
This document was created from the closed caption transcript of the May 16, 2023 City Council Regular Meeting and Work Study Session and has not been checked for completeness or accuracy of content.

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

<https://www.scottsdaleaz.gov/Assets/ScottsdaleAZ/Council/current-agendas-minutes/2023-agendas/05-16-23-regular-and-work-study-agenda.pdf>

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

<https://www.scottsdaleaz.gov/scottsdale-video-network/council-video-archives/2023-archives>

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

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

CALL TO ORDER

[Time: 00:00:01]

Mayor Ortega: I call the May 16th, 2023 City Council Regular Meeting and Work Study Session to order. City Clerk Ben Lane, please conduct the roll call.

ROLL CALL

[Time: 00:00:13]

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

Mayor Ortega: Present.

City Clerk Lane: Vice Mayor Kathy Littlefield.

Vice Mayor Littlefield: Here.

City Clerk Lane: Councilmembers Tammy Caputi.

Councilwoman Caputi: Here.

City Clerk Lane: Tom Durham.

Councilmember Durham: Here.

City Clerk Lane: Barry Graham.

Councilmember Graham: Here.

City Clerk Lane: Betty Janik.

Councilwoman Janik: Here.

City Clerk Lane: Solange Whitehead.

Councilwoman Whitehead: Here.

City Clerk Lane: City Manager Jim Thompson.

City Manager Thompson: Here.

City Clerk Lane: City Attorney Sherry Scott.

City Attorney Scott: Here.

City Clerk Lane: City Treasurer Sonia Andrews.

City Treasurer Andrews: Here.

City Clerk Lane: Acting City Auditor Lai Cluff.

Acting City Auditor Cluff: Here.

City Clerk Lane: And the Clerk is present.

[Time: 00:00:37]

Mayor Ortega: Thank you we have Dustin Patrick and firefighter Eric Wilson should anyone need assistance, and let's begin with the Pledge of Allegiance. I will call on Vice Mayor Littlefield.

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

MAYOR'S REPORT

Mayor Ortega: Welcome, everyone. I do want to call our attention to the war in Ukraine and remember that their sacrifice for freedom and democracy is ongoing. Pause with me in silence. Thank you.

Well, the month of May is Indian Bend Celebration Month! And 50 years ago, the Indian Bend Wash opened. There are still two events coming forward on Saturday, May 20th, there is a dive-in movie, and Thursday, May 25th, there's a Toss on the Wash event at Vista Del Camino Park. Both are free to the public. Please note that the McCormick Stillman Railroad Park, we have our concert series going all the way up to June 3rd.

PRESENTATIONS

Next, we'll have a presentation regarding the Arizona Public Service Peak Solutions rebate. I call on Brian Biesemeyer and Austin Prusak.

Brian Biesemeyer: It's our pleasure to have a nice big check to give to the city. The peak solution is a demand response program that helps APS handle large load days and allows us to reduce where we can our load consumption on these high-demand days and as a result of that, we have been very successful, and the result of, that we have a nice check. Before the check, I will let Austin come up and say some words.

Austin Prusak: Thank you, Brian, I'm so happy to be here to represent APS and also to say that Scottsdale does such a wonderful job with our demand response program they really are a great partner. The water department is a wonderful group of people and I'm happy with everyone that I have spoken to at Scottsdale.

And, again, very pleased and very happy to be here to present the check to not only Brian, but the Scottsdale folks here. Thank you very much for allowing me to be here.

[Time: 00:05:12]

Mayor Ortega: Okay. We have a couple of announcements. First of all, during tonight's meeting, the council may make a motion to recess into executive session to obtain legal advice on any applicable item on the agenda. If authorized by the council, the executive session will be held immediately and will not be open to the public. The public meeting will resume following the executive session.

Second P.S.A., per our council rules of procedure, citizens attending the city council meetings shall observe the same rules of detour um applicable to members of the council and city staff: Unauthorized remarks or demonstrations from the audience such as applause, stamping of feet, whistles, booed, yells and/or other demonstrations shall not be permitted.

Violation of these rules could result in removal from the meeting by security staff. It also helps our time management so the meeting runs smoothly. Next, we have public comment. Public comment is reserved for Scottsdale citizens, Scottsdale business owners and/or Scottsdale property owners to comment on non-agendized items that are within the council's jurisdiction.

Advocacy for or against a candidate or ballot measure during the council meeting is not allowed pursuant to state law and is therefore not deemed to be within the council's jurisdiction. No official council action can be taken on public comment. And speakers are limited to three

minutes to address the council. We received two requests. So as I call your name, you will come forward, state your place of residence, and you would have three minutes and you will see a timer for that. So welcome, William Teskey and then Jason Alexander.

PUBLIC COMMENT

William Teskey: Good evening. My name is William Teskey and a long-time resident of Scottsdale, going back to 1962, when property was pretty inexpensive. The main focus that I come here tonight is better government. And that -- and I want to introduce what I had practiced most of my business career, academic career, and I called it the Teskey rule. I named it after myself.

Basically what this is, it is my goal, my objective, is always searching for and doing better government. Better government and less cost, immediate enjoyment, and there's nothing but winners and no losers. So in that light, after 65 years of practicing, that I codified it into law a number of years ago. Remember Berk's law, that used to be on TV? That's where I got the idea of the Teskey law.

I'm talking about the sustained -- the sustainability plan and urbanization thing, and I'm very concerned what's going on, you know, with this and I was a practicing accountant for many years, and I know that money draws a lot of good things but nothing happens unless somebody sells something or there's money behind it. And I have handled a lot of money. Millions and millions of dollars I had in my hands. And I know money works and how it corrupts absolutely. Getting to the crux of the matter here.

I live off 68th Street and Osborn and I noticed they blocked off a couple of the lanes and that there, and I found it hard to get out because all the traffic going into one lane. I understand they have the sustainability thing, and they have a word for it, and what -- I'm having difficult even getting on to 68th Street. So what I propose -- if this is so good, this 68th Street project, why not expand it to every place in town, you know, like Scottsdale Road and up all the major streets? And so I know there's a lot of money involved.

[Time: 00:10:19]

It's a money-driven economy and I suggest this to all community members. It's a nasty word I will say and that is -- I spell it as a-u-d-i-t, audit. It cries out for a forensic audit, and also to set up a program and that for a tip line. Tip line, you know, of wrongdoing. And I want to say to everybody here, the council, everybody standing here, that as a citizen of this community, you are duty-bound to report any wrongdoing to the authorities. If we don't, and that -- that -- you would be considered a collaborators, and that you have a duty to report. And I'm suggesting to the council and the officers of this community and even our treasurer here is a certified fraud investigator. She's got a CFE certificate. We need this seriousness goes on.

Mayor Ortega: Thank you, Mr. Teskey. We audited the time, and you got 24 extra seconds. I appreciate anything in writing.

William Teskey: Okay. I have a lot more to say on this. It needs to be done and the duty-bound and that. You've got to report any wrongdoing. Thank you.

Mayor Ortega: Thank you, sir. Next we have Jason Alexander.

Jason Alexander: Thank you, Jason Alexander. My address is on record. I would like to stress that when council makes decisions, the best decisions are made when we think of all the residents, all the various stakeholders and to think towards the future. And there's this great clip from 2016 that I would like to play where the sentiment is so well expressed. I would like to play the clip now.

Video Audio: Thank you, Mayor, members of council. One of the things that has separated Scottsdale from so many other places is our ability to plan ahead. Most would call that vision. As you make your final considerations of the transportation master plan this evening, I urge you to consider all the city's needs over the next 20 years and to try to predict every transportation solution to meet those needs.

Also think back 20 years ago to 1996, and just how much our city has changed. Going forward it would be very short sighted to let today's picks impact the needs and lives of future residents. Scottsdale didn't become the great city it is by drawing lines in the sand and limiting discussions about important topics like transportation. Of our leaders came together and planned for an evolving city that people not only want to visit but work and live.

[Time: 00:13:55]

I ask you to look beyond today's political differences and to contemplate the Scottsdale of the future. Please don't be content with a temporary solution that addresses a near-term issue, while sacrificing smart, long-range planning. Thank you for your time and attention.

Jason Alexander: Thanks, staff for playing that. What a great comment by a younger and slightly slimmer and slightly more pursuit Mr. Graham. What a great sentiment. Think about the future. Think about all the stakeholders and think about everybody, and not give in to the politics of the day. Thank you.

Mayor Ortega: Okay with that, we will –

Councilmember Graham: Mayor, may I reply. Should I change my haircut back?

Mayor Ortega: Thank you. And we are moving on to the next topic. So accordingly, I will close public comment. And just to make a note of it, we do receive written comments, which are available at the clerk's desk and those can be filled out, and you would just need to itemize whatever topic is on the agenda.

MINUTES

Next, we have the approval of minutes. I request a motion to approve the minutes for the

retreat meeting minutes of April 13th, 2023 and the regular meeting and work study session minutes of April 18th, 2023.

Councilmember Whitehead: So moved.

Councilwoman Janik: Second.

Mayor Ortega: We have a motion and a second. Please register your vote. Thank you. That's unanimous.

CONSENT AGENDA

Next, we have our consent agenda. Consent agenda items 1 through 16 are all on our website, as well as posting on all the details in the backup information for every item. Do councilmembers have any questions on any of the consent agenda items or request to move any of the consent agenda items to the regular agenda?

[Time: 00:16:17]

Councilmember Graham: Mayor, can we move the public training facility.

Mayor Ortega: And what number was that one?

Councilmember Graham: I don't have it in front of me. I think three or four.

Councilmember Durham: Five.

Councilmember Graham: Five.

Mayor Ortega: Okay. So that's number five. Any other questions or comments? Okay. And I also call to the public. So the public could come forward and comment. I see that there were no requests to come forward open any of the content agenda items. I do want to point out that one of the things we review and do audit is item number 9, which is the boards and commissions, which shows a number of absences, attendance, as well as recusals. So those are all listed and part of our standard process: With that, I would -- I'm open for a motion to approve consent agenda items 1 through 16, except for number five.

Councilwoman Janik: So moved.

Councilwoman Whitehead: Second.

Mayor Ortega: We have a motion and I -- a second. Please record your vote. Thank you. That is unanimous.

ITEM 05 – MODERNIZE AND EXPAND POLICE AND FIRE TRAINING FACILITY CONSTRUCTION SERVICES CONTRACT

[Time: 00:17:56]

Mayor Ortega: Next, we will have a presentation of item number 5, as requested by council, Councilman Graham.

Alison Tymkiw: Hi, good evening, Alison Tymkiw, city engineer. The item you have before you tonight, is the award GMP1 for the police and fire training facility. It's for the procurement of some of the long lead items for this project. Do you have any questions?

Mayor Ortega: Go ahead.

Councilmember Graham: There's no presentation or any slides?

Alison Tymkiw: Sorry, no, we didn't have any presentation prepared.

Councilmember Graham: That's fine. For this particular project and the bonds, what was the original estimate as it was stated before the voters in 2019?

Alison Tymkiw: Okay. The original estimate was 4,227,262.

Councilmember Graham: Okay. And what's the updated estimated amount?

Alison Tymkiw: Our updated estimate is -- hang on one sec. \$20,374,938.

Councilmember Graham: That's more than I remember it. So that's like a 300% increase. You don't have any sort of renderings -- I kind of wanted to show the public for those that are residents that are new to this process, or not new to this, but not familiar with this particular project.

There were two bond projects for the public training, it was the fire station that we talked about ad nauseam and then this is the complimentary police training facility. This is actually a shared use facility; is that correct?

Alison Tymkiw: Councilmember Graham, so the police training facility and the fire training facility are located at the Tom Hontz facility which is on one property in the city of Tempe. So it's a shared site.

Councilmember Graham: A shared site. And so this project is 400% over budget -- or over the original estimate; is that -- is that more or less correct?

Alison Tymkiw: I didn't do the math, Councilmember Graham, but, yes, the original estimate was \$4 million and we are at \$20 million.

Councilmember Graham: So is there any way to walk us through the process. When we set up an estimate and we say this is our best guess of what we think it will cost. Public safety and police. Public safety tells public works or engineering or somewhere, they are telling you what

they need and then you are engineering it out and developing cost estimates. Can you kind of walk us through that process?

[Time: 00:21:25]

Alison Tymkiw: Councilmember Graham, yes, this is basically the process when we go through are the CIP each year. I assume it was the same process for bond 2019. I was not involved at that time. The departments come up with their projects and we make the estimates for them.

Councilmember Graham: What do you think could have been improved in that process, it's one thing to be 10% or 20% over budget, but different when you see 100%, or 200 or 300% over budget. Is there anything you think we can do differently? It's just an overall process question.

Alison Tymkiw: Councilmember Graham, yes, I would just say maybe have a little bit more of a concept design to base an estimate on, rather than just a list of a scope, again, I wasn't involved and I don't know what the process was at that time.

Councilmember Graham: Did you take the time to review on this process. I'm sure people signed off and approved some of the steps. Did you take the time to go back and look and do a postmortem of the project?

Alison Tymkiw: Yes, Councilmember Graham, when we realized this project was underfunded, we did go back and look to see where we might have been short.

Councilmember Graham: And what did you find when you looked at it?

Alison Tymkiw: Councilmember Graham, we just found that some of the areas were underestimated.

Councilmember Graham: So you said it was 4.2 and then what's the final estimate?

Alison Tymkiw: \$20 million.

Councilmember Graham: Okay. Thank you. No further questions, Mayor. Thank you, Alison.

Alison Tymkiw: Thank you.

Mayor Ortega: Thank you. Just for the record, this topic was discussed in our earlier budget discussions and our CIP presentations, as well as at our retreat, and certainly the pressures have come on many bond 2019 projects due to inflation, COVID and then the break in the supply chain.

[Time: 00:23:54]

The purpose and what's being heard today is to do the advanced purchasing at today's prices. Elements that would be installed perhaps a year away. We buy them so that we can secure the

best possible price at this time. With that, I move to approve the construction management risk contract to modernize and expand the police and fire training facility, that is adopt Resolution 12828, construction manager risk contract, 2023-065-COS with CORE Construction Inc. in the amount of \$9,250,058, to modernize and expand.

Councilwoman Whitehead: I would like to second it and speak to my second. So these -- for those of you who have not been part of this discussion, we had 319 projects in our approved bonds and I don't know if our public works corrector would like to speak to this, Mr. Worth. But we did identify two pretty substantial mistakes that were made in design, early design. So these costs increased are not typical.

They are significant, but we have lived out of our city police and fire have lived out of trailers that most people wouldn't live in for a weekend camp trip for the last, I don't know how many years.

Mr. Worth, do you want to speak to any of this, just for a few minutes to talk about where we went wrong? The projects were sized wrong and so we have a choice. We can either fix the projects and build proper training for our police and fire, or we can stick to the budget.

Obviously, we made the right decision and we kind of really addressed these mistakes in a past meeting and I also want to pound out that our bonds are a small percentage of our CIP, our capital improvement project. So the bonds itself are not the only dollars we have to do the important infrastructure that we do here in the city of Scottsdale.

So the good news is with our strong financials in the city and our incredible management of money despite what these two projects would otherwise suggest, we have the funds to do it correctly. And so I don't know if you want to speak to any -- how we got there and what's going to be done to fix it, but just kind of -- you gave a darn good overview when we had a retreat a few weeks ago, just a couple of minutes on that. We have a long meeting. Go ahead, Mr. Worth.

Dan Worth: Mayor, Councilmember Whitehead, I'm not going to say anything I didn't say at the retreat. We acknowledged that we had a big miss on this one. Some of the things that we didn't adequately account for. I think the biggest one was it's a police training facility. They have an indoor firing range. The one they have now is inadequate in terms of safety, it's inadequate as far as the size.

[Time: 00:27:26]

The size of the force is twice as big as it was when it was originally built. And we anticipated modifying the existing range. We can't do it. We've got to build it in a new building. And it's got to be precast concrete to meet the safety requirements. That's what this contract award actually does, is it buys the precast concrete so we can build that facility. There were other things that -- and I will say the same thing I told you last month, just looking at the square footage that we estimated at that time, the estimate should have been higher. It was a miss. I don't want to make excuses.

