as a comment, that is true. Having overly restrictive zoning is what makes a very inequitable city. When we make large exclusionary lot zoning, that's exactly what keeps us from having affordable housing and diversity in our city. It keeps us from having all of those things that we say we want in our general plan. There's no schools north Pinnacle Peak road. This is because we have exclusionary lot zoning.

We do have to look at what is best for our city and that's exactly where we are drilling down into this area. That's why we are getting passionate about this and it's not just the city overall but each individual resident inside of our city. So that's my last word on that. Thank you.

Mayor Ortega: Councilwoman Milhaven.

Councilmember Milhaven: I don't know if you have any clarify. I agree with Councilwoman Janik and Whitehead that if they want to leave that category in as a note, I'm agreeable to that, as long as the major and the minor definitions mirror the old land use map. I think then that gets us out of hot water but I think calls attention to it in a way that is of concern. So I would certainly be supportive of that.

Mayor Ortega: I don't know if we need to take the temperature here on that. I would throw in that the r130 is definitely something that I would drop from the rural equestrian classification. There's a lot of, you know, heartburn coming from the state on that. In terms of how practical, especially in the NAOS area, 3 acres is not hardly feasible for meaningful equestrian use. At this point, do you need to poll or could we just move on to our next consideration or maybe to form -- maybe we should see something to form, I suppose, as how it would be listed in an appendix or in a reference as -- as requested. Vice Mayor -- oh, let me go to Erin first and then

Vice Mayor Janik.

Erin Perreault: Mayor and council, I don't have consensus on the removal of the r1/130 and in addition, it seems like we do have consensus on going from a major amendment to a minor amendment. That is still adding a process for those properties, it's just that minor process that would be concurrent with their zoning case. Just so you are clear on that.

So if they would make a change in the future, you know from rural neighborhoods to anything else, that is denser than one unit per acre, they would have a major amendment today. If we have desert rural, that's a minor amendment, it would be a change for them. It would just be a different change that's concurrent with their zoning case. So I just wanted to be clear about that.

Mayor Ortega: I see. Councilwoman Janik and Milhaven and Whitehead. Vice Mayor Janik.

[Off microphone comment]

[Time: 01:26:22]

Vice Mayor Janik: This is a change in topic. I wasn't sure if we were done. So I will hold until we are done with this discussion.

Mayor Ortega: Okay Councilwoman Milhaven and Whitehead.

Councilmember Milhaven: Can you elaborate what the minor amendment process entails?

Erin Perreault: Sure. It can be done any time of year. And it only requires four votes on council. It does not require an additional planning commission hearing, which in the major amendment process is called the remote planning commission hearing.

We do all the same analysis otherwise on both types of cases and provide the same exact information to council to make the decision on both types of cases as well.

Councilmember Milhaven: So the only difference you say this is a minor general plan amendment.

Erin Perreault: The two major people look like at is the timing, which can be done any time of year and the additional count on council.

Councilmember Milhaven: And no additional meetings?

Erin Perreault: Correct.

Councilmember Milhaven: Thank you. Thank you.

Mayor Ortega: Councilwoman Whitehead.

Councilmember Whitehead: My question has been answered.

Mayor Ortega: Thank you. Let's move on.

Erin Perreault: Next slide, please. The next element we have is newly created and added to the plan the arts culture and creative community element. And I will pause there and see if there's any additional questions on that element this evening.

[Time: 01:27:47]

Vice Mayor Janik: Um, I wanted to go back to LU-35, page 48. I thought we had suggested that would read engage the community in all land use discussions. Just to add the word "all." Thank you.

Mayor Ortega: Okay. Continuing.

Erin Perreault: Next slide, please. And, again. The next chapter is the sustainability and environment chapter. There have been a number of changes that Councilwoman Whitehead with the permission of the rest of council worked on in some of the various elements. So we will be pausing on those elements to get feedback because we have not reviewed those publicly, those changes publicly until this evening. Next slide. Next slide.