58 projects that made it through the election, and another 20 or so that didn't, we have to review estimates on it and I still stand by the fact that there were very few misses but this is admittedly one of them.

Councilwoman Whitehead: Thank you so much.

Dan Worth: Thank you.

Mayor Ortega: Next Councilwoman Janik and then Caputi.

Councilwoman Janik: Thank you, Mayor. I think we all realize that this project was way over budget. We didn't do our duty, but the most important thing is that we don't let it happen again, that we come up with a policy so that we can catch these errors sooner in the process and our treasurer Sonia Andrews a couple of weeks ago came up with a process whereby we will review budget items over a certain amount of money, I believe it was over \$1 million and if it's more than 10% over budget and the project cost is over 1 million, we will come back and review it. We have learned from our mistakes and we go forward. Thank you.

Mayor Ortega: Thank you, Councilmember Caputi and then back to Councilmember Graham.

Councilwoman Caputi: I'm just going to belabor this again. I think it's important that the sound bite is, oh, my gosh, we didn't guess right, and the city was wrong. I think the message should be, yes, the scope was incorrect. Materials have increased yes, 400 and 500% sometimes. We have been through this on this council several times, steel and different materials have actually gone up 400%.

Alison couldn't have possibly known that in 2018 because of COVID. We have the situation that we have. The residents told us that they want a brand new fire and police training facility. The message I would like residents to leave with, is we are proud to have a police and fire training facility.

It will be state-of-the-art and it would be far more expensive for us to continue to send our firefighters and police officers to other cities to get trained or to lose our employees because they are not trained to support our people. Yes, it was scoped incorrectly in the beginning and the materials have increased but we absolutely have to move forward with it. And I'm proud to support it. Thank you.

[Time: 00:30:36]

Mayor Ortega: Okay. Councilmember Graham.

Councilmember Graham: Thank you, Mayor. A couple of follow-ups. We are not debating the necessity of the training facility. Chief Walther and his crew deserve the best. I have been down there and I have seen, it's dilapidated and in disrepair. It needs improvement. That's not the debate. I keep telling that.

The debate is we told the residents it's going to cost this and now we are telling them we need to increase the scope, double the square footage of the facility, oops. The cost of the facility will go 400%. That's the issue. The necessity of the facility is not the issue and that's why I'm going to support this tonight. But I also want to bring attention to the fact that with a 400% increase. If you look at the whole training facility in that area.

If you are looking at just the fire, the police, the shared use or the whole thing, when we pay for that, we are going to have to sacrifice other things. We can't buy everything else anymore. The -- when we went to you, the city, we being the city, we told you -- we said these are the 58 projects from the 2019 bonds. We got rid of all the nice to haves and we got rid of all the projects that it would be fun to have and these are the critical projects. We have overruns that we have seen, and we have never seen overruns to this extent and we are looking at a third of these critical must have, can't live projects they are not going to happen, maybe ever or for a long time. That's what I'm bothered by. When we are over budget on this. We have other money. Scottsdale is a wealthy city. We have other money.

Especially to extent, the simple thing is we can't buy everything else we said we could buy. The bond projects, yes, we need this project and that's why I'm happy to support it, but the other projects that we told you were critical, there's not going to be money for. That's something I'm bothered by.

The last thing I will say is I haven't really heard how we're going to -- what changes we're going to make or procedures we're going to implement to prevent this from happening again. We talk about inflation is happening and maybe that's -- when you estimate these projects, you estimate the amount of inflation, no one could have seen how much inflation was coming but I would like to see a little bit more about how we will prevent this from happening again. With that, thank you, Mayor and I will conclude.

Mayor Ortega: Councilwoman Whitehead, please.

[Time: 00:33:44]

Councilwoman Whitehead: I agree, if we go to the voters and we tell you the price of something, the city's plan, five, ten, 20 years out, it's imperative that we come back and keep all changes transparent. And that's certainly what we're doing here tonight. I want to briefly talk about the bond decision. It's first bond package that our city passed in 20 years. The bonds are based on taxes. The restriction we put was on taxes not time frame.

So we committed to the voters that we would not raise taxes. We would do the bonds in a time frame, in a manner to keep your taxes flat. So we didn't put a time constraint. There's no schedule. But I will tell you that -- and I also want to just comment too that there are absolutely no critical public safety projects in this city that don't get funded ever. So did we -- we delayed cactus pool remodel. That's one of the remodels.

The final thing I want to say, this does happen, when you are a city, it does happen. Two projects that were approved in the bonds, in 2019, were also approved in a past bond, but just didn't

happen and that's Ashler Hills Park was one of those. And the dog park at Thompson Peak. The city governments, we can't predict the world. We don't have a -- we don't have a crystal ball, but what we do provide is transparency. Here we are being transparent and none of us are happy about the increases, but we do have the funds to do it and as Councilman Graham said, our police and fire deserve it and so do our constituents. So thank you.

Mayor Ortega: Thank you. Seeing no further discussion, please record your vote. Unanimous, yes. Thank you.

ITEM 17 – PUBLIC HEARING ON AND ADOPTION OF FISCAL YEAR 2023/24 RATES AND FEES

[Time: 00:35:46]

Mayor Ortega: Next, we will move on to item number 17 and 18. They are regular public items. Item 17 is adoption of the fiscal year 2023/24 rates and fees. Our presenter is Judy Doyle, budget director and Michael Clack, chief development officer. Hi, Judy.

Judy Doyle: Hello, thank you. As the Mayor stated, this is the public hearing and request to adopt the fiscal year '23/24 rates and fees. Next slide, please. On March 7th, divisions presented in detail their proposed new and/or rate and fee changes. The proposed rates and fees were then posted to the city's website in mid-March so the public would have an opportunity to review the proposed changes. Tonight serves as the final public hearing. Next slide, please.

So in lieu of the divisions coming back up for a second time to walk through almost 70 slides of details on the proposed rates and fees, I will go ahead and give a brief recap. I will note that the details of proposed rates and fees are included in the council report, and that original presentation that was given on March 7th is also part of tonight's packet. Additionally, divisions are present this evening, and available to answer any questions you may have.

[Time: 00:37:30]

This slide summarizes the forecasted revenue, based on the rate and the fee proposals. First focusing on enterprise, I will note that the water and sewer rates are being deferred due to separate legal requirements that necessitate additional public postings. The water resources division will bring forward the rate changes for water and sewer on June 13th after those required notice periods are completed.

For public works, solid waste presented the changes to their rates and fees to address inflationary impacts, landfill and transfer disposal cost increases, the recycling market volatility, resulting in increased costs. The solid waste rate and fee changes would be effective July 1st. The non-enterprise are proposed to address inflation, improve customer experience, and timeliness and staffing costs. And those proposed changes are also effective July 1st.

Planning and development services proposed increases to various permit fees and wireless facilities. There's a proposed new water analysis fee for each applicable project using 100,000 gallons of water or more per day. There's a new green building compliance fee. We made a change to that fee per council direction and Michael Clack our chief development officer

will come up in a few minutes to present that change for you. Also planning and development services proposed a CIP stormwater fee increase of \$1, paid by water utility customers that would be dedicated to capital drainage and flood control projects.

Community services proposed increases to several fees in parks and recreation, aquatics, WestWorld and the Scottsdale stadium. And changes to fee at McCormick stillman railroad park and final proposed changes to existing fees for public education classes. They also proposed increases for after-hour fire inspections, the Brycer compliance engine upload fee, commercial record requests and the fire plan review fee. Next slide, I will turn it over to Michael Clack to go over the green building compliance fee. Next slide, please.

Michael Clack: Good evening, Mayor and council. I hope you all can hear me already. Thank you. So what you have before you is a change in our packet as Judy Doyle had previously said, and previously we had proposed a \$600 flat fee per project. We listened to the council and reevaluated that proposal and it would be 10 cents per square foot fee, it's a sliding scale that would max out at \$600.

So, for example, if you had a project that was 1,000 square feet, are that green building compliance fee would be \$100 and next 3,000 square feet would be \$300, and at the end, once it gets to 6,000 square feet, that's where it would max out at \$600, no matter how big the project is at that point. Most of the projects are less than \$600. So it would be less than 6,000 square feet. That's about 78% of the overall project -- of all the projects that we take a look at, that would be below that number. And it so our revised estimate is \$160,000, which would help cover the costs of two reviewers for this project, for this program. And that concludes my presentation.

Mayor Ortega: Okay. Councilwoman Caputi.

[Time: 00:41:56]

Councilwoman Caputi: I'm happy that it's sliding. Now I know that council remembered that we make this a little less punitive. I feel like if we want people to be green, which we do, we would love folks to build more green, we should be rewarding them and incenting them to do it, not punishing them to do it. If you do a Google Search and look into the different programs the city of Scottsdale has to incent folks to be green, we actually don't have any.

Again, we are fining them to do the right thing and I think we would have a lot more -- a lot better compliance if we made it a good thing to be green. We said that the whole point of green building is that we are going to save so much money and so, again, it just seems very counterintuitive to me that we would be fining and punishing folks for being more sustainable and green.

So again, I'm glad it's sliding, and it's not like it's going to be cost prohibitive, and I appreciate that. Just philosophically, I think asking folks to do a behavior by punishing them to do it seems really backwards to me. That's it. Thank you.

Mayor Ortega: Councilwoman Whitehead.

Councilwoman Whitehead: I want to thank Councilwoman Janik and Caputi for bringing this up at the last meeting. It is a brand new fee and I want to give special thanks to Councilman Durham. He pointed out, why are there 5,000 projects that will get this fee?

Again, we do things on the dais, we are communicating with each other for the first time, so we don't break open meeting laws, and sometimes it's hard to digest what people are saying. But the fact is that these fees would have been charged to projects that don't have to meet these green building fees because they are too small.

I want to thank my colleagues for pointing out the weaknesses even though I didn't understand it quite that night and say I support the fees. Thank you.

Mayor Ortega: Councilmember Graham.

Councilmember Graham: Thank you, Mayor. Mr. Clack, were you finished with your presentation? Was there any more content?

Michael Clack: Yes, I'm finished.

Councilmember Graham: Judy, did you have anymore? I had some questions, but I wanted to wait until the end. Thank you, Mayor. Thank you, Mr. Clack.

Mayor Ortega: Just another -- my own comment because I have worked with plan reviews and so forth. A fee is not a punishment. The fee is cost of review and personnel. The one stop shop is incumbered with making sure that things are -- there's sift -- safety issues with electrical, plumbing and so forth and so it's a direct cost of our providing services which our council voted on, that is to have a green building program that could be reviewed by technically prepared and trained staff. It's a good thing overall.

[Time: 00:45:08]

As far as the other clarification, it is for commercial, commercial and multi-unit residences. There's a couple of exceptions but generally speaking -- I don't want somebody to say that you know, because they did a house addition, they had a green building fee, whatever, this only applies and that's where dividends come back to landlords and tenants when you have more efficiency in a building. Vice Mayor Littlefield.

Vice Mayor Littlefield: Thank you, Mayor. I just had a quick question for you. At this revised fee ratios, do you have an estimate of about how much revenue that would bring into the city through these fees, these changed fees.

Judy Doyle: Mayor and councilmembers, yes, it would -- I think the original estimate was about \$310,000. The new estimate was \$160,000.

Vice Mayor Littlefield: Okay. Thank you.

Mayor Ortega: Good. Continue.

Judy Doyle: Yes, next slide. Please. I did just have one more slide. We are recommending adopting the associated ordinances and resolutions shown here on the slide and, again, divisions are here this evening and happy to answer any questions you may have.

Mayor Ortega: Okay. The other purpose of this item is to make sure we have a public hearing and public comment. So I will return back to Councilmember Graham, if you have some general question or comment.

Councilmember Graham: Thank you, Judy. No more content?

Judy Doyle: That is the full presentation.

Councilmember Graham: I'm very appreciative of it tonight. The confusion about the fee, we passed a requirement back in December for the green codes and we have to hire people when you require people to do something, and it requires enforcement, we have to pay for it, so we have to charge people for it. I'm not shocked by that.

What we do know for sure is the amount -- you have gone and reduced that fee and so the amount of revenue that we anticipate collecting is going to be less than what it costs. So we're going to be -- we're going to have to hire people -- I'm rounding numbers. We will have to hire a couple of people, \$300,000 with salaries and benefits and collect \$150,000.

So we're just going to have to subsidize that from other parts of the department. That's just how it works. So I wanted to kind of clarify that and then -- do you agree with that, what -- that summary?

[Time: 00:47:55]

Judy Doyle: Mayor and councilmembers, yes, that is a good summary. It's my understanding that the division does plan to maybe stagger that hiring to see if, you know, that additional position is necessary. The division is also planning a rate and fee study. So they are in the process of putting out a request for proposal for that. So they will be able to take a look at all of their rates and fees.

Councilmember Graham: But the green fee, I mean that's almost -- it's almost a tangential issue, because the real important thing, in my opinion, what we are talking, about we are raising fees or anything and everything across the city. Every time I want to use a pool or gym or rent a field or use a facility, your water fee. Is there any service that residents are receiving that a fee hasn't gone up?

Judy Doyle: Mayor and council, I can tell you that the rates and fees are reviewed on an annual basis. And yes, I believe there are fees in community services that did not go up this year.

Councilmember Graham: It's almost the exception, isn't it?

Judy Doyle: No, no. We look at them on an annual basis. It's based on cost recovery. There are a number of fees and community services that we don't look to get 100% cost recovery. Some of our human services, you know, programs so.

Councilmember Graham: But if somebody wants to rent a ball field, if somebody wants to rent a horse stall, any field they want to -- the pools, the gyms, all that, rent ramada or a cabana, all the fees are going up, correct?

Judy Doyle: We do have fees for all of those things and yes, if the market indicates that they need to go up or if the cost of providing that service is going up, then yes, we propose a rate and fee increase.

Councilmember Graham: I will support the fee increases but I have reservations about it. Number one, we had all of this growth and there's more usage and more fees and there's more wear and tear and depreciation on all of our facilities and we have to pay for that. I understand that. We have been told over and over, that the growth and we have added, you know, how many housing units, it pays for itself.

[Time: 00:50:25]

It fills the public coffers and now we go back to a bigger population saying we have to raise the fee if you want to do anything in the city. It feels a little bit wrong, and I have reservations about that. We are kind of in an economic -- you can call it an economic tenuousness. We don't know if there's recessionary headwinds ahead of us and we are increasing fees. So those two things give me pause and reservation about it and I wanted to add those to the record. Thank you, Michael, for your presentation tonight. Judy, thank you as always. Thank you, Mayor.

Mayor Ortega: Well, I think that concludes the comment. I would now open for our public hearing and this is a statutory requirement. I see that one person wishes to -- oh, excuse me. I don't see anyone on item number 17. So with that, I would close public comment. There's plenty to talk about. This is like the third reading for our budget. So we've had a first go around, a second go around, several of these questions.

They are slides of record and I guess the illustration I use when I took office in January of 2021, there was still a minimum wage neat of paper right over the -- sheet of paper right over the copy machines. It says minimum wage is \$11.29. So that was what the recorded minimum wage was when you consider now, I think it's close to \$14 or whatever it is. So that's how much things have changed and also, of course the cost of gasoline and providing services. So we do plan to be as cost conscious as possible.

There's no need for an action item for this. There is. I'm sorry. So with that, I would call for a motion. I don't see any other requests or questions. We have accepted the citizen comments at this hearing of the proposed rates and fees. And we are now at the point to adopt rates and fee

ordinances and resolutions. Do I have a –

Councilwoman Whitehead: I will move to adopt rates and fees.

Councilwoman Janik: Second.

Mayor Ortega: So we have a motion and a second. Just to clarify, the motion is to adopt, order Ordinance 4588, Resolution, 12786, Ordinance 4592, and Resolution 12805, and adopt Resolution 12788. All of these are posted under number 17. We have a motion and a second for the discussion. Seeing none, please record your vote. Thank you. Unanimous.