So the first element is the open space element under that chapter. Next slide, please. The open space element includes, of course, open space types in Scottsdale and we have four different types listed in this element. It includes the preserve initiative, natural open spaces developed open spaces and goals and policies regarding those as well as regional open space and connecting open space systems. Next slide, please.

We have enhanced references to the ESLO, and NAOS and we aligned goals and policies to order our open spaces from preserve, natural, continuous and developed. And there's been emphasis placed with goals and policies on public open spaces and tree and canopy shades were additions to this element. I will open it up to any suggested changes or additions.

Mayor Ortega: I see no comments from council. Councilwoman Caputi.

Councilmember Caputi: On page 75, os-2.1, Sonoran McDowell preserve. That's the general plan. Is that not something we will be debating in council at some point? It feels –

Erin Perreault: This is one that's in our existing general plan. It's been carried over. It's an aspiration for the community.

Councilmember Caputi: Okay. Great. Yep.

Mayor Ortega: Vice Mayor Janik.

Vice Mayor Janik: I have a quick question. On page 75, the opening, you have goal os-2, and then you have the state mandate. Is this a state mandate? Because I think David Smith wrote all of us and said it wasn't. I wanted clarification on that.

[Time: 01:30:55]

Erin Perreault: Mayor and council, a portion of this was state mandate but in terms of fulfilling the preserve, it's not state mandated. So we can take that off.

Vice Mayor Janik: Okay. Thank you.

Mayor Ortega: I have one item on page 75, OS-2. Top sentence, it says ensure development. Next to Scottsdale McDowell Sonoran Preserve. I would say maybe in proximity to. Next to is -- probably in proximity would cover the influence area. Rather than just adjacent or abutting. Any other comments? Sustainability? Councilwoman Whitehead -- oh, sorry.

Councilmember Whitehead: I just agree with that. I like that better.

Mayor Ortega: Okay. You do agree. Vice Mayor Janik.

Vice Mayor Janik: I also agree that's a good change and then I had one other comment. It's page 77, OS, which is now 5.1. And I guess what I think we spoke about was to restore that element, the stricken language, ensure the public open spaces in public ownership remain or remain unrestricted and accessible to community members for compatible recreational use. I believe that it is very important that we say compatible recreational use. Page 77, and it's OS-5.1. And just to restore the stricken language. I think we had discussed it previously.

Mayor Ortega: Councilwoman Littlefield.

Councilmember Littlefield: Yes, I agree.

Mayor Ortega: No objections? Councilwoman Littlefield, oh, yeah, that's you. Councilmember Durham.

Councilmember Durham: I would agree with that too.

Mayor Ortega: Okay. Thank you. Let's move on.

Erin Perreault: Next slide, please. The next element is the environmental planning element. Next slide, please. In this element, we have, again, enhanced references to ESLO and NAOS, and we

have also expanded language to support environmental planning programs and initiatives. These ideas have come from private citizens, as well as our environmental commission in works with Councilwoman Whitehead.

Mayor Ortega: Vice Mayor Janik.

[Time: 01:34:05]

Vice Mayor Janik: I have a question for Councilwoman Littlefield. On page 88, element 3.1, I know that you were very concerned that some of the wording indicated that we were going to go to mass transit and you wanted to make sure that we did not use that language, that it was more general and I'm hoping that 3.1 accomplishes that. Thank you.

Councilmember Littlefield: Yes, it does. I would prefer to say freeway -- freeway or some other word than transit, but that's me. I have a question too, though, if I could, mayor.

Mayor Ortega: Sure.

Councilmember Littlefield: 3.2, actively participate in regional coordination partnerships for air quality improvement, reduced automobile emissions and trips. What do we mean by "and trips" S. that when the city goes to national conferences or when employees go out on the road to do repair work or what are we talking about on trips? I don't think it's tripping out.

[Laughter]

Mayor Ortega: Erin, please comment.

Erin Perreault: The trips back and forth for individuals. So that's what it's referring to.

Councilmember Littlefield: Would that be for our citizens or our staff or what?

Erin Perreault: It could be for all of the above. It could be, you know, encouraging different modes of transportation. A lot of major employers have incentives for carpooling and those types of things already. It's those types of programs that are trying to reduce the trips to help the air quality. Little thank you.

Mayor Ortega: Councilwoman Whitehead and then Councilmember Durham.

Councilmember Whitehead: A suggestion for 88, based on Councilwoman Littlefield's concerns, what about -- I'm going to skip the first part but expansion of regional connectivity removing the word "transit."

Councilmember Littlefield: Very good. Perfect.

Councilmember Whitehead: I don't think it changes the meaning for me. I'm absolutely interested in, you know, non-car transportation. That's what MAG does, but I mean in addition to cars. But I do think it's an extra word that could be miss construed.

Mayor Ortega: Councilmember Durham?

[Time: 01:36:38]

Councilmember Durham: I just wanted to say on 3.2, I suggested taking out that second comma, before "and trips." And so therefore, it will make it clear that it's reduced emissions and trips. So we're reducing trips. It wasn't very clear to me at first. But I think that will help it.

Mayor Ortega: Councilwoman Littlefield.

Councilmember Littlefield: If everyone is done on that page -- I don't want to go forward unless everybody has talked. I just had on page 89, the next page, EP-4, excuse me, 4.4. Wherever possible and appropriate? How about when possible. Use paperless media and limit the use of hard copy materials.

Erin Perreault: Mayor and council, whenever possible and appropriate has been struck. It's to strengthen language throughout the document. That's what we did. So it starts with use paperless media.

Councilmember Littlefield: I would say when possible.

Mayor Ortega: Thank you. I see no other sustainability and environment comments. So let's move on.

Erin Perreault: Next slide, please. Next is the conservation element.

Mayor Ortega: I'm -- I may have missed something. Councilmember Durham, did you have a --

Councilmember Durham: Yes. EP-7.4. I wasn't sure how that relates heat islands after the revisions that have been made and it seemed to me it didn't really belong in there anymore.

Mayor Ortega: Page 91, did you say EP-7.4? Page number?

Councilmember Durham: EP-7.4, after the revisions no longer references heat islands and EP-7 is related to heat islands. I didn't understand why EP-7.4 is still in there after all the heat island language has been taken out. I'm sure there are other areas that talk about engaging the community and -- and climate action and resiliency.

Mayor Ortega: Councilwoman Whitehead.

Councilmember Whitehead: I'm fine pulling that. Fewer words and it doesn't really add anything and we do talk about educating the public on the environmental issues and many other places. So I'm good with pulling it if everybody else wants to.

Mayor Ortega: Vice Mayor Janik.

Vice Mayor Janik: I concur we should just remove EP-7.4. Thank you.

Mayor Ortega: Moving on. Conservation element or –

Erin Perreault: Next slide, please. In this element, we added action language to the goals and policies. We have added some language with regard to conservation 2.7 that was recommended by our environmental -- or our environmental commission as well as approved by our internal staff and parks and recreation. And then otherwise there's just been some minimal adjustment and clarifying language as well throughout.

Mayor Ortega: He see no hands raised on this section.

Erin Perreault: Next slide, please. The next element is the water resources element. Next slide, please. There has been minimal adjustment to this element, with regard to one new policy that has been added by the water resources staff, and that's policy 2.7.

Mayor Ortega: Councilmember Durham?

[Time: 01:41:00]

Councilmember Durham: On WR-1.5, I think we are trying to take out where practical and possible language. And there's still a where practical hangs on to the back of that one.

Mayor Ortega: Vice Mayor Janik.

Vice Mayor Janik: Under 2.5, I would like to define periodically are or say at a minimum one time a year or every other year. I worry about periodically because it's vague and it could mean five or ten years. So if we could put a limit on it. As advised by water department.

Erin Perreault: Okay. Thank you.

Mayor Ortega: Thank you.

Erin Perreault: Next slide. We have an energy statute. The major adjustments here are two new policies that have been added on page 104. Next slide, please. We are now moving into the collaboration and engagement section. Next slide, please.

This has one community created element and that's the community involvement element. Next

slide, please. Just one goal has been adjusted and that's goal c-12 on page 113.