**ITEM 18 – PUBLIC HEARING ON AND ADOPTION OF PROPOSED FISCAL YEAR 2023/24 BUDGET
(TENTATIVE BUDGET)**

[Time: 00:53:53]

Mayor Ortega: Next we move on to item number 18. Item 18 is the public hearing on an adoption of proposed fiscal year FY-2023/24 budget, tentative budget. We have our treasurer, Sonia Andrews and Alison Tymkiw is our city engineer. So we'll have the presentation first, and then we'll have our public comment and discussion. Thank you, treasurer.

City Treasurer Andrews: Thank you, Mayor, thank you, council. Next slide, please. Tonight's presentation on the tentative budget is a much shorter presentation than the presentation we provided on April 25th on the proposed budget. So the budget -- the proposed budget for this fiscal year '23/24 was published on April 4th and is available for our citizens on the website.

On April 25th, as mentioned earlier, we did a much longer presentation on the proposed budget and tonight, we are asking for a public hearing and also council to adopt the tentative or preliminary budget. And CIP. Next slide.

Based on state law, once the tentative or the preliminary budget is adopted, the final expenditures or the total expenditures cannot be increased upon the final budget adoption. Just wanted to make that clear for council. Next slide.

So our tentative budget is \$2.533 billion, made up of the operating budget and the grants and special districts budgets as you see on the slide, the capital improvement budget and the contingencies and the reserve. It's a balanced budget, meaning our expenditures do not exceed the revenues and the fund balance we have available. Next slide.

So when we presented the proposed budget in April, on April 25th, our proposed budget was \$2.54 billion and since that time, we have made some changes based on council direction and also council-approved items to arrive at the tentative budget before you tonight. I'm not going to speak to each one of those, but if you have any question on each one, we can, you know, answer those questions.

We've removed specifically -- I specifically, we moved the \$14 million for the Second Street improvements, and we have also added the Pima sound wall to the budget as directed by

council. So all of these changes are as directed by council. I'm going to pause for a moment to see if there's any questions on this slide.

Mayor Ortega: Yes, Councilmember Graham.

Councilmember Graham: Can you tell us what's in the .9. I know it's small. Sorry.

City Treasurer Andrews: Can I get back to that. We'll look that up.

Councilmember Graham: Take your time. No rush.

Mayor Ortega: In the meantime, Councilwoman Janik.

Councilwoman Janik: The Second Street project, number 18 on the list that we reviewed, could you give me a little more information on that project? And why we decided to hold back on it?

City Treasurer Andrews: So Alison will cover all of that in her presentation of the CIP.

Councilwoman Janik: Thank you.

Mayor Ortega: Councilwoman Caputi.

[Time: 00:57:51]

Councilwoman Caputi: Sonia, this might be covered by Alison then. Cut me off. The only thing that is confusing about our budget. I feel like during our retreat, we talked about wanting to move forward with the stage two project because -- the theater project because they were bringing so many of their own dollars to the project and they wanted to get started with their own money. And then it sort of disappeared. I didn't know where we ended up with that.

City Manager Thompson: Mayor, members of council, Councilmember Caputi, we cover this. It's not out of the budget we have the \$1.2 million but we show that for '24/25, which was always our intent when we originally went out and came up with our schedule, '24/25. The \$4 million that art has that they desire to move forward, we have to make sure that we follow all of our requirements, Title 34, that we get the project costs and so forth and they have the \$4 million. And we have discussions because the 1.2 is in question still. We have pretty clear guidance.

We think we can use it for the project, but that's how it was placed in the budget and how it was originally scheduled. The \$4 million that they have and they may desire to use, but obviously we need to have that discussion. We need to make sure that we follow all the city requirements associated with it. We will manage the project, because it is the city building and it complies to Title 34, which are bidding requirements and so forth. There are some things to go forward. It is in the budget.

We will have those discussions with Scottsdale Arts and come to a conclusion on that, what makes the best sense. We do not have any additional funds beyond the \$1.2 million that was

the bond approved portion of it. There are no additional funds beyond that.

Councilwoman Caputi: Okay.

City Manager Thompson: Because we don't know what the amounts are yet. We have estimates but they are preliminary estimates and as we found out with a lot of projects right now, because of the costs are occurring –

Councilwoman Caputi: So we don't know if it's happening or not happening?

City Manager Thompson: We have some ideas but we didn't include them because it would require additional elimination of other projects to move that forward and we were not in a position to do that and we didn't do that with some of the cost challenges.

Councilwoman Caputi: It's not dead. We just don't know yet or it might be happening in a future year?

City Manager Thompson: Scottsdale arts has \$4 million potentially available for a project. So they will have to comply with all of the requirements of the city and the city will manage that project. If they wish to use their \$4 million and go out and design it and determine what the final cost will be, we'll have to discuss that in next year's budget, which will take them almost the whole year to come up with those numbers anyhow to see if we add additional funds beyond our \$1.2 million.

[Time: 01:00:49]

Councilwoman Caputi: Thank you.

City Manager Thompson: You're welcome.

Mayor Ortega: Councilmember Durham.

Councilmember Durham: Thank you, Mayor. Aren't we confusing two different projects, the \$14 million is for the overall improvement of Second Street, but that's a separate project from the Art Center renovation, right? So when we're removing the \$14 million, that's just for the street improvements along Second Street, that's not for -- that's not specifically for the arts center theater.

City Manager Thompson: Mayor, members of council. What we have on Second Street is the original \$1.8 million, which was for the design. We do not have any funds in there to build anything at this time as we discussed at the retreat.

Councilmember Durham: That was a separate question. I was going to ask, we still have money for design.

City Manager Thompson: That is correct.

Councilmember Durham: In there. Thank you.

City Manager Thompson: You're welcome.

[Time: 01:01:49]

Mayor Ortega: Okay. Any other questions at this point?

City Treasurer Andrews: So I wanted to get back to Councilmember Graham's question, what was the remaining \$.9 million. I wonder if I should wait for him to come back. Here he comes. So in response to Councilmember Graham's question on the \$.9 million at the bottom, it is itemized on the council report, that is provided to the council, primarily transferring \$369,000 from the Dynamite Boulevard, Pima Road to 136th Street turn bays and bike lanes to the Osborn Road complete street, and that was approved by council on March 21st, 2023. And the other major one is transferring \$607,292 from one project for WestWorld arena lights to another WestWorld renovation project, and that was also approved by council on April 18th.

Councilmember Graham: Thank you, Sonia.

Mayor Ortega: Okay. Please continue.

City Treasurer Andrews: Okay. Next slide. So the budget by category is shown on this slide. Our \$2.53 billion budget is made up of personnel costs of \$334.7 million and \$10 million contribution, additional contribution to our public safety pension, and \$271.7 million for commodities and contracts, \$122.7 million for debt, for a total operating budget of \$739 million. Operating budget is only increasing by 7.3%.

The largest increase to our budget is really in the capital improvements which increased by 28.3% as we have discussed with inflation and project changes and such. We have also increased our contingencies and reserves to \$325.3 million. I just want to point out that with this budget, there's no proposed increase to our sales tax of 1.75% nor to our property tax. Our property tax remains very low.

I believe the prior year property tax is .91 per \$100 of assessed value and proposed '23/24 is .096 per hundred of assessed values. So property tax and sales tax makes up the bulk of the costs that our residents pay for city services. Fees and charges make up a very, very small portion of revenues for the city and the fees and charges that were presented earlier are made by residents that receive a direct service or a direct benefit.

Fees and services are not charged for general core services, like public safety, street maintenance, or any of the core parks and rec that the general citizens enjoy. And so for sales tax and property tax, that is what supports the city's core services and that is not increasing. Next slide.

With our proposed budget, we are proposing adding 50 new full-time equivalents that is

employee counts and that's 1.9% of our total full-time equivalent count and it brings our total F.T.E. count to 2,639. The proposed salary adjustments, we have in the budget is merit of 5%, and a market of 2% and that's actually right in line with our peer cities around the valley. And this slide just shows that with the increase, our F.T.E. count per thousand remains more or less the same.

[Time: 01:06:14]

The general fund is our largest operating fund, it's the fund that funds or provides for public safety, public works, community services, and such. The general fund budget is \$582.1 million, most of it is our operating budget and our reserves and contingencies. As you can see on the slide, \$266.1 million of the general fund budget is personnel. The operating expenditures are \$99.3 million and so the total operating budget in the general fund is \$375.4 million. Next slide.

And as I mentioned, the general fund budget reflects the city's priority for public safety. The expenditures \$375.4 million, 57% of that is police and fire, community services make up \$51 million or 14%, public works \$28 million or 7%, community and economic development is another 7%, and the remainder is the support services and general government. Next slide.

And this is a slide that I wanted to bring up because the resolution to adopt the tentative budget specifically requests council to provide an approval for an exception to our tourism development fund policy for the other category, so that the tourism development fund, funds destination marketing, and other tourism-related expenditures and in our policy, we have a restriction for specific projects funded by the 25% plus rent revenues to no more than 600,000 per item.

The tourism fund received significant amounts of revenues this year, because of our super season with Super Bowl and the very strong tourism season. We collected a significant amount of bed tax and with the bed tax that we collected, we identified these projects that would benefit our community in terms of improvements to WestWorld, the stadium, you know, and art walls or something like that. So these are the projects that were identified and presented to the tourism commission. And they exceed \$600,000 per item and so we will need council-specific approval to provide for that exception to the policy. Any questions on that.

Mayor Ortega: I don't see any hands up. I will comment that I seem to recall when the monsoon hit really bad, it did rip the WestWorld tent and that was a considerable unexpected expense. And there was other similar damage to the roadways here and there. And that is unforeseen, but definitely a large expense we've got to take care of. Continue, please.

City Treasurer Andrews: Thank you. My last slide before I turn over to Alison, I wanted to talk about the capital improvement program and the \$1.4 billion that is budgeted for the CIP. The reason for the increase in our budget over the last few years is because of water sewer projects. The life cycle projects, they have been in the works for the last four or five years through -- they have been in the design and engineering phase and they are progressing into the construction phase.

So you will see an increase in our budget because we're starting to put the construction dollars in the CIP for the arterial life cycle program. The other reason for the increase in our CIP budget is also the bond 2019 projects and then we have other transportation projects, drainage projects and other service and community facility projects. And that ends my portion of the presentation and I will respond to any questions before we turn it over to Alison.

Mayor Ortega: I see none. So we'll turn it over to the capital improvement discussion. After this presentation, I will go directly to public hearing, and then we will get into our own dialogue from the dais.

[Time: 01:10:47]

Alison Tymkiw: Thank you, Mayor and members of the council. Could I get the next slide please, and one more, please. This is a summary of the changes in the CIP since the April 4th, proposed budget release. Quite a few of these items were discussed with the city treasurer's presentation, but I will go through each of the items that have changed since the released of the proposed budget, as well as the presentation that I did back on April 25th of the proposed budget.

So first we added two new capital projects which were approved by city council on March 21st, the Pima Road sound wall and it was the Railroad Park Ramada. Second, we transferred \$369,306 from the dynamite boulevard, Pima Road and 136th Street turn bays and bike lanes to the Osborn Road complete street Hayden Road to complete street project and that was approved by city council on March 21st. And Osborn Road is complete and open to traffic.

Third increased -- we increased the 68th Street and Indian School Road to Thomas Road project, \$92,159 and that was approved by City Council open March 21st and we moved up the timing the storm drains on 68th Street. So it would align with the 68th sidewalk project. We removed the additional funding not necessary for two bond, 2019 solar projects.

We originally were planning some inflation amounts in those projects and we realized we can scale the projects to the current budget. We also increased 45 renovate horse barns to increase our rentable space as discussed on the repeat on April 13th. We removed the streets, again based on direction received on April 13th at the council retreat for the 2nd Street and Drinkwater Boulevard.

And \$607,292 for the -- from 47 replace WestWorld arena lights to reduce operating costs to project 45 renovate WestWorld horse barns to increase rentable space and that was approved by city council on April 18th. And that's it, if you have any additional questions.

Mayor Ortega: I will go to Councilwoman Janik and then City Treasurer.

Councilwoman Janik: Thank you, Mayor. I have a couple of questions Alison and it's to clarify some issues that we discussed at the retreat, versus what we are seeing now, just to get some clarification on why those projects are made. I have project numbers. I hope it's okay to go that way. The Ashler Hills Park. I think we discussed we should not install the shade structure as a cost-saving measure and the project is now on, can you explain why that change was made?

[Time: 01:14:15]

Alison Tymkiw: Councilwoman Janik. Yes, the Ashler Hills project, we are going through some value engineering on that project right now and we are specifically looking at the shade structure. We did get a cost structure to remove that shade structure and it was \$300,000. So that's not a large impact. And additionally, the project already has been through design review board process. It had extensive public outreach and the shade structure was important to the public.

Councilwoman Janik: Thank you. That's good judgment. Next one is -- well, we talked about Second Street, that we just are going to keep the number at that one \$1,845,000 basically. And the next question is on project 25, the Paiute Center. There was some discussion that we might have additional funding for a second story and the bond project was about \$11 million. And we were considering perhaps adding more to that. And at this point we are not.

Alison Tymkiw: Councilwoman Janik, we have -- I believe we have applied for a grant for that project; is that correct?

City Manager Thompson: Mayor, members of council, just a quick update on that one. We discussed it at the retreat. We discussed adding a second floor with outside money that would be brought in from maybe county or federal funds associated with that. This year, our goal in that project -- and we're not really funded out to '24/25 to construct. So we will be designing. And in that process, we will come back to you to have those discussions with those funds that might be available from other entities that could add to this project.

Councilwoman Janik: Thank you.

City Manager Thompson: You're welcome.

Councilwoman Janik: And then just one last one. Renovate and modernize the stage two theater. I think we already discussed that though. Thank you for that clarification. Appreciate it.

Alison Tymkiw: Thank you.

Mayor Ortega: Clarification from city treasurer and then Councilwoman Whitehead.

City Treasurer Andrews: Mayor, members of the council, I wanted to make one correction and clarification in my presentation earlier, I had misspoke and said that there was no increase to the property tax. There is an increase to the property tax rate. It's going to go from .907 to .968 per \$100 of assessed value. Thank you.

Mayor Ortega: Thank you. Councilwoman Whitehead and then Councilmember Graham.

[Time: 01:17:10]

Councilwoman Whitehead: I want to thank Councilwoman Janik, and actually, everybody up here. This budget process started last year and we go through many steps to get to where we are today. I want to mention the staff expertise at every level and then the staff specifically in the treasurer's office a \$2 billion budget is a big deal and it's great to be here tonight after doing so much work on this.

So a city budget really is a book of priorities and how much -- and it's the best way to decide if the city is, in fact, aligned with its constituents. And not only that, the level of programs, services and infrastructure improvements that get funded in a budget is a measure of the city's fiscal discipline and prudent decision-making. And by prudent decision-making that means making decisions today that save you money tomorrow.

So it's easy to cut costs today and save you dollars in the future. This is my fifth budget on City Council and I have to say it is my favorite. So maybe I will say that every year. This budget is very robust and from policies to capital improvement projects to line items, this is directly -- I look at these items. They are directly from you, the citizens. And so I want to go over just some of the examples of these projects. Petitions. We found out that there was a gap in a sidewalk, south of Camelback on 68th Street, that was a year and a half ago.

That is -- and it's a pretty dangerous gap. That is funded. Not only is it funded, it's funded in conjunction with drainage work, which we have a grant to do to reduce the taxpayer impact, the taxpayer cost. Pickleball courts in the south, that's a petition. That's funded. Indoor playground at the railroad park, that was a group of citizens who actually raised money and brought it to our attention. So that also is a citizen priority. More traffic enforcement officers. I have a lot of people asking me for that.

We have got that in your budget. So other priorities from our community are the Pima sound wall. That came straight from the residents too and thank you to staff for making sure that the right pot of money was used to fund it. So other things that are in this budget we have an ADA coordinator for the first time in over 10 years. We have rental assistance.

We have a number of programs to make sure that everybody in our city is cared for. So in this past year or two, we have seen seniors getting priced out of homes they already live in. We take a big stab at solving that problem in this budget. We have a tree canopy plan. We have things that don't seem that exciting but are money makers. The Polo field lighting, we are doing lighting that saves money by having LED lights and expands the use of these fields to nighttime sports.