Mayor Ortega: Councilwoman Littlefield.

Councilmember Littlefield: On page 110, goal c-1.2, you say seek direct input. Can we put seek direct input from city residents, something to define?

Mayor Ortega: I like the word residents.

[Time: 01:43:38]

Councilmember Caputi: Are we talking about the title part, the goal c-1.2?

Councilmember Durham: The title is a little bit different than page 113.

Councilmember Caputi: Is that where we are putting resident in, direct input from all areas of community? Is that what you are referring to? I like all areas of the community.

[Laughter]

I mean, residents, businesses, anyone who is in our community, I think.

Councilmember Littlefield: I was referring to page 110, the title.

Councilmember Caputi: Which page. See, that's why I was confused!

Councilmember Littlefield: It just says seek input.

Councilmember Caputi: Oh, gotcha. Why don't we just make it match. Direct input from all areas the community. It's fine the way it is on the page, right?

Councilmember Littlefield: That's fine with me as long as we identify it as residents.

Councilmember Caputi: It's no big deal.

Mayor Ortega: Thank you. Next.

Erin Perreault: Next slide, please. Moving into the next section is the community well-being section or Chapter 4. Next slide. We have three state mandated elements and one community created element. Next slide. The next element is the healthy community element. Next slide, please.

With this, there has been one new policy added with regard to the creation of the network to share and receive local fruits. That was a council suggested addition as well as a council

suggested addition for a new health facilities map, which has been added on page 127.

Mayor Ortega: Excuse me, on H-2.5, you might say locally grown produce instead of fruits.

Councilmember Durham: On page 120, in the second paragraph, there we kept in the promote lifelong learning reference. You know, I think most of that has been transferred to the education element. It doesn't really hurt to leave it in here, I don't think because it's something that makes sense but possibly we would want to take it out since we transferred that material.

[Time: 01:46:17]

Erin Perreault: Next slide. The next slide is the housing. This is state mandated. There's only been clarifying language and strengthening the language added back in. There has been the deletion of h-2.6, and that was suggested a few work study sessions ago during the council discussion. That's only page 131. Next slide, please.

The recreation element is next. Next slide. Here we have one new policy about the enhancement of aquatic community, facilities and programming on page 136, and then we did update the map to include aquatic facilities as well as Solstice neighborhood park. Next slide, please. We're moving into the safety element. Next slide. Some highlights here.

There has been a new policy added about retrofitting city facilities for -- to continue operations during possible disruptions. We have updated policy s-3.1 as suggested by council as well as the new policy s-3.6, with regard to cooperating with state and county public health during emergencies, disasters, pandemics and so forth.

Mayor Ortega: Okay. Thank you. Continue.

Erin Perreault: Next slide, please. We are moving into the connectivity chapter, Chapter 5. Next slide. The connectivity chapter has two state mandated elements. Next slide, please. The circulation element is the first element. Next slide, please. We did clarify language on c-1.1. I believe that was Councilwoman Littlefield wanting some clarification there. And we did delete the references to high capacity transit and also deleted c-1.6. Next slide, please.

Councilmember Durham: And c-1.3, there were some extra words there in the first line where it says reduce conflict points between various transportation choices, modes of transit travel and I think that's probably one or two too many words there. It could be just various modes of travel or various transportation choices but when you say choices and modes, it -- it just makes it too wordy.

Erin Perreault: Okay. Next slide, please. Next we have the bicycling element. Next slide, please. There's been minimal changes here in terms of clarifying language on b-1.5 and we moved the term "shower facilities" from b-2.2. Next slide, please.

Moving into Chapter 6, the revitalization chapter. Next slide, please. We have six state mandated elements in this chapter. Next slide. Neighborhood preservation and revitalization is the first element. Next slide, please.

We clarified the language to emphasize historic destinations to come as a result of the properties owner desire from such. That's on page 170. Next slide, please. The next element is conservation rehabilitation and redevelopment. Next slide. Again, minimal text changes in this element.

Mayor Ortega: Excuse me, Councilwoman Littlefield, you had a comment?