We now have soccer games on the Polo fields. So lots to love about this budget and I just also want to say that we are delivering a broad range of infrastructure projects and at the same time, we have significantly reduced our pension liabilities and we have substantially increased our rainy day funds. So this year's projected reserve balance is \$81.8 million, and I just want to point out that that's three times the amount of the rainy day fund when I first got elected four years ago, four plus years ago. I have already asked so many thousands of questions that I have no more. Thank you.

Mayor Ortega: Thank you. I have Councilmember Graham and then Vice Mayor Littlefield.

[Time: 01:21:57]

Councilmember Graham: Thank you, Mayor. I have a -- I'm not quite as optimistic on this budget as my colleague. I do think a lot of it is very good. But unfortunately, there's been so many projects that have gone over. There's this budget kind of is sort of in a lot of ways putting out fires to cover overruns and there's so much that we are not getting that residents, I think, we need to tamp down expectations and make sure that they understand, you are not getting as much as you might want from this budget. The overruns have been jaw-dropping.

We have seen over and over again, I mean there's just -- we have talked about that many times. So I kind of wanted to start with that. Sonia, can you bring back up. Can you bring up the tourism projects that require the waiver of the \$600,000?

City Treasurer Andrews: Yes. Here it is.

Councilmember Graham: One of my concerns is a lot of these projects, I want these. We want these. We want a nice updated wall mural along the 101. Jim, can we deliver on these projected quickly before -- before they get chewed into by cost inflation and other project cost increases? How do we get the shovels going on these?

City Manager Thompson: Mayor, members of council, there are a few that will be a little more challenging. I will take the tent as an example, it will take time to order the materials and have them arrive. We can order the materials right away. And then you have the labor costs. I can walk through each in great detail. There's a couple that may not jump out right away and move forward. There was discussion with the -- your tourism commission, that desired for us to go slow on a couple of them. But our goal is to complete them, as proposed.

Councilmember Graham: Are you preparing us that we may not get them very quickly.

City Manager Thompson: Yes, we are.

[Time: 01:24:18]

Councilmember Graham: Well, my hope is that we can get them. If there's something that the six or seven of us can do to make that happen, please let us know. Thank you. Sonia, we talk about -- this is about the revenue side. We talk about property tax and we always brag so much about your property tax rate is going down. That's just because we know assessed values are going up like crazy.

Is the amount of property taxes that Scottsdale residents, the actual check that they are writing is that going up or down?

City Treasurer Andrews: Mayor, Councilmember Graham, and members of the council, the check that they are writing will go up because the assessed values are going up. Also, property

taxes consist of property taxes paid to the school district, community college, county, special districts and those may go up as well.

Councilmember Graham: Right.

City Treasurer Andrews: So the city's portion is just a portion of the project.

Councilmember Graham: And I'm focusing on the city's portion. Do you know what percentage the people's property taxes are going to go up, just so we have some clarity on that?

City Treasurer Andrews: The state statute limits the assessed value increase to no more than 5%. So even though your market value might have increased significantly, your assessed value can only go up by 5%.

Councilmember Graham: Okay. So it may go up by 5%.

City Treasurer Andrews: Maximum.

Councilmember Graham: I'm a little bit concerned about the 50 FTE, full-time equivalent head count increase that we are going up. I know there was debate that we need 100 or 200. Even if it's 10 or 20, people look at that and they have questions. Why do we have to raise the head count? And I do have some concerns about that. A question for Alison, if she's still around. Oh, there she is. I would want to talk about Ashler Hills which is behind Target or Safeway, whatever it is.

When we talked about the bond retreat in April or March, we had that retreat, and for starters, the -- that was a 2019 bonds project; is that correct?

Alison Tymkiw: That's correct.

Councilmember Graham: And how much did we tell voters -- how much did we estimate that project? Sorry to put you on the spot.

Alison Tymkiw: That's okay. I have it. I just have to look it up. Let's see, Councilmember Graham, build a neighborhood park at Ashler Hills, the bond 2019 amount was \$6,907,659.

Councilmember Graham: \$6.1 million, right?

Alison Tymkiw: Yep.

Councilmember Graham: And so in the budget this year we have \$10.8 million toward it.

Alison Tymkiw: Yes, there's an additional request for \$4.7 million, correct.

Councilmember Graham: Okay. So, I mean, another 80% increase on a project. It continues. A lot of it is not our fault. It's inflationary. Councilmember Durham is correcting me. It went from

6.1 to \$1.8 million. Is my math wrong? Is my arithmetic wrong? 70%. Okay. It's still a significant increase.

[Time: 01:28:22]

I want to manage residents' expectations about that. We are covering a lot of those. Some of the -- some of this -- what we're authorizing from the tourism fund is to cover more overruns. When we met at that retreat, we talked about setting aside the shade structure. And the reason we -- I remember this and my colleagues can correct me if they disagree. We were told that that was the major cost driver for that project. And now you say it was a \$300,000 delta?

Alison Tymkiw: Councilmember Graham so if you recall, from some of those elevations, that structure was not the shade structure itself. It was also the restroom building. It was like this one large structure together. So just removing the shade structure was \$300,000 and that's from the CMA --

Councilmember Graham: We are still buying and spending significant money for it?

Alison Tymkiw: Correct.

Councilmember Graham: Okay. I don't want to quibble about that. It's 77% increase. So how are we -- thank you, Alison. That's all I wanted to ask about Ashler Hills. My last question for the time being, how are we on the expenditures, state statute expenditure limit?

City Treasurer Andrews: Mayor, Councilmember Graham, members of the council --

Councilmember Graham: And can you explain to the residents a little bit of background and then where we are with this budget, if you wouldn't mind?

City Treasurer Andrews: Yes. So the expenditure limitation is a constitutional limitation that restricts the city's budget to a 1979 to 1980 amount. For population. So the state takes the 1979-1980 budget and calculates the number and limits the city's local expenditures of local revenues to an amount called the expenditure limitation. We receive that calculation from the state every year and our expenditure limitation this year, is 585.8 merchandise.

Our proposed budget comes in at \$582 million for the expenditures that are subject to that expenditure limitation. Now, granted, that is assuming we spend the entire budget. We often budget a cushion so we do not spend the entire budget. And looking back the last three to five years we are 20 to \$30 million below our proposed adopted budget, our actual expenditures.

Councilmember Graham: What happens if we need to spend over the limit?

City Treasurer Andrews: We cannot legally spend more than the limitation limit.

Councilmember Graham: Unless we get voter approval?

City Treasurer Andrews: Correct. We can get a permanent or a temporary increase to the expenditure limitation.

[Time: 01:31:54]

Councilmember Graham: Is that something you are concerned about this year or next year?

City Treasurer Andrews: For this year, since our budget proposed is below the expenditure limitations we do not have any concern. We don't believe that we will go over. We cannot legally go over the budget once it's adopted, but in future years if our expenditures increase more than the increase in population and inflation, because of new programs or additional expenditures, above inflation and population growth, then, yes, we may end up having to look at the increase and requesting voters for something.

Councilmember Graham: All my questions thank you Sonia and Alison. Thank you, Mayor.

Mayor Ortega: I will call on Vice Mayor Littlefield and then Councilmember Durham.

Vice Mayor Littlefield: I had a quick question, and most of my questions were answered by council and our staff. I had a couple of things I wanted to bring out so that citizens know what's going on on some of these other things and Jim, I will put you in the hot seat right now. We have in this budget, 50 full time equivalent openings. I would like to have a brief explanation of where those people are going and how much it will cost the city.

When with you do employee increases like this, that's a permanent increase into the budget because you are opening a new position slot. The employee will have overhead and possessions and health insurance and he's going to stay with us for many years, hopefully. So it's a long-term investment when we increase our employee count. First of all, where are 50 new people going to be and what will they be doing for us.

[Time: 01:33:56]

City Manager Thompson: Thank you, Mayor and Councilmember Littlefield. We had a request of 160 employees of the various, inclusive of future opportunities. I think one of the items that will come up this next year is starting to do our own transports in fire and those are not inclusive of all of these numbers. However, as we know, we were planning on some retirements and other things that will transpire in public safety and we have been preloading them so that when we have some of these losses that we have the skill set and some reps under the skill set and we have been doing that for a few years adding in that particular area.

This year our largest area of increase is in planning and development services and in the police. We are adding seven. And in planning and development services, 6.25. The planning and development services, we're not going to hire them all on day one. Some of them are tied back to the green code we had and filling some of those. Some of them in planning and zoning and police are related to the short-term hiring. And then we have the park ranger program. We will roll out the park ranger program this year with designated funds from the state, and we're going

to use sworn police officers so be the park rangers as opposed to the park rangers writing tickets and doing citations when they see infractions in the park and the preserve and so on.

Going through the list, it's spread out through all areas. The next highest area is in solid waste management and transportation and streets. As we continue to add and improve roadways, we need additional staffing in those areas. In solid waste management, we did have -- when we had the last big monsoon, we fell behind and one of the things is we just don't have adequate staffing and if we have any that take time off or otherwise, it's unlike some other of the other areas where we have coverage.

If someone is off or sick or on vacation, we have to cover their route. That means we have to hang together. We added some additional areas of town that we have to serve and so, that's why we are adding to those additional areas. Some of them, we do through our rates and fees. When we had 163 requests and we only brought 50 forward, they were pretty specific in nature that they are really needed to provide the level of service that we do, otherwise we have to start backing down the level of service.

The other big area, the next one was information technology. So we continue to run new software platforms out to better -- to better serve. I think the other area that we're challenged with is in security. All of us read where people continue to get hit on the security front and the pilfering and the other things that are occurring out there. We have additional five FTE in that area to ensure that we are at the forefront of ensuring our technology and our environment. And so those are the highest areas and then there's somewhere we have one or two here or there. The next highest would be water resources and that's in the water and reclamation. We continue to add reclamation wells. We are being challenged on some the drought management, that we need to continue to be at the forefront of.

That's next higher usage and then the last one, at least above the one number, and or above two, and that's communication and that's to continue to meet some of our outreach, and the programs that we are doing. That's why we have the ones that we have.

[Time: 01:38:12]

And then there's one or less in some of the areas. Parks and Rec. Some of that was restructuring our part time to full-time. And we had numerous part-time employees at WestWorld and we are moving them to full-time. When we had six part-time FTEs, we are going with three full-time or if we had temporary or volunteers we resorted those and that happens every year in parks and recreation. As we go through and look at where the best needs are. Those are the 50 that we're proposing.

Not all 50 are being hired on day one and not all 50 may be hired throughout the year. We'll also have numerous vacancies throughout the year which traditionally occur in the city, because we have a large city, we will have retirements and resignations and possibly even terminations throughout that year. And so we do have those things that occur that fluctuate the numbers.

Vice Mayor Littlefield: But these are new opening positions that we are putting into the budget on a permanent basis?

City Manager Thompson: That's correct.

Vice Mayor Littlefield: And I wanted to know that. I had an odd question, it's not a lot of money, but I just kind of wondered about it. We have in our budget a new item for \$1.3 million at WestWorld for Polo field lighting. Is this really high priority? How many people would use this? And is there anything else that the fields would be used for?

City Manager Thompson: We believe it is. We know we have a shortage for fields. We continue to add fields and demand. Remember a couple of years back, we were not using the Polo fields for any other events other than the Polo event and parking on. And so we went in and we did improvements to those fields and we want to add lights and now we have soccer and we have additional soccer leagues using those and youth sports going out and utilizing WestWorld, where traditionally that was not the case.

Keep in mind that area is in a flood zone. When the rains come, it does flood. We wanted to extend the usage out there, in particular for the youth soccer programs. Our demand is far greater than the number of fields that we have and we continue to add fields. This is an inexpensive improvement to extend that availability to the youth in the community.

Vice Mayor Littlefield: Thank you very much. I think it's high time that we replace that tent at WestWorld. It was time to replace it many years and now that it's received some wear and tear on it, I'm really glad to see that to be put into the budget. It needs to be done. And before it goes and costs more. So that's basically what I had. I think this is pretty well rounded. And I think it's well done.

I want to thank Sonia and her team and all of the people who worked on this and make it as good as it is. And cutting back and sprucing up and making it a very, very well-designed budget for the coming year. Thank you.

Mayor Ortega: Okay. Councilmember Durham.

[Time: 01:41:34]

Councilmember Durham: Thank you, Mayor. I agree with everything that Councilmember Whitehead said about the budget. I don't think our residents will be surprised that costs are going up. They shop for gasoline and groceries. They know their expenses are going up. I think they are smart enough to figure out that the city's expenses are going up. If we are going to provide the types of services that our city expects.

And our land values, the values of our houses go up and that's because of the good structure that Scottsdale provides and it's a great place to live. And on the number of employees, if you look at the graph, we're only now coming back to the number of employees we had before the great recession. And I'm very happy that some of these new employees are dedicated to

short-term rental enforcement.

Almost every day we get emails about the lack of enforcement on short-term rental rules. We have a new set of rules. I'm really hoping that the new employees who will be dedicated in this will help with this and frankly, I would like to see us hire more dedicated to short-term rentals. These are simply the costs of living in this type of environment, and it's unfortunate. I think almost everyone understands why these costs are going up. Thank you.

Mayor Ortega: Thank you. Councilwoman Caputi.

[Time: 01:43:28]

Councilwoman Caputi: Thank you. That was great, Tom. It's pretty much what I wanted to say and I want to remind folks that we have increased our cash reserves and contingencies in our general fund budget to 25% this year. So in terms of pumping up again an expenditure limit, we have an awful lot of extra rainy day funds that we're -- we have set aside, which is a very conservative move for the city.

So I don't think we need to worry about that. And this why there's a nefarious scheme and we have overrun everything. I agree with Councilmember Durham. Everyone understands that everything is wildly increase. I sell commodities for a living. Anything that you estimated even a few months ago is no longer relevant today. Things are continually increasing and we have done an excellent job managing given the uncertainty of the times.

And as Councilwoman Whitehead said, this is my third budget and I'm very proud of it as well. I think we did an excellent job of delivering resident priorities. Almost everything that folks told us they wanted during the course of the year, as was just pointed out actually, got put in the budget which is wonderful. Thank you.

Mayor Ortega: Well, thank you. Just to wrap up, I believe you were very informative. I would like to -- before I conclude with my own comments, I would like to move on to the public hearing. We have David Smith, the former treasurer of Scottsdale. And also just to emphasize, again, anyone who wishes to provide a written comment on these subjects can do so. We have received them here at our dais and we also have them of record as they were transmitted in email. That's all part of the very transparent public process. Go ahead, Mr. Smith.

David Smith: Mayor Ortega and members of council, my name is David Smith, as you said, and I am now and have been for 37 years, a resident of Scottsdale. One thing you were told a little early was surprisingly, if you were short on capital, take a look at the tourism fund because they had a good year and see if you can get some money from them. Among the several actions you will be asked to take tonight on moving forward on the adoption of this budget is to waive financial policy 10.2, as it relates to the six capital projects that you intend to fund with carryover reserves or the tourism development commission. And without this waiver, this financial policy would limit the use of the tourism, to one-time commitments not to exceed \$600,000 per proposal. This is the policy since the voters approved the increase the bed tax from 3 to 5%, back in 2010 and previous councils have established and abided by this progress

and to maximize the number of projects. It's to maximize the number of projects that our tourism dollars could sponsor. But tonight, you are being asked to waive the policy, at least five times to permit tourism development dollars to fund five projects that require an aggregate of \$9 million out of the tourism carryover budget.

[Time: 01:47:22]

Your tourism commissioners who you have established as your advisor on how to spend bed tax dollars have expressed their concerns about these projects. While they're worthy projects in their own right, they only bear a remote possibility of enhancing Scottsdale tourism and your council report says that the commission recommended the use of tourism dollars of 4-3. That's simply not correct.

Setting aside the precedent you might be creating by waiving this policy five times tonight, I wonder why you are not being asked to waive the policy regarding the several other tourism projects in the budget, that are designed to replace the collateral that previously supported the acreage north of Bell Road. The debt service on that acreage, and when it was sold last year for \$42 million, you were told the city would have to re-invest the sale proceeds, totaling \$19 million in order that they continue to qualify as tourism projects and I presume that the tourism fund would still be charged the debt service.