[Off microphone comment]

Mayor Ortega: Okay.

Erin Perreault: Next slide area. And the growth element is next. Next slide, please. In this we have added the major add to this section was the old town growth area. It does have similar language to what's in the character type. So based on earlier conversation this evening, we will go ahead and clarify language in this section, if it's maintained in this sections and depicted amorphously as to where the downtown core is.

We assigned specific boundaries to our existing growth areas and there's no new growth areas proposed. Next slide, please. Cost of development element is next. Next slide. We added some clarifying language, but there's been minimal adjustment in here, and minimal discussion as to adjusting.

Mayor Ortega: Clear. I see no other comments.

[Time: 01:52:14]

Erin Perreault: Next slide, public services and facilities element is next. Next slide, please. And here again, minimal clarifying language has been added and we had minimal discussion and minimal comments from the community as well on this element. Next slide, public buildings, also state mandated. Next slide.

Minimal clarifying language. And the school district map was moved from this element to the new education element. Next slide, please. Next chapter is Chapter 7, innovation and prosperity. Next slide. This includes three community created elements, economic vitality, tourism and education. Next slide, please. Economic vitality, next slide.

We have moved E.V. policies 2.2 and 2.3, back under economic vitality on page 209. We temporarily moved them to the education element, but we do have a reference in the main goal of EV goal two with regard to education as it relates to economic vitality and so we felt they were better placed here. Certainly looking for any input that you have on that.

City Clerk Lane: Mayor, I apologize. Councilwoman Littlefield has a comment.

Mayor Ortega: Councilwoman Littlefield.

[Off microphone comment]

Mayor Ortega: Use your speaker.

Councilmember Littlefield: On page 200, goal 3.2. Encourage the location of elementary schools along minor collector streets so they are accessible, but exposed to lower volumes of traffic. They should be within walking distance of as many students as possible and cited in conjunction with parks whenever feasible. Is -- this is part of the problem I have with the education chapter also, safety for our kids.

This would have probably been okay 20 years ago but this today's world and where we are at, unfortunately today, I don't think it's safe for kids to be walking long distances through parks and areas that may not have a lot of other people around. I think we are tempting fate there and I really have a concern with that. I have seen too many problems happen, and I certainly don't want to be some -- in the position of approving something that could harm our kids. And I also think that really goes in the education chapter. But --

Mayor Ortega: Thank you. Councilwoman Whitehead.

[Time: 01:55:18]

Councilmember Whitehead: I respectfully disagree. I told my kids they can go to whatever school they can walk to or bike. I think the news media covers the issues far more than when we were kids but the reality is that the walking to school has been shown to make kids succeed in school. Certainly addressing many of the physical health issues they address with. I think we should butt out.

Parents aren't going to read this and suddenly allow their children to walk to school if they are not comfortable but I'm an advocate for the more kids that walk to school, the safer it will be for all kids but I don't think it's really our business, but I would like to leave it in. Thanks.

Mayor Ortega: Thank you. And, of course, the school district entities are separate government body and we will make sure that our streets provide to any user, you know, safety as much as possible. Oh, Councilwoman Littlefield.

Councilmember Littlefield: I think you need to add education on one of those elements on page 205 when you list the elements in this chapter.

Mayor Ortega: Next section.

Erin Perreault: Next slide, please. The next is the tourism element. This is newly added by the Citizen Review Committee this -- last year, in 2020. Next slide, please. We have had minimal clarifying language with regard to this new element. Next slide, please.

And then finally, the last element is the education element. Newly added within the last month. There has been some edits since the last time you saw this education element. Next slide, please. Just the highlights of those, just adding a note that Scottsdale is served by five public school districts. We added a statement about private nonprofit and faith-based educational offerings as well to recognize those.

We softened some of the language because we don't have a lot of active control over education from a city standpoint, provided some examples of current city programming. So it was clear that we're really putting out goals and policies for what we do now to help support education. There was a suggestion to delete edu-2.8.