You know what they were renovating the Chaparral Pool, renovating horse barns at WestWorld and a variety of other things that have a remote relationship to tourism. I sympathize with the capital needs of the city that is caused by a number of factors, but raiding the tourism fund and waiving the applicable financial safeguards is not a supportable solution. And I suggest it's not what I and other Scottsdale voters expected when we improved the increase in bed tax in 2010.

Mayor Ortega: Thank you, Mr. Smith. Point well taken. With that, I will conclude the public hearing. I see no other requests to speak. So I will close the public hearing. At this point, so many positive things have been said. Essentially our budget is our best attempt to balance revenues and needs. They keep our city healthy. They hope our city safe. They keep our city clean, and that, you know, forward our own well-being. And part of that well-being includes, you know, budgets for recreation, arts, our community programs.

We can speak about tens of millions of dollars, and I won't go into that, but I will talk about one small item, it's a new item in our budget. Two years ago when I became Mayor, I asked to set up a subcommittee on education so that we ask our peers in the school district and the community district to meet quarterly, and two of our members completed that duty with me and we meet with the Scottsdale unified school district and the community college. One the points of discussion was that we support scholarships, internships and pathways.

And as you know, city of Scottsdale has many pathways, diesel mechanics and police and fire, and more. So we have in our budget \$100,000 that would help and assist and identify those students who would be moving into either a trade school or community college, and open that education or remove any part of the obstacle to achieving that. And serving one another. I will also say that it is with deep appreciation that we have as council, for every individual, who is

working with the city of Scottsdale, administratively and top to bottom.

I noticed this morning when the waste people came by, my wife happened to say thank you to the truck as they went by. They were there for 6 seconds and moved on. So with that, we have a complete report and I will ask for a -- so we have completed the hearing. I would ask to adopt ordinance number 4593, as presented, and including all of the particulars of the tentative budget.

Councilwoman Whitehead: So moved. I move to adopt our fiscal 2023/24 budget, ordinance number 4593.

Councilmember Durham: Second.

[Time: 01:52:42]

Mayor Ortega: Thank you. So we have a motion and a second. And I think I made the motion, and she made the second. Either way. Either way, it all worked out. It all worked out. So we move to do that and please record your vote. Thank you. Unanimous.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Next, we will move on to the next item is public comment. Public comment is an opportunity for any non-agendized item, to be discussed, but it must be within the council's jurisdiction. We had an earlier public comment opportunity. We have a second one now. Seeing that there's no requests for public comment, on non-agendized item, I will close the public comment.

Next, we move on to item number 19, which is the citizens petition item. We received the citizen petition, our charter allows for a petition to be submitted to the clerk's office, and then would come forward on our agenda, seeing none, that item number 19, is therefore, closed. We have no petition.

Next, we will have the work study, and I would ask for a -- allow a short recess. So we will reconvene at 7:05, and get to our work study. Thank you for hanging in there.

[Break]

Mayor Ortega: We will now reconvene our city council regular meeting, May 16th. We're beginning the work study session. And it provides a less formal setting for the Mayor and Council to discuss specific topics with each other and city staff and provide staff an opportunity to receive direction for the council to provide an opportunity for public input, yet continue to maximize the amount of time available for the council to have focused discussions, focused comment.

We will have five speakers and they are permitted three minutes each. And this will allow the meeting to continue on the topic as posts. I have a request for five speakers. And we will begin with Thomas Kube. And then French Thompson.

[Time: 01:56:06]

Tom Kube: Thank you, Mr. Mayor, members of the city council, I'm Tom Kube. I live on Sunnyside Drive in Scottsdale. I appreciate that you are discussing the issue of the road diets outlined in the street section of the transportation plan which has lately galvanized. It says restricting lanes, traffic safety, modal streets and multimodal community access over traffic throughput, emphasis on over.

Reducing capacity by cutting traffic lanes will neither contribute to safety or the ability of motorists to travel readily in Scottsdale. The 45-page staff report concludes with do offset paragraphs inserted to focus on the main concerns of road diets, one that emergency vehicle access traffic will not be impeded as cars will get out of the way and safety will not be compromised. Really?

When lanes are reduced safety is negatively impacted for all users. Road diets have seriously mixed success. Communities like Los Angeles; Akron, Ohio; Philadelphia; and Oakland, California, where road diets were implemented increased accidents and injuries. City planners there are perplexed by that unexpected outcome that. Speaks directly to safety. The final offset addresses housing unit growth and that traffic is generally consistent implying that traffic won't substantially increase.

Now, does anyone in this room believe that 10,000 new apartments approved and yet to be built with will not contribute to added traffic safety and suggestion? Really? More apartments will be proposed and you will approve more, most likely on split vote approvals. Currently Phoenix is building a wall of apartments and condos along Scottsdale Road, each of them with motor vehicles. They will share and use our roads again more traffic, equals safety concerns. Scottsdale's own economic development strategic plan states Scottsdale's population growth is three times the U.S. average. We expect your previous decisions will significantly grow traffic volume which will impact safety, the proposed shrinking the streets is really counterintuitive. Growth means traffic, traffic impacts safety. Please allow this topic to be placed on the 2024 ballot as safety and traffic are major issues that Scottsdale voters have an obligation to vote on. Thank you for the opportunity.

Mayor Ortega: Thank you. Next Ginny Bertoncino and French Thompson.

Ginny Bertoncino: Can you hear me? Okay. Mayor and council, I'm Jenny Bertoncino long-time Scottsdale resident. We all heard the reason for creating complete streets is safety. How can it be true? 10,000 apartments already approved throughout the city haven't even broken ground yet. Thousands of new apartments will definitely add to our current traffic congestion, yet reducing lanes on heavily traveled roads makes it safer? It's a lie!

How can emergency vehicles make their way through congested streets without entering a bike lane, a sidewalk, or a center divider? Yet complete streets are safer? It's a lie. I lived at Thomas and Hayden for 27 years. I traveled down Thomas Road to and from work during that time. Coming home where three lanes turned into two, turning eastbound towards Hayden, caused

traffic to wait three or more signal lights to reach that intersection and yet it will make your commute safer and improve air quality? It's a lie!

[Time: 02:00:20]

We're all aware of the federal government is providing funds for creating complete streets, and we're all old enough to know accepting money from the feds makes us beholden to them. Instead, why don't we take a deep breath, say a break, and use the money we pay in taxes at the gas pump to fix existing roads that are full of potholes.

Our city streets have become horrible and unsafe to drive. Solange, we have heard you tell us, it's all about safety. I don't believe that's true. If it was true, the other 43% of councilmembers would vote the same way you do. But they don't. They're listening to the citizens of Scottsdale. Please put the measure on the ballot and let Scottsdale residents decide. That's the only fair and equitable way to resolve this issue. I will end with a question: What happened to common sense?

Mayor Ortega: Next, we have French Thompson and then Charles Fernandez. Let's keep things moving. French Thompson, Charles Fernandez, and then Patty Badenoch.

French Thompson: Thank you for allowing me to be here, French Thompson, 7158 East Main Street. She makes a lot of sense. It's all about the money. You have been talking about money all night long. It's money. It's all about money. Road diets are not about public safety. It's all about the money. It's disingenuous to say that this is about public safety. In fact, this is simply a misdirection of the facts. No one is upset about public safety, or where to put stop signs or speed limit signs nobody wants to do that. They have input in the removal of traffic lanes which are used every day by Scottsdale citizens and other people coming and going in our city. City taxpayers paid for the roadways that you want to take away with more taxpayer money. The very nice medians that were on 68th Street are not all that old and they were paid with citizen taxpayer money.

Now they are being torn up, using more taxpayer money. Whether or not it's local taxpayer money or federal taxpayer money, it doesn't make any difference. It's still taxpayer money. Federal money is our taxes. The money we pay. So it's not free money. You guys all paid for those taxes. So shouldn't the taxpayers have some say on you squander your money.

It wouldn't be surprising to me that if those who built the medians are the ones who are tearing it up and knocking it down? This happens in Scottsdale all the time. Where are the traffic studies that show how many bicycles will be traveling on these complete streets? Where is the hard data showing the great need for complete streets. Hard data on how many bicycles will be using the roadways. I have never seen any of that. You are actually taking away roadways used by 99.5 or more percent of the roadway users to give lanes to less than 1 half of a percent of users which would be a major amount of bicyclists.

How do you justify adding more lanes of traffic in the more affluent, less densely populated area of Scottsdale while taking away from the less affluent, more densely populated Scottsdale. This

is a distinct form of economic and traffic discrimination.

[Time: 02:04:12]

This road diet plan is simply trying to diminish the value of and access to Old Town Scottsdale. Taking away the flowers and the plants on 68th Street for a bike lane is one example of this. The only reason why the city council does not want to let taxpayers vote on this is because they know that the citizens will vote no. You know the citizens will vote no on this. You just don't want to listen to the tax paying citizens. It's all about the money. That's where it comes down to. So you can listen to the money or you can listen to the citizens. Thank you.

Mayor Ortega: Thank you. Next, we have Charles Fernandez and then Patty Badenoch.

Charles Fernandez: Mayor and members of the council, thank you for the opportunity to address you this evening. My name is Charles Fernandez. I'm here because I do ride bikes in this area. I ride on these roads. In fact, I like Lafayette out there, it's really cushy. I lead a tour of the public art in this area just last month.

I pick up my favorite authors at the Poison Pen, John Scalzi was there a few years ago. Downtown is nerve wracking and Indian School is nerve wracking. I take my space in traffic. That's great for me, but it really doesn't work for the friends who aren't as confident in traffic, or for all the people who I really want to invite to see the city in this way. Because the biggest people reason -- the biggest reason that people are afraid to try riding is because of cars and having to claim that space in traffic in order to ride safely or, indeed, at all.

Cities should be designed for people and not machines. Space should be prioritized for those who are living, visiting and not for the expediency of drivers who are passing through. Complete streets policy and proper collection and application of traffic data informs leadership how to do exactly that. Road designed tell drivers how to act. Posted speed limits can be everywhere, but when there's a wide stretch of road that goes off to the horizon, it says go and speed is one of the biggest factors in crashes.

Priorities are chosen in road design, and I'm hoping that the city of Scottsdale will choose the health and the well-being of human beings both inside and outside of vehicles rather than expediency and convenience. Roads that move fast will come in a cost of pain, suffering and death. I like being alive. It's kind of become a habit. I want to keep at it, and honestly, riding bikes brings me a lot of joy. It puts me in closer touch with the neighborhood, with local businesses and with people. It means I appreciate little things like water and shade and public art and I hope there can be space for that, for myself and everybody else who wants to share the city. Of thank you.

Mayor Ortega: Next and last, Patty Badenoch.

Councilmember Graham: Mr. Mayor, the previous speaker didn't state his address.

Mayor Ortega: I'm sorry, Patty.

Charles Fernandez: That would be 153 East Palm Lane. My apologies.

Mayor Ortega: Thank you. Next, we have Patty Badenoch.

[Time: 02:07:37]

Patty Badenoch: Patricia Badenoch, 47-year resident of Scottsdale. I heard that this road diet was overwhelmingly supported by the residents of southwest village at 68th Street which is south of Indian School. So I decided to go to the neighborhood and find out for myself by doing a random survey.

I took a survey form and I -- at this point, I would like to read it to you. We the undersigned residents of southwest village oppose the removal of the vehicular lanes on 68th Street as approved by the council. We also are opposed to the proposed lane reduction on Thomas Road. Additionally, the Southwest Association does not speak for us, and no formal vote or survey was organized or conducted to represent the views of Southwest Village residents of these matters.

So I went door to door. And I was appalled at what I saw. In short amount of time, I filled two pages -- here they are -- of 30 signatures and there were also other volunteers collecting signatures using the same form and I just received 13 more. That's 43 total. Very few residents know about the project, and those who found out were outraged. Many people thanked me for stopping by and are disappointed that this is a done deal. They don't want the bike lanes at the expense of taking out any lane of traffic on what they are experiencing, which is already a busy street getting worse.

You people on the council have been told that an overwhelming majority of this neighborhood supports of project and you can see from my survey, that this is clearly not the case. You are basing your decisions on false information. Put this issue of road diets on the ballot and let the voters decide. The survey has been sent to the city clerk and I am sure each of you have a copy. Thank you.

Mayor Ortega: Thank you. And with that, we will close public comment. We will move on to the roadway classification work study item, and our presentation. Mr. Melnychenko.

[Time: 02:10:21]

Mark Melnychenko: Pardon me. Thank you, Mayor Ortega and city councilmembers. We hope this presentation will provide valuable information and historic background on roadway reclassification, lane reduction and repurposing of excess road capacity and the continued use of these proven processes in developing transportation system for everyone in Scottsdale. Next, please.

For the last 30 years, the city of Scottsdale has developed and implemented policies, practices and plans that support high-quality transportation for all users. These documents include the 2001 general plan and the 2008 and 2016 transportation master plans have moved the city in a

consistent direction. All plans include extensive public input, transportation commission recommendations, and city council adoption.

The 2022 transportation action plan or called the TAP is an update to the 2016 transportation master plan and a continual continuation of transportation planning in Scottsdale that has occurred since the early 1990s. Goals and objectives have remained consistent throughout these plans that support the Scottsdale general plan and have helped guide the city. Next, please. City staff used the foundation of previous plans along with the 2022 TAP and the city's design standards and policies manual to support the goals and the objectives of Scottsdale's general plan 2035. Each one of these documents, which helps to guide the city's decision-making were adopted by council and have a common theme in their direction. Safety, complete streets, multimodal, accommodation for all users, and livable community. Next, please.

With each master plan update over the last 20 years, Scottsdale's road reclassifications have been evaluated to account for changing capacity, based on long-term volume trends and land use patterns: Street reclassifications are a common occurrence in transportation master planning. They are based on a level of maturity in the city's existing transportation network in consideration of surrounding and current future planned development. Street reclassification were included in the 2008 and 2016 master plans as well as the 2022 transportation action plan. The T.A. P. reclassified 17 roadways that were significantly under capacity to a lower functional classification. Next, please.

[Time: 02:14:05]

The goals, policies and performance measures of the TAP's street element provide a balanced approach for staff, to evaluate roadways and provide added safety and designs that accommodate all users. The TAP lays out a policy of restriping following rescheduled repaving. This process which includes extensive coordination between transportation divisions would design striping to improve on-street bicycle accommodations, and center urn turn -- turn lanes while keeping existing pavement width. So the curb-to-curb configuration of the street stays the same. Some of the elements of the restriping can also include reallocating extra space for parking, shoulders, transit use, turn lanes or pedestrian refuge islands. Next, please.

For a successful project, the city strives to implement transportation solutions that stress sharing the road and safety first. In all of staff's efforts, we attempt to use the right-of-way in the most effective manner to address the needs of all users. The city's transportation system has taken decades of quality work by staff to develop -- to develop based on data-driven solutions. Much of the heavy work has been completed, but there is still more to be accomplished in filling the remaining system gaps. Next, please.

Some of the most important data for transportation planning is the city's traffic volume trends. Every two years, city staff collects volume data for the city's major street network. This has occurred over the last 20 years, providing strong data on traffic conditions and trends occurring throughout the city. The information is key in determining if changes need to be made for a road to perform more efficiently and is paired with anticipated and historical development patterns. The volume data collected over numerous years is what the city uses in recommending future

restriping changes. Next slide, please.

The main reason citywide traffic volumes have remained stagnant while development has grown is due to the construction of the regional freeway system. In 1989, the freeway system was in its fin fantasy. And people used the roadway network. Starting in the early 2000s, when the Loop 202, and the Loop 101 were completed traffic migrated to the freeway system. As a result, the city has seen a constant rate of traffic on most major roads. This and the creation of the Sonoran preserve in the mid-1990s creates these traffic volume patterns. Next, please.