I apologize, it's actually dropped out of your draft, instead of being struck through. So that language is -- I placed it on the screen so you can see what that is, it was supposed to be on page 222. But it reads "support initiatives and revitalization strategies which are designed to improve the quality of educational outcomes and increase the likelihood of postsecondary success through elimination of funding barriers for the first two years of college."

So there was a suggestion to delete that, and then a suggestion to delete policy edu-4.3. Which is in -- which is on page 223. And with strike through text.

Mayor Ortega: Councilwoman Whitehead and Councilwoman Caputi.

[Time: 01:59:04]

Councilmember Whitehead: Okay. So I didn't -- I didn't remember the discussion to remove 4.3. So we're trying to expand parks as we get more population. I certainly with or without the general plan, I'm definitely pushing this school board to open up their playgrounds. So I -- I think that by leaving that in there, it takes any pressure off of us to provide a park. We're just saying we will advocate for more parks by bothering SUSD or whichever school district it is. I would actually like to see that put back in. Page 223, edu-4.3. In fact, I have reached out to the board just this week on that subject. Thank you, mayor.

Mayor Ortega: Councilwoman Caputi and then Councilwoman Littlefield.

Councilmember Caputi: I agree. Of course we should be encouraging joint use of facilities between the city and the schools. That's the whole point. I don't even understand why this is a hot button issue in any possible way. Why do we have to keep saying, we get that we -- the city doesn't affect the schools or the run the schools. Yes, we are all clear. I think everyone is clear on that.

I don't know why that's irritating to people. Less silos are always better. Let's work to go. That needs to be put back in. The language you put up there, who is that –

Erin Perreault: It's suggested for deletion and I'm not sure where that came from.

Councilmember Caputi: I like it.

Mayor Ortega: Councilwoman Littlefield.

Councilmember Littlefield: Well, first off, on page 220, I think on the very second paragraph on the top, you need to have a couple of Ss on the second paragraph, the education element provides goals and then it should be encourages partnerships and furthers the community. So that's just a little verb thing.

I have a problem with 223, collocation of facilities taker taken open space accessibility. We already do that to some extent. We work with the schools and use that on occasion for open houses and meetings and we did that for a major general plan amendments and a number of different things when we were meeting in-person.

The problem where that comes in is insurance money if something happens who is at fault? And so I think that has to be kind of careful about how you structure that. That has to be worked out pretty much in detail, because we can't commingle these funds. I have another speech about the education thing, if I can find it.

Mayor Ortega: Thank you. Vice Mayor Janik.

[Time: 02:02:23]

Vice Mayor Janik: I was going to concur that edu-4.3. My kids used to play basketball when they were little guys in the school's gym. And it was a lot of fun. I think it's great to encourage that. It's part of what makes a community a community. And I do like edu-2.8 that you have on the screen. I would like to retain that.

Mayor Ortega: I think if you look at 222, edu-28 states Scottsdale is committed to working with schools to achieve the best outcome for our children and this includes shared facilities such as parks, libraries, recognition of student achievements. So we are already listing facility use and saying that Scottsdale is committed to working with schools. Saying specifically about sports fields, tennis fields and so forth on page 223, is in my opinion not necessary. We are duplicating that.

Just for the record, we are in the process through the mayor's office preparing an ordinance which would be a cooperative that would have to be approved by council to move forward with facilitation with the school board. So we have that coming forward in the next month or so. It

has to be approved as to form because, remember, that the relationship is a two-way relationship.

So the school districts would also have to concur with their legal team that they would provide a three-person panel to discuss this collaboration. There needs to be a structure and so-called intergovernmental structure to make that work. That's consistent with item 2.8 in working with the schools and achieving success. That's the enabling manner that something gets carried out and it's pending right now. Councilwoman Littlefield and Whitehead.

[Time: 02:04:51]

Councilmember Littlefield: Here I go again. We have gone over the general plan twice now. And we received hundreds of ideas and their input. And we read that input and taken it into consideration. We have added items and removed items and changed the wording, all along the way. We have moved some things from one area to another and added elements and definitions. Staff has been doing double duty to ensure that we did all of this, right?