The TAP reclassified 17 roadways to a lower functional classification this is the list of reclassified streets from the TAP. These roadway segments listed on the slide have traffic volumes significantly under capacity. As a result, staff would consider these roads for possible lane reductions and combine these modifications with scheduled repaving. The list of reclassifications in the TAP is 3% of the 1,060 arterial and collector streets in Scottsdale. Next, please.

This map shows the locations of the reclassifications mentioned on the previous slide. Five of the roadways have been evaluated and have been removed from contribution for the duration of the transportation action plan. These include McDowell Mountain Ranch, Hayden Road, 128th Street, 130th and 132nd Street and Bell Road. That leaves 12 of the 17 street segments listed as podge lane reduction locations. There are also two projects funded in the fiscal year 2022 and '23 capital improvement plan that are in progress, 68th Street and Thomas Road.

[Time: 02:19:23]

These two projects are not listed in the 2022 TAP since there was no reclassification involved. The last portion of the Thomas Road was reclassified in the adopted 2016 master plan update from a major to minor arterial. Next, please. McDowell mountain ranch road, 105th to 108th was changed earlier this year. We didn't change the lane striping because our analysis determined that there was minimal benefit to reducing lanes as the existing bicycle and pedestrian facilities were already adequate.

Next, 96th Street to Shea to Via Linda is a good candidate for restriping. The volumes have been constant since 1998, as you can show on the graph on the bottom. There are no existing bike lanes, therefore, it would provide strong connections to the active transportation network shown on the map, and complete the 96th Street corridor all the way up to Redfield Road. Next, please.

This we call the spaghetti bowl. This slide provides an example of a series of roadways in a confined area, significantly under capacity, with a built-out roadway. This will be reclassified and reevaluated and potential options considered. Next, please.

Two goals of the type of this type of initiative are to complete the bike network and provide consistent roadways. This slide shows both 68th Street and Thomas Road projects and the remaining connections to be made to fill gaps throughout the system, which includes streets,

multiuse paths and canals. Each road will also have a uniformed street configuration from one end of the city to the other. Next slide, please.

The transportation and streets, the department has seven distinct sections with various disciplines and expertise. All work collaboratively and with other departments on developing transportation solutions that may include pavement markings and potential lane reductions and safety features. Next, please.

The TAP lays out a policy of roadway restriping, following scheduled repaving. This restriping protocol will be applied when roadways are due to be treated. The process would keep existing pavement widths and could include removing vehicle lanes from the roadway or reallocating the existing space for bike lanes, parking, shoulders, turn lanes, medians or pedestrian refuge islands. Next, please.

Over the past 20 years, there has been a steady increase in the number of multifamily housing units in Scottsdale. Planning department data shows between January of 2010 and December of 2022, approximately 26,500 units have been approved through the entitlement process. Within that same time, 6,900 students received development review board approval, with 10,800 units being lilt, and 2,900 units currently under construction. Despite the growth in multi-family housing, traffic data for this same period in the city remains constant, showing vehicle miles traveled between 3.8 and 4 million miles per year.

As I said before, several factors account for this, including the development of the freeway system, which has redirected traffic from the city streets and the creation of the McDowell Sonoran Preserve, which has reduced development density in northern portions of Scottsdale. Next, please.

[Time: 02:24:22]

The national community survey is an important piece of information for the city in looking at trends. Since 2020, ease of travel by car is the highest it's been since 2003, and our goal in the TAP is to maintain ease of travel by car above 70%. Currently 78% of community survey responders to that metric rated ease of travel by car as excellent or good. Next, please.

Since 1995, Scottsdale has increased the bike lanes from 8 miles to almost 200 miles across the street network and what is also added 132 miles of paved paths. Active transportation is a key element of the city's history and has been part of efforts for decades to provide choices for all users. Next, please.

New technology is emerging. And the city must provide space that can provide all of these forms of transportation within our network. Federal regulations, space limitations with increased usage and north-south directions are challenges that we have with canals and paved paths. So it will be key to continue to expand on-street facilities throughout Scottsdale. Next, please.

The city's planned lane reduction projects will not adversely affect emergency response. Road diets implemented in other cities often use a series of infrastructure changes such as moving

curbs to narrow streets or building barriers to protect other users of the road. Scottsdale Roadway configurations would serve using pavement parking or paint, and space. Drivers on roadways are required to move to the right and yield the right-of-way to allow -- of way, to allow for emergency. Drivers will have the same ability to do this, following a lane reconfiguration using paint marking only. Transportation and streets have received concurrence from both fire and police on this item. Removing excess travel lanes or roadway capacity can help reduce speeding. Next, please.

Transportation and streets staff work collaboratively to meet the needs of city projects. Staff develop appropriate designs for new roadway striping and conduct public outreach before making any major changes to the pavement striping of a roadway. These are potential public outreach strategies and tools and it's our goal to public increase our public outreach efforts. Next, please.

There are several transportation-related initiatives throughout the United States and the world. Including vision zero, five minute city, and the growth of light rail transit as a major form of transportation. Vision zero is to eliminate all traffic fatalities and increasing safe mobility for everyone. It's a great goal. The 15-minute city is an urban planning concept in which most daily necessities and services are easily reached by a walk or a bike ride by any point in the city. Light rail was removed from consideration as a transportation option in Scottsdale with the approval of the 2016 transportation master plan by the City Council.

[Time: 02:29:00]

None of these initiatives have been adopted or under consideration in Scottsdale. Two planning initiatives that are starting in the city of Scottsdale are blue zones and a roadway safety action plan. The blue zones is collaboration with Honor Health is looking to create a more livable and healthier Scottsdale. Over the coming years they will provide advice on quality, livability and healthier Scottsdale. Also, the city of Scottsdale is starting a roadway action plan. We received \$300,000 as a federal grant and we will provide -- we will develop practices tailored to the needs of the city of Scottsdale. Next, please.

Scottsdale is comprised of over 140 square miles that include extensive infrastructure, which our expert staff has played a major role in planning designing, constructing and maintain over time. Staff has been managing our transportation system for decades and our track record indicates that we are well versed in our field. This is a list of items that staff, develops, maintains and improves over time. Next, please.

Again, thank you for the opportunity to present this information on the city as process in helping to develop a safe transportation system for all users. One of the Scottsdale's consistent goals for decades. Thank you.

Mayor Ortega: Thank you. We'll proceed. Councilmember Durham.

Councilmember Durham: Thank you. That was an excellent presentation. We've been told many times that no one will use the bike lanes. We have also been told that the bike lanes are going to

be so crowded that police and fire will not be able to get through, and I believe Chief Walther is here and Chief Shannon is here. So there's been repeated claims that these plans would impede fire and police and other emergency vehicles. So if it's possible, I would like the two chiefs to speak to that issue.

Police Chief Walther: Thank you, Mayor, members of Council and Councilmember Durham, thanks for the question. We have consulted and been consulted with regarding this -- the road diet strategy. And when we look at the roadway itself, the width of the roadway is not changing. Really what we break that down to is we're talking about paint. And so you are changing the striping on the roadway.

That's it allows access and allows Chief Shannon to speak to this because his vehicles are significantly larger than mine, but for the average police vehicle, traversing the streets of Scottsdale, road width is key. If we are talking about leaving road width the same and we are talking about changing paint and restructuring lanes then our emergency response should not be impacted at all. I know one of the previous speakers spoke about bike lanes and police officers would have to traverse or move into bike lanes when passing traffic that's pulled over to the right per statute, you have to pull to the right to yield to an emergency vehicle, and yes, there are times when my officers are driving through the bike lane with due caution but they are using the bike lanes to get around traffic that is stopped.

Roadway width is important. We are at that time talking about changing curbs here. We are leaving streets the same width and with the streets the same width, again, I hate to belabor the point. With we are really talking about changing the lane striping with paint. Chief Shannon.

[Time: 02:33:20]

Fire Chief Shannon: I don't have much to add. We did a little bit of a deeper dive on our history. Mark pointed out very accurately that we collaborate very closely with the transportation department on all proposed changes in traffic and there's no significant data that suggests that this particular project or this method specifically, because we are talking about paint striping would have any impact on our response time.

The cursory studies that we have done suggests that there's actually potential for an enhancement in response times in some areas because you give people yet an additional option to -- to space themselves as emergency vehicles are coming. So I really don't have much more to add other than that. There's no data that supports any concerns.

Councilmember Durham: Thank you have. I would like to reassure everyone that your city is not run by morons. We checked this out before we changed streets. Of so we don't do this willy-nilly. The police and the fire were consulted before any of these plans to make sure everything would work right. It's not as if we ignore the issue. We considered the issues and confirmed that it would not be a problem. Thank you.

Mayor Ortega: Councilmember Janik and then Councilwoman Whitehead and Councilmember Graham.

Councilwoman Janik: Thank you.

Councilmember Graham: Sorry, Councilmember Janik. I wanted to make sure that the fire chief stays because I have more questions for him. I wanted to make sure that he stayed around.

Mayor Ortega: Thank you.

Councilwoman Janik: All right.

Councilmember Graham: Thank you, Councilmember Janik.

Councilwoman Janik: No problem. April 26th, 2022, vote on the TAP plan. This is what I said. Printed and reviewed twice today. I ask you to do a robust engagement of the citizens and businesses, and use the most up to date traffic information before you do the conversion. They said they would. Now, here's my question. Data, traffic counts should be performed within one year of the proposed narrowing. Three years, not good. Too many variables.

The data should have been more accurate, contrary to what they promises. Data collection should be done during peak demand in peak season, January to March. I'm shoot sure if that was done. I would -- I'm not sure that was done. I would like to see data and I would like to normalize and extract the data. I have done science research. I want to see the formulas. I'm questioning the data. There should be a separate data column for projected traffic counts with new approved construction projects. That is just the data we need to make a good decision.

Now, notification. There should be meetings between staff and each business owner that is affected or adjacent to the narrow road. I don't know. We got a petition with the 22 businesses saying they were not notified. Now Tom, went and looked, yes, they did get postcards. Okay. These are the postcards that I got last week in one day. Five very big postcards. The only reason they are not in the garbage is because I want to show everybody the value of these postcards, and it's very limited. Now, I know it was the standard way we used to do it.

[Time: 02:37:10]

We need to come up with a better way. I would say you need to meet with all the H.O.A.s in the affected zones and all the businesses that are affected. You need to have generous signage perpendicular to the roads under consideration for at least 90 days. I think you need to use all the social media notification of all the neighborhood meetings so we get good participation. Some of the responsibility is yours and mine. We do make these meetings available.

We do a pretty good job of advertising them, but people don't bother to go. So you need to assume some of the responsibility as do I, and then I talked about the postcards. Now, if we get all of this data, and the people don't want these roads, why don't we listen and not do it if we don't want that, that is the whole purpose of doing the research. If you get the majority of the business owners saying no, if you get the majority of the people saying we didn't know anything about it, and then when they find out, they don't want it, perhaps we should not do it. I was

voted in by the people.

I promised to represent the people. I don't think the vote that was taken on these road diets represents the view of the people. I would suggest perhaps a five-year moratorium on all road diets or if the next election in '24 we all get to vote on it and a moratorium until we vote on it. Now, there was a study done very recently, a polling done, and it had to do with the hospitals and Banner and Honor Health.

But you know what the number one concern was of the residents in the City of Scottsdale? Traffic. And it's not going to get better. And, again, I question your data. So those are basically my impressions. I think that I was let down by the research that was done. I don't -- I actually don't trust the data unless I can see it and do the calculations. So you have a growth in population. We are waiting at traffic lights longer and longer. Why? Is it traffic? Is it something else? I don't know. But before we do this, we need to get the data to make an informed decision. Thank you.

Mayor Ortega: Councilmember Graham and then Councilwoman Whitehead. Thank you. Please contain yourself. Councilmember Graham and then Councilwoman Whitehead. Thank you.

[Time: 02:39:38]

Councilmember Graham: Is it my turn? All right. Thank you. Chief Shannon, thank you. Did transportation personnel discuss the 68th Road diet with you before they brought it to us?

Fire Chief Shannon: Yes, of course. The transportation division meets with our planning staff at the one-stop shop and they work very, very closely on all projects.

Councilmember Graham: Okay. Did the fire department give transportation -- make any requests when you looked at the proposal?

Fire Chief Shannon: None were reported to me. Of course, we have a fire marshal that oversees that staff. I met with her on this issue. No concerns were voiced.

Councilmember Graham: Did you review her review of the --

Fire Chief Shannon: I did not.

Councilmember Graham: What did she tell you in that meeting about why they approved it as it was.

Fire Chief Shannon: Because road diets, in her opinion, have little impact on response times and/or maneuverability of emergency vehicles, especially in the design type that is proposed.

[Time: 02:40:52]

Councilmember Graham: Do you like this specific road diet as a public safety tool?

Fire Chief Shannon: I'm agnostic on traffic. We find that anything that delays a smooth transition through traffic can be problematic. Certainly, that's where we get interested in things like roundabouts and speed humps and things like that. This particular project and ones similar to it don't concern us as much. I frankly have not heard of any concerns prior to this project. And then in my own research, it would appear that projects designed like this offer maneuverability to emergency vehicles that almost negates the issue.

Councilmember Graham: You found out that this became a hot issue, did you go back and talk to your subordinate about what she saw for this particular --

Fire Chief Shannon: Precisely, yes.

Councilmember Graham: Do you think this road diet would have any chance of delaying a smooth transition of emergency vehicles?

Fire Chief Shannon: I do not. And I apologize that Maricopa Ambulance isn't here. I did convey your interest in having them comment as well. My guess would be that in as much their vehicle is somewhat sized between my vehicles and the chief's vehicles there would be no lesser maneuverability of their ambulances.

Councilmember Graham: Are you aware of any road diets done anywhere else that had a negative impact on response times?

Fire Chief Shannon: I am not.

Councilmember Graham: Okay. So by removing half the car lanes on this collector street, you think -- you believe it will have no effect on fire response times.

Fire Chief Shannon: There's no data to support that it will. Given the sensitivity to the issue, we would certainly study that. We have data that talks about accident history on all roadways. We can map that. We have very talented mapping staff, and I certainly would propose that we continue to look at that with any changes in traffic patterns.

Councilmember Graham: Okay. And the last comment I wanted to make, and you made illusion to it, I asked transportation staff last week if we could talk to -- if we could have our ambulance people here to --

Fire Chief Shannon: I had no response from Maricopa Ambulance. You made the contact on the 13th to mark. Mark gave it to me and I contacted her on the 14th with no response.

Councilmember Graham: I think I could have added some further contextualization.

Fire Chief Shannon: Perhaps. They are not here.

Councilmember Graham: Those are all of my questions for Chief Shannon.

Mayor Ortega: Councilmember Whitehead and Councilmember Durham.

[Time: 02:43:42]

Councilwoman Whitehead: I want to thank everybody once again for being here with this issue. The best way to find out that we have not done our job directly is to put it out in the public and get your feedback, good, bad or otherwise. We have certainly gotten a lot of input on this transportation action plan. I want to remind everybody that the focus, six of us spent about a year reviewing this transportation action plan. And our focus was, of course, to protect our interests and we are your neighbors. And that was focused on preventing road widening. Preventing roads that will increase infrastructure at your cost, the taxpayers in order to allow high-density development that you don't want. And so the transportation action plan protects you in many ways in that and many of you are from the Shea corridor.

There was a proposal to widen Mountain View Road. That would have eliminated the nice tree-lined road, between 96th and 92nd Street to allow four lanes of high-speed traffic, people who want to cut through your neighborhood to get to their doctor's appointments. And it would have enabled infrastructure to allow the future city council to develop some apartments. We heard from everybody loud and clear you don't want them.

So when question right sized roads, it's not to get you out of your car. It's to protect your neighborhood from high density development you don't want and we don't believe is a good fit for the city of Scottsdale. That's not the -- we're not an urban city. That was the focus and I also want to point out that the transportation action plan and I'm pretty proud of it, because it took me four years eliminated a road in the preserve.

There was a road alignment in the McDowell Sonoran Preserve. When I was a preserve commissioner, we didn't think we could eliminate it because the purpose of that road was -- it was no longer needed because of a wildlife corridor, we preserved the land. That was going to be built on your dime to enable nothing more than more density in Rio Verde Foothills. So that road is no more. It's an emergency access only road that will have gates. So a lot was done on the transportation action plan specifically to protect the constituents who are here and the 240,000 who didn't show up today. D

id we miss something? Oh, heck yeah. Did we hear from you? Oh, heck, yeah. We have a data driven table. We look at roads every couple of years. It's not public opinion, it's data. We count cars, how many cars drove on that road? And we classify the roads based on that. So -- Mark, you are going to need to get back up.

The table -- thank you for trying to anticipate. The table with the road reclassifications, please. Here is where we made our mistake. We have a road reclassification table. That's completely accurate, but we added in some verbiage saying that maybe possibly we will use the same list to put road diets and that is where everybody exploded.

[Time: 02:47:34]

Now, let's look at this. McDowell Mountain Ranch Road was on this list. It didn't mean a road diet. It meant it was under consideration. The staff reviewed it. They didn't even come to the city council. We would have said no. It's a road that's two lanes, the entire loop. It's got bike lanes. It's got ADA compliant sidewalks. There's no reason to change it and we didn't. I also want to talk about the price.

We're being told that we aren't doing potholes because we are doing bike lanes? Forget it. Let's take that and throw it away. What we do is we take the paving schedule and when we repave, that's when we look at restriping. Guess what, we have to restripe anyway. If we restripe one way or another way, it's the same cost. We are saving you tax dollars. This is the reason your taxes are some of the lowest in the valley. And potholes. Two different people came to me with pothole issues over in the last month and half. They were fixed in the last two weeks. Let's talk about how to fix this. We don't have a procedural problem. We have a communications problem with this document. So I do have some suggestions that I want to bring up and this is based on the incredible input I have gotten from all of you. Some of you have written me a little cranky. And we came up with solutions.

Bicycle safety is safety for drivers. This is not bicycles versus cars. We have bike lanes all over the city and nobody is saying get rid of the bike lanes. We are filling a couple of gaps and believe me, I know each and every one of you would be pretty upset if you hit a cyclist like happened three or four weeks ago on 68th Street. Even if you were not unhappy, I don't think you want to spend the rest of your life in court. It is in your interest as a car driver to make sure you don't hit somebody who has a disability. You don't hit somebody on a bicycle, you don't hit somebody who is walking your dog and you don't hit somebody who is also driving a car. Public safety is the reason we do this. City of Scottsdale has never reconfigured a road to increase congestion and we're not going to do that moving forward either. Here are some guardrails that I would suggest for this plan to better communicate the process of what we would do to consider any lane changes.

[Time: 02:50:18]

First of all, one the gentleman brought this up that throughput is somehow subordinate to safety and livability. One of you guys brought that up. I agree. I see you. We need throughput to be equal to safety and livability. That's actually what we do. That is a change I would like to see happen in this document. We need to -- we need to add verbiage -- take out the verbiage that the list of road classifications can also be road diets and be more specific and I will bring that up again. On page 29 of the presentation, the lane narrowing. It might have changed.

When we discussed the transportation action plan, we were discussing all of these roads. First of all, we were here until like 11:00 at night. That was fun. We had some pretty long meetings. I think for me anyway, when we talk about road diets which is something I had never heard of. We do a lot of lane narrowing in the city. I want Mark to talk about that.

I get complaints about speeders, cutting through your neighborhood. One way that we fix that is we narrow lanes, but we are still bound by federal guidelines. We can't willy-nilly pick the width

of a road. I would like to see as the lower usage roads to have lane narrowing in the verbiage, in the transportation action plan as well as lean reduction I think lane narrowing would go a long way and that might be an option for 96th Street south of Shea, you know?

So other things I would like to see. Oh, so we have a five-year paving cycle. We will not re-configure your lanes any other time because it costs money. I think any road that's not within the five-year paving cycle should not be in a table of possible lane reconfigurations. It's five or ten years out. I would like a five-year paving cycle -- anything beyond five-year paving should not be considered, it's for future council and future residents to decide.

Mark Melynchenko: Mayor and Councilwoman, if I might?

Councilwoman Whitehead: Sure.

Mark Melynchenko: Regarding the lane narrowing, as an example when we looked at McDowell Mountain Ranch Road. It's two lanes in either direction and bike lanes already. The lanes are 11 feet, which is our standard. And then -- so before we looked at the width of the lanes we need we know this already has bike lanes but can we narrow the lanes to put in a 2 to 3-foot buffer for the bike lanes. We didn't have enough safe. We didn't have enough space. It meets our needs and it will not be changed. So staff looks at these things.

As you said when you narrow lanes, it also helps with the speeding. And on a road such as McDowell Mountain Ranch Road, it has -- I think it's like 5,000 and it can hold 40,000. I mean, these roads, some of them have so much capacity and that's part of the speeding problem too. And so another issue is when we looked at that spaghetti bowl area, 100th Street, 96th Street, right there. That area, as you can see is fully built out. And yet I drove and I couldn't find a car. We have so much pavement over there that we have to maintain at the same time, but how do we utilize the space so it's safe and effective. There's almost so much pavement it's hard to make any concepts work. That's why we say we want to evaluate the options if there are to make things work. I just wanted to interject there.

[Time: 02:55:05]

Councilwoman Whitehead: Thank you so much. That brings me to my point. We have a communication problem, not a policy program. I would like language in the transportation action plan that includes this lane narrowing and includes the five-year paving cycle, we don't even bring those as possibilities and also it provides more detail on the community input aspect of these decisions, the process. Just because you are on a list doesn't mean you are going to have your road change, but talk about the community input, talk about the public safety data.

I agree with Councilwoman Janik that we should have a timeline from when that data, the traffic data is, let me see if there's any other things. So just beef up our transportation action plan on this to separate data driven tables from possible road diets, add lane narrowing and beef up the process so people understand that they will be very involved in the decision. And I just want to mention on the public when I was up in legend trail. They don't want a 5-2, 5-7 to decide what is best for legend trail parkway. We absolutely want to make sure that the people impacted every

day of the week have the biggest voice in these decisions. Thank you, Mayor.

Mayor Ortega: Councilwoman Caputi and then Vice Mayor Littlefield and then myself.

Councilwoman Caputi: Thank you. Thank you, mark for giving us such a deep dive into the facts and the data. I think this has been sorely needed and also thank you, Councilwoman Whitehead for requesting this work study. When you first asked for it, I -- do we need it? I think now in retrospect, it was very important. I have a question from for mark and then a couple of minutes of comments I want to make. Mostly because I thought a lot of what you said is so important.

I think this drones a little bit and I want to emphasize some of the things that you said. First of all, I just want to reiterate for folks that there are very specific criteria that have to be met before we would even consider engaging in any change to our roadways. So mark, you have got a sum of slides in here -- a couple of slides in here. That was a really awesome but lots of information presentation.

So there's a few slides that talk about -- it says evaluation examples. Can you quickly -- when we look at these cases, we say it needs to hit check, check, check. We're looking at volume capacity and speeds and whether there's bike lanes or not. It's very methodical when you make a decision like this?

Mark Melynchenko: There's not necessarily a checklist, but it's part of staff, they put together a plan called a project assessment and engineering study for these types of projects. You look at the existing conditions and the future conditions the speeds, the width of the lanes, are there opportunities to make modifications, and as talked about previously, there's lane widths but there's also opportunities to take the center turn lane away. Many times we have miles and miles of center turn lanes to nowhere. It provides no access.

That's another opportunity to change all of those things are looked at by staff, the existing conditions and also in the future. We look at development patterns, is it near the preserve as this is? Or is it built out and we see the trends from our documentation.

[Time: 02:58:59]

Councilwoman Caputi: Okay. I want to make a few comments about roadway changes. I first want to make a comment that I think we also need to recognize the much more important issue that's going on here, we have folks, political agitators and even councilmembers who are using false facts and misinformation to create wedge issues in our community and try to control our agenda.

The people who have been complaining about wasting time and money are the people who are actually creating the divisions that are wasting our time and money. Where there really aren't any. I think most of us recognize that we make good public policy based on facts and data, not on rumors and fear. We make way better decisions when residents are not just engaged but properly informed. And, again, that's why I'm very glad I'm having this conversation tonight. Great example is the safety of our roadways.

So many times we heard that making these changes was going to increase danger, and we had the police chief and the fire chief here to explain that that's not the case. I so appreciate the passion in our community. Thank you to everyone who emailed us with your comments on this issue. This work study was put together in Dr. He can response to the residents' concerns.

We are listening to your comments, and we want to make sure that our policies are clear and methodical and we include your information. That's a lot of information in a huge chunk from mark. This is an amazing city! We are obviously doing things really well here in Scottsdale if this has become such an issue of the day. This is a really, really small issue. We reduced lanes on, I think 3 miles of roadway in the last 30 years. It's impacted 1 mile of roadway while we have been on this council in the last three years and there's only one other mile slated for evaluation in the near future.

Restriping roads involved less than 2% of the lane miles in the city and we only do it if we are going to be increasing efficiency and safety. The city has no interest in changing how people are driving. We just want to make sure that the lanes correspond to the cars. So we want to have capacity where it's needed and not too much capacity where it isn't. That makes things unsafe.

Accusations that there's schemes, and we want to get people out of the city. There's no basis of fact in any of those things. I think Mark explained to us our data looks back 20 years. We are looking at trends and we fully understand that 2020/2021 was an outlier year and there was a little asterisk in the slide show that showed that we are removing that from consideration. We are not trying to do a gotcha. That was smaller than others.

We totally appreciate that and as Councilwoman Whitehead pointed out, we are restriping -- we align the restriping with the repaving. It's not done instead of fixing potholes. We are doing them together, if we are doing it at all. So restriping a mile of roadway certainly does not take money out of our bond projects. Those are completely different pots of money. Again, the slide that showed the difference in the freeways if you want to pull that. 1989, 1990, we had no State Road 51, until 1991, and no 202, until 2006, the city's roadways were all planned before we had these freeway systems.

[Time: 03:03:05]

This is why the vehicle miles traveled have remained flat despite the increase in our population and more development. Look at how many more freeways we have. People aren't using these side streets anymore. I know when I first moved here, you know, the 101 was not here. We were forced to use different streets than we are using now. We have voter approved plans, our transportation plans and we are using our plans to guide our decision making. It took us years to create these plans.

We had extensive community input and it reflects our community priorities. Having a safe and livable community for our residents is what guides our decisions. We don't just abandon the plans and the priorities over a few miles of roadway when a few of us have a disagreement up here and we certainly don't challenge every 4-3 council vote by sending it to the ballot there.

Was no time making the plan if we are going to abandon them the minute a conflict comes up. We had huge community input into all of these plans that we are using, including a voter approved general plan.

So I think it's imperative that we decide each case on its own merit. Some of them make sense as mark pointed out to us. Some of them don't. Having a consistent evaluation criteria is really important and that makes our decisions clear to the community. And deciding case-by-case maximizes the neighborhood involvement. If we remove all flexibility in the future, then neighbors will not be able to tell us their feelings as that particular area comes before us. We are giving you more of a voice. 68th Street made sense.

We followed the process. And I would suggest that we monitor that road. Let's monitor and record back. If it's a success, great. If it's a failure, then we will admit our mistake, but I think it's important that we come back to the community and show them. So those are the roadway decisions. What I really want to talk about is the larger problem that we have this recurring misinformation that gets out into the community. And what I would suggest is that we have a white paper of facts prepared by city staff and put forth when we have these issues that will become controversial.

I think the transportation department prepared one for an upcoming project on Thomas and that doesn't go anywhere. It's really good, I think for the community to see the facts and the data and get that out there. So that we can get ahead of the curve and try to explain a little bit more about what we are doing. Maybe controversial topics should probably have staff do a tally of analyzing them.

If we had 300 comments, are there 50, you know, unique commenters? Are there only 20 who live within a mile of the case? Those are the things that would be super helpful. I think we need to do a better job proactively distributing the positive resources and definitely data sheets out into the community. So to close, I want to repeat, I think we make better decisions and public -- better decisions and public policy are made when residents and councilmembers are educated and engaged and with we receive accurate information. And I think we should be at the forefront of improving our outreach on these topics. It's not just mailing out in a wider area, right?

[Time: 03:07:00]

It's getting the right information in front of people. It doesn't matter if we send a postcard to every single resident in the city if it doesn't give them the information we have need. Let's try to do a better job of creating white papers and getting the facts and the data into the hands of our residents so they feel empowered. Like the rest of you, I got a lot of emails when I attached the PowerPoints and gave them the facts and data, the conversations shifted. I think it's important that we make sure that people have good information. That's what I've got. Thank you so much.

Mayor Ortega: Thank you. Vice Mayor Littlefield.

Vice Mayor Littlefield: Thank you, Mayor. Well, when citizens learned of Scottsdale's intent to

remove over 30 miles of automobile capacity on 18 different streets, they were stunned and outraged and they were angry. Most of us are not surprised at this, for many years the main complaint regarding our roads has not been enough traffic lanes to handle the traffic. Not too many.

Over the past couple of years, during COVID and due to people working from home, the problem lessened for a while and traffic decreased. Now, however, we realistically anticipate increases in traffic over the next several years from the additional apartment houses, condos and businesses coming to Scottsdale and our neighboring cities as they too build up and out and use their cars to travel to and through Scottsdale. Citizens rightly foresee an additional traffic coming to Scottsdale. It's not rocket science. It's only common sense.

As businesses open up more and more as two large additional hospitals are built, Exxon expands and the 101 adds more lanes around the 101 bend in Scottsdale, heading from Tempe through Scottsdale to Phoenix, the thousands of additional apartments currently approved cars will be driven in Scottsdale and we will need more lanes no the fewer lanes to ensure that people get to where they need to go in a reasonable amount of time.

Also, we have heard repeatedly from our residents in person and emails that we should be spending our transportation money to maintain and repair deteriorating roads and to accommodate the expected increases in traffic flow. This planned removal of lane has angered citizens across the entire city. We all know this, we have received the hundreds of emails. This road diet has been tried in many cities and it usually is not very successful. Cities want the federal money offered to pay for these changes.

[Time: 03:10:12]

They are all thinking free money, however, many of the road diets have had to be reversed. One such example is Portland, another Seattle. It's not free money anymore if you have to go back and reverse what was done and pay for that too. We shouldn't be looking at the federal government as piggyback. Their money comes from businesses and citizens, from us. Wasting it in this manner will eventually cause our federal taxes to increase and there will be no benefit to our quality of life to show for that increase. This is no free lunch, folks, and we should learn from the mistakes of others regarding these road diets.

Another consideration regarding the car vs. bike mode of transportation, by and large, we are an older population. We like to get out and walk, and some of us even enjoy riding our bikes, especially along the bike lanes and into the preserve, but we depend on our cars for our basic transportation needs. Most of us do not want to take a bus or ride a bike to go shopping, attend church, dine out or pick up the kids from school or soccer practice. We want to drive and we want that independence of movement and time that it gives us. Another point, a road diet plan has become a symbol of increasing distrust that citizens have in this council and in our city government as a whole.

Our citizens believe we are not listening to them, when we consistently ignore their hundreds of emails which I have a big pile of here. That have been sent to us regarding this very issue. We

get calls. We get letters and like this, that is a direct influence on their homes and on their quality of life, when we respond with we don't care, we're going to keep doing what we're doing. A single lane is not a safer scenario than having a two-lane road. Think about it. It's much more dangerous because there's less space and that limits your options in emergency situations.

You have less space and less maneuverability, if you add bikers, walkers, skateboards to this mix, this can be an accident waiting to happen. It doesn't make common sense. It's why we wanted two lanes and not one lane to begin with, in the first place. There's no upside to doing this. It's a recipe for road rage, and disaster. We spend taxpayer money we do not need to spend to achieve a narrow and more dangerous and more crowded road.