And that council has received the input we requested and needed from our boards and our commissions and most important from our citizens. I want to thank you for that. You have been doing a magnificent job. There's some things that I'm uncomfortable and they are general philosophical things that are hard to put a word to or hard to definitely explain.

So I hope you will bear with me as I do my very best to that. There is too much in the plan that goes beyond the general plan. There are places in the plan where we are telling our citizens how they will conduct our lives in order to be good citizens. Not in so many words, perhaps, but in attitude. Expectation, you should want to put solar and drive and electric car and live your life outside.

Considering that our population's average age is one of the oldest in Arizona. Many have lost their jobs due to the pandemic and face the fears of losing their homes, we cannot bike or walk in the summer heat and cannot afford or want a new electric car. I think we are taking a lot upon ourselves to try to tell our citizens how to live their lives. That's not the purpose of the general plan. The general plan is for the city itself.

It should not give the impression of trying to mandate to our citizens how they have to live. Suggestions are fine but they should be stated as suggestions. And not commandments. I think this plan goes a little -- a little too far trying to dictate lifestyles.

I'm a strong supporter of public education. I come from a family of teachers. And I and both of my children attended Scottsdale schools. I support the city cooperating with the five school districts that we have in Scottsdale. We have always done so. But in Arizona, municipalities and school districts are separate governing boards and separate funding sources. Funding for each entity, city and school districts comes from a different taxing source, and is approved separately, under separate votes for our citizens.

They should not pay for city responsibility for school funds. And some of that gets close to that and it worries me. I believe it needs to be spelled out very, very definitively if we go forward with this element so there's no question of funding sources or mechanisms by either of the school boards or the city council now or in the future. We need to be crystal clear that there's no intent whatsoever to violate the intent of our citizens' votes.

Finally -- that's basically what I have. It's too easy to commingle funds and I think that's illegal and we could get in some really deep problems with that. Thank you.

Mayor Ortega: Councilwoman Whitehead.

[Time: 02:08:52]

Councilmember Whitehead: It probably doesn't belong in our general plan. It was a hot button issue for me, how dare you lock our playgrounds but that's a different issue and I'm fine with yanking it out to Councilwoman Littlefield, we are no more telling people to buy an electric car than we are forcing citizens up north to have a horse.

So two of you made an assumption because of aspirational, what we aspire and what we know bring value to our community. Is it demanding someone get an electric car? No, we are aspiring for a city that's cooler, cleaner and easier to get around in. So I don't think -- I think this is aspirational. And then what you are talking about this education.

I don't think what we are asking for is collaboration and I understand your concern. I don't want there to be any confusion or any dialogue, certainly on social media assuming that we are paying SUSD's bills. There's nothing in here that says, that but we have to make sure as the leaders of this city, that our citizens understand the school district could not be as good as it possibly could if we had a corrupt city government but the city could not be as good as it possibly could be if we had crappy public schools.

So I think what we are trying to say in this element, is that public schools and all schools, we are not limiting it to public schools. All schools are crucial to the value of our community, but we don't want to say it in a way that we are looking for partnerships that make all governments efficient with resources but we are not paying someone's tab. I do appreciate your concern.

Mayor Ortega: Councilmember Milhaven and then Durham.

Councilmember Milhaven: I wanted to respond to Councilwoman Littlefield and I agree with Councilwoman Whitehead these are aspirational, but if you think there are sections here that are mandates, I would certainly like to know what they are, because then we need to fix that because we should not be mandating anything. I would like to know where they are.

And we are not dictating lifestyle, like what is the role of the city? We are a bike-friendly city and

we create -- the city create bike paths and bike lanes and places to park bikes and things like that. So people don't have to ride bikes but if we think it's a good idea, we encourage infrastructure to support.

That I just point out this is aspirational. It is not mandating and should not be, nor do I think it mandates anything to anybody. You know, we are not going to come along. And then in terms of the schools, you know, it's sort of interesting, the one that says they should be on nonmajor streets and whatever.

That's kind of nice, and we can hope for, that but the truth, is at the end of the day, the schools will locate where the schools are going to locate and frankly the public school system right now is struggling with how many schools they will close and not how they will locate schools and the charter schools will go where the charter schools that want to go. Is it basis up on Shea was a controversial project a lot of us would have liked to have seen it go someplace else but at the end of the day they were entitled to go there. Some of it is aspirational and some of it is nice and some of us we won't be able to influence it at all. It's just a nice statement to make.

Mayor Ortega: Councilmember Durham and then Caputi.

[Time: 02:12:48]

Councilmember Durham: Thank you, mayor. In 2.8, the first part seemed harmless and innocuous, but the second part was talking about encouraging funding for increasing the secondary -- the second half of that sentence seemed to me to be beyond -- to be beyond our role and scope.

That's something on a much higher pay grade than us at the federal or state level, or somewhere. On the first part, it was somewhat meaningless and I would -- I would have stricken -- kept the striking of 2.8.

Mayor Ortega: Councilwoman Caputi.

Councilmember Caputi: I'm not married to that. I don't I'm not sure who sent it in. Either way that doesn't really bother me. I just want to agree some of the other comments. The plan is aspirational. We are not writing this for the citizens of today. We are kind of writing this plan for the citizens of tomorrow. Yes, we are hopeful that there's biking and there's cleaner environment and all of these aspirational goals that we have.

It's not necessarily for the people who are sitting in the room. It's our kids and our kids and moving forward. We've got to remember that we are building this city forward. And this section is not called schools. It's education. Again, the general plan is an aspirational document.

I think it's super important for us as a city to say, education is something that we value. That's the whole point of making education a separate piece of our general plan. There's like three

cities in the entire country that have actually done it. It's cutting edge. It's forward thinking, it's really cool for us to say as a city. We value education. Again, let's not -- we don't need to drill down into the school district SUSD, PUSD, whatever.

We are making an aspirational statement that it's a great idea to value education and to partner with our educational facilities to enhance each other. That's it. We don't need to get hung up in the language and the words and oh, my gosh this should have a period or a comma. We're saying that we value education and we're -- we're putting it as a separate element, just to underscore that point.

Mayor Ortega: Council woman Whitehead.

[Time: 02:16:03]

Councilmember Whitehead: I almost hate to say this. Maybe I would be willing to do it or if someone else would volunteer, I know Vice Mayor Janik -- no, she said no. Okay. I would volunteer do we want to streamline and make it fewer words this education element? It's pretty long.

As the mayor pointed out, and there's some duplication going on here. Would there be value -- would the council agree that we should make it shorter and make it very, very clear that we are talking about partnerships and we're talking about values. We're not talking about paying or requiring? Would that make sense?

Mayor Ortega: Thank you, councilwoman. I like the length the way it is. What we are doing by adding an educational element, it's groundbreaking. It's groundbreaking for Scottsdale and this is very meaningful. And it's not unilateral. We are aspirational and we are reaching out and unifying. These are our children and our future. And so with that, I think we will close that subject and move on.

Erin Perreault: Next slide, please. The next section is Chapter 8, the implementation chapter. Next slide. The implementation chapter includes funding sources, oversight process and measuring progress. We included, this is a new chapter to the general plan that we don't have currently. We included it just to give an idea to the citizens how the general plan is implemented in so much different ways. Because that's often confusing our citizens in terms of how it's going to be implemented. Next slide, please.

We anticipate and we are working with other city staff to see there's any educational elements that we need to add to the implementation chapter and we will bring them forward in the next work study session. Next slide, please. Next we move on to appendix. Next slide.

It includes abbreviations, glossary, related plans and policies, historical content that we move from the beginning of the plan, photo credits and labels and acknowledgments. Next slide, please. In terms of highlights, we did add some new glossary terms. We generalized some

glossary terms in terms of low, moderate, high and added highest density to those terms, and then, of course, a move that historical content that I mentioned earlier. Next slide, please.

That concludes my presentation. I don't know if anyone has any input on the glossary. I'm happy to take any of those comments if you do have them.

ADJOURNMENT

[Time: 02:19:20]

Mayor Ortega: Thank you. Seeing none, at this point, I'm able to adjourn the city council work study.