[Time: 03:13:04]

Another comment, councilmembers recently met at the Scottsdale Airport to prioritize our bond projects and make changes in projects to align them with voter approved allocations, money. Due to inflation in both materials and labor costs, our bond projects costs have skyrocketed by I believe now about \$155 million. To date. And going up. If we have extra money available in our transportation budget for road diets that our citizens have made very clear they do not want, perhaps a better use for those funds would be to apply them to the voter-approved bond projects that deal with the transportation needs that our citizens have told us they do want, projects 24, 48, and 62, might qualify and could help stretch some of our bond dollars to help cover at least some of the increases in costs for these projects. It's just a thought. We would have to check on that.

Once again, here we are trying to force feed this plan of road diets down the unwilling throats of our citizenry. With very few exceptions the citizens of Scottsdale do not want 30 plus lanes of Scottsdale Roads re-delineated to reflect a reduction in car lanes. They rightfully believe this will not assist them when driving around town to doctors, grocery stores, work, or even city hall when they come here to complain about what we are doing to their streets.

While this may seem like a simple technical issue to some, it has become a divisive political issue for many, and needs to be decided by the voters. We have divided the city and outraged people to an extent I have never seen before in Scottsdale, and that's saying something! Whether you support or oppose road diets, you should want this breach of citizen trust healed. We can do that by having the citizens decide.

Our job up here is to vote the people who put us in office, and they have been loud and clear. We need to represent what they want. If we do not, this wound will continue to fester in our community and with every road diet plan we pass it will be a very long time. And people will remember from our emails our letters, our calls, it has been very clear they don't want these road diets. If we do this against their overwhelming will, we purposefully and knowingly violate the very fabric of trust that should be the strongest bond between us.

I still believe we need to direct staff to agendize a discussion and possible council action to place the issue of road diets on the next available city ballot. Thank you very much.

Mayor Ortega: Thank you very much. Next, I will speak and then we will go to some secondary comments. When I came to Scottsdale 44 years ago, it's true the highway system did not exist and 20 years ago when I was a councilman, I was at the ribbon cutting for the 101. And the first car passed the 101. We knew that within five or six years, it would need to be expanded. And whatever funds were purposed for that were spent to get what we have today. I'm going to focus on basically one phrase that brings us all here today.

Whether you are elected, whether we are staff, and, you know, those in the audience. And that is a word or a phrase that we put in the general plan. It's called "a sense of place." Okay? Scottsdale has a sense of place. It had a moniker west's most western town 40 years ago. And 20 years ago, when they put in the 101, the moniker changed. It was still the west's most western town to us, but the moniker was Scottsdale, next 15 exits. Okay?

[Time: 03:17:48]

It did release a lot of pressure on all of our surface streets because the 101 was open. So whether you are coming east at Scottsdale Road, there's a sign there that says Scottsdale, next 15 exists. And as soon as you approach McDowell, there's that same sign, next 15 exists. So what do you find when you are coming off 80-mile-per-hour or 75-mile-per-hour freeway? You get a sign -- I was going to compliment -- I have been -- I have been told numerous times, gee, you have a new welcome to Scottsdale.

And there's a welcome to Scottsdale sign, you may have noticed. It's right there at McDowell, at Thomas, at Indian School, at Chaparral, McDonald where I live. And they go up and they are very attractive. When you get off, driving 80 miles per hour. You have a destination. There's a special place called Scottsdale. As you come off of -- whether it's Indian school. So very nearby, there are two lanes going each direction, and there are two bike lanes on each side, and there is a very attractive landscape median.

And as you come east towards city -- sorry, west towards city hall, that is the pattern on a major street that we have in Scottsdale. What does it do? It slows you down. That's okay. If you ask any merchant on a highway or somewhere else, degree, I want -- gee, I want to get them off, it's a business imperative, but the other thing you have is we have a safe median turning lane. Okay? So that someone can turn left or right into a business, into their neighborhood before they reach that section. With also, again, walking through this, and these improvements have widening at intersections. So at intersections, we go from two lanes each direction to a right-hand turn lane, that's an add and usually when you hit Hayden, we have two left-hand turns. So think about that. These improvements involve improvements that Phoenix doesn't have.

If you keep going down on Indian School, you will see a raceway of three lanes going that what I, and people passing you on your right. And then figuring out, oh, I'm coming to a light, and I have to get back into that other lane because I'm stuck in a queue and there's so many cars there. People who come to Scottsdale want to relax. I want to relax. People can sense that. Okay? In the opposite direction, whether again, it's Thomas, you are also going to be crossing bridges. Now, at McDowell, the bridge has three lanes each direction. At Indian School and Thomas, it's

school per! Now if we said let's design it for peak and during Barrett-Jackson we need eight lanes each direction, because we have 40,000 people coming through, that doesn't make sense. It violates our own greenbelt concept. So if people have to wait one more light to get all the way to Scottsdale Road, it's not the end of the world. Okay?

[Time: 03:21:46]

If we design roads so people could speed through and cut from Phoenix to Mesa, to make that jaunt easier, they're going to figure out, it's probably better to just take the 202 or the 51 or whatever. All of that factors into -- you know, I have been a downtown architect. I have been living down there. There's clients would say I love foot traffic. Now, if we look at any of these existing components we have probably 20-year-old trees in the medians there on Thomas and Indian bend. Plus turning lanes. And that serves a major east-west function for Scottsdale. Now, as soon as you get to Thomas and this one area that's coming to question, we have a very unsafe situation. There's three lanes going one direction and two the other and no turn lane in the middle. That's a dangerous situation. It also doesn't pep because someone may want to go into -- doesn't help because someone may want to go into a business and make a safe turn in the median.

Well, what has been shown, I happen to go through that public discussion, and I saw that. I said, oh, my gosh, you are losing a lane. We are creating a safe turning lane. I need that. I will -- and as soon as you go near Thomas near the Home Depot in Phoenix, oh, maybe I will take this turn because there's no median right there. And that's what's happening.

That's the difference when we evaluate facts and look at them. It does relate to the sense of place. The sense of place, right? We all love Scottsdale. We want to feel and see, oh, my gosh -- I got emails saying don't let them cut those trees in the median. We have attractive bushes. Gee, I'm in Scottsdale. I know that.

Would it help if there were four lanes in each direction? Hell, no, I wouldn't want that on Indian School or Thomas. What do we are projecting in our Old Town area. Do we want to take out something on each side just because we want traffic to scoot through there? Traffic generates a sense of place when you can calm it down. I'm not afraid to say that. That's what my customers want. If there's so much noise out there and they can't hear and see me and cars are whizzing by, they won't stop at my art gallery and buy some paintings. This is not a bar of bicycles against cars.

We are looking at solutions that widen intersections and calm people down. But those who want to take Hayden south or Hayden north have a turn lane for that purpose. It's a good thing. It works and the other way of looking at it is we have the ADA components. Having ADA access doesn't create more or fewer disabled people, okay? It doesn't -- having it creates access to a human being to move around that they didn't have before. So when we widen those intersections, we are making improvements and, of course, they are fixing the potholes. They don't say, well, we are just striping for bike lanes and we will ignore that pothole. No. They do that as a complete project. Every component can contribute to our well-being. That's a good thing. That's what I look for as an architect and Mayor.

That's why I believe also -- if we were to say, let's vote on whether we're going to do a road diet any more ever, okay. Are we going to take out that median and the bike lanes there at Indian School? Are we going to take them out at Thomas? They are not harming anybody, and they are there and they are beautiful. Go and see how it's operating. We are taking x thousands of cars every day off the highway, they are saying, ah, I found Scottsdale. It's a good thing.

[Time: 03:26:48]

People are trying hard and they are investing in that area. Another thing that I find -- because I did speak to the young woman, the staffer who said, I walk for days and I went to every business. It was not just the card. She has that. She is a competent professional person. She did not skip over anybody. That was over and beyond. We could find out -- I met her the other day and she's also a communications person. So to say, well, they didn't talk to me and I will run my own survey and this and that and somehow that staffers are corrupt. That stuff is just not leading to a well-balanced decision that I have to make and you have to make for what? We all want the same thing. Sense of place, Scottsdale.

Are there other pressures in yes. That's why we are here because of heights and density and other factors, right? But there is a place for everyone, and we are not changing the road width at intersections where the most accidents happen there's where accidents happen. If there's pass through and they want to turn. They are in my way, and I can go through there and I can get to the next intersection. Go to Phoenix and you will see it's a disaster. They have buses there. They don't even have pullouts for buses.

We have a lot more movement available for us here and the other cases I get passed all the time on the right-hand side in the slow lane, before they come and swerving back. It's -- so that's the identity part that I believe we are elected to do you as fellow neighbors, citizens, are, you know, wanting and appreciate us. And I believe that we do earn the trust every day. I do not think that it's an us or them, and, you know, we are squandering people's money. It's interesting, you know, like the airport. We met at the airport for a work study.

The federal government tells you what asphalt and how thick and where to stripe it. We have \$12 million of federal money for our runways. And we didn't say, well, we feel like striping it different because, you though, we don't like the way you stripe it. It works because that's not the strings that go with us. That is our money but it's also the specs that work for a productive outcome. We have some important things that have to be accomplished.

In the future, we'll be -- I have studied the Thomas connection. I like the idea that when you enter Scottsdale, coming from the east -- from the west, you can say, oh, there's a sign that says entering Scottsdale and you know there's a difference. There's at least a turn median so you can turn safely. And oh, my gosh, there's even turnout lanes a decel lanes. I can tell. I'm in Scottsdale. I love it here and our signs are replaced so we don't lose our way. So we needed this discussion tonight.

I see that there's go members that want to add to the information Councilmember Durham and

Councilmember Graham and then Caputi. Continue. Here we go. Durham, Graham and Caputi. Ms. Caputi. Excuse me.

[Time: 03:30:13]

Councilmember Durham: Thank you, Mr. Mayor. I did have a little bit of my say when I asked the two chiefs about the emergency vehicle, but I do have my own views on the subject and many have been repeated by Councilmember Whitehead and Caputi and by you, Mayor. So I will try not to repeat too much of what has already been said, but this is really important because you just said and I think it's really important that we be transparent. You know, the notion that we have not been transparent on this subject is insane! Because we have spent more time on this than on almost any I can think of. I'm glad we are having this session because there's a tremendous amount of disinformation on this subject. I have gotten emails telling me over and over and over again that police and fire will not be able to get through and I have seen videos showing fire trucks stuck in traffic.

I hope if we did one thing tonight, I hope we put a stake through the heart of this ridiculous claim that our police and our fire are incompetent and not able to drive over paint stripes. I hope I never hear that again. And I hope I never hear again that this is an excuse for light rail or trying to put people on buses or we're forcing people to go on bicycles. These are just ludicrous claims.

When it comes to division in the community, the division results from the fact that a small number of people are sending out emails telling people to contact the city council. And these emails and that's the source of information that's occurring and it's very regrettable. I hope this session clears some of that up. So I thank Councilmember Whitehead for suggesting this. I think it's clear from the presentations that our staff is already following many of these principles. Our staff doesn't say, hey, we're going to talk to the police and fire before we do anything. But of course they do that. There's the only reasonable way to proceed. I think -- I'm hoping that we can agree on some clarity on what road diets are and what they are not, and I think the rules need to be more specific about when the road diets are appropriate and when they aren't. We have already had successful road diets in Scottsdale for many years.

The people sending us emails probably don't know that, but there's some wonderful projects we've already had. I mentioned before 96th Street is one of the best examples of a successful road diet and the Mayor talked about a sense of place. And I ride down that section of 96th Street almost every week on my bicycle because elderly people do ride bicycles in 100-degree heat, believe it or not and that street is a great example of a road diet, because it's lined with trees on both sides of the street.

[Time: 03:34:00]

There's trees in the median. It's shady. It's safe for pedestrians and cyclists. It's a huge success no matter how you slice it. And so if you are opposed to road diets and if you are one of the people sending me emails, I would ask you to do this, drive over to 96th Street. I think it's in between cactus, south of cactus to Shea, and tell me why that doesn't work. Go over and look at

that, and tell me why it's a problem. Because there's no congestion on that street. When the Mayor talks about a sense of place every time I ride down that street, I think my pulse goes down a couple of beats because it's such a beautiful inviting street. And that's what a successful road diet, if you use that term, can be. And with careful planning we can recreate that in other areas. I think we need to clarify the rules in some ways.

My first suggestion is -- has already been mentioned by Councilmember Whitehead. And Mr. Kube, mentioned there's a phrase that says emphasize traffic safety, livable streets, and multimodal community access over rapid throughput. And I believe that's very well phrased and I don't think it's really correct reading of the plan. Because in my view, what the plan simply says, that in the past, we have built out a comprehensive road network. That gets us through the city safely, and they state this at the beginning the road network is essentially built out.

Now that the road network is built out, it's time to refine it and improve that network, and I think that's what the TAP is trying to do. But I think we need to say but those improvements should not be done at the expense of traffic throughput. We shouldn't do things that create congestion. We should allow people to drive at the posted immediate limits which a lot of people don't observe. We need to continue that throughput. I think what that phrase really means is traffic safety, and livable streets and multimodal access are all equally important goals. I would like to see the TAP rephrased to make that clearer, that these are all important goals and that perhaps safety is the most important one. But these are all important goals.

Now, in my view, under the criteria 68th Street -- would it be a good idea to have consensus on that rephrasing?

Mayor Ortega: So the purpose of this work study is just to -- how we may agree or round up here. Since several of us want to speak, let me just ask this question, one repeating theme I hear is that communication is important, notification is important. I believe that misinformation can spin off of poor communication.

Councilmember Durham: Yes.

Mayor Ortega: At this point, I think this is the consensus conclusions versus necessarily speaking about one particular case. Everyone has been able to speak so. I will go back to Mr. Graham -- oh --

Councilmember Durham: I still have some more points I wanted to make.

Mayor Ortega: Okay. Continue.

[Time: 03:38:19]

Councilmember Durham: Now, going back to 68th Street in my view, that was a simple case, because that street has very low volume. Parts of it are below 50%, but even though it has a low volume, it has a very high rate of accidents. In fact, it's one of the most dangerous streets in the city because it has a very high rate of collisions between Thomas and Osborn and that's the

point that there's a choke point where it moves from two lanes to four lanes and it has an extraordinarily high accident rate, more than double the rest of 68th Street and I think that's precisely because there is the choke point there. So safety, road diets are about safety. A lot of people said safety has nothing to do with it, but 68th Street tells you it does. That was confirmed by neighbors who live in that area who told us there's a lot of accidents there. And federal studies too make it clear that there's an increase in safety coming from road diets properly understood.

Now, Thomas may be a different situation because the volume is a lot higher. The Mayor's made some good points about adding turning lanes to add access to business. But, you know, the volume there is higher. So we may want to have more specific rules on what volume we want to see on road diets. Councilmember Whitehead made a great point that restriping doesn't cost anything. Road diets don't cost anything because as all of you want, we are improving the streets. We are repairing them. We are repairing and repatching the street and when you repair and repatch a street, you have to repaint it. We are not doing restriping separate from road refinishing. You've got to repaint the street after you repave it. So that doesn't add anything to the cost. It's not like you can take that money and apply it to bond projects. It literally doesn't cost any extra money.

You know, on data, I -- you know, I do have a little bit of concern that we don't have the most recent up to date data. It's difficult to do that. We have historical data that shows even over the growth of the past years, there's been no increase in traffic. Traffic is relatively stable. So the notion that traffic is going to increase 10% next year, just doesn't make any sense, particularly when more and more people are working from home. I wish French we are still here.

Why did we do extra lanes in the north and reduced lanes in the south and the answer is that Pima Road is operating at 114% of capacity. That's why Pima lane is getting extra lanes and 68th Street is 58% of capacity. Only has to do with the traffic capacity and Pima was way over capacity. That's why it's being widened. It has nothing to do with discrimination against the south. And when it comes to the citizens voting on this.

[Time: 03:42:24]

You already voted for it. You voted for road diets because they are included in the general plan. Very specifically laid out in the general plan. Nothing that we are doing that we have been proposing is anything different from what is in the general plan which was approved by the citizens. So I could go on and on about this all night. You know, if you look at -- if you research it if, do research on the federal databases and I have done a lot of it, this definitely leads to safety increases, less collisions, less pedestrian accidents. We're not making this up. It's all in the data. And it's Councilmember Caputi has said, many of times we've got to rely on data and facts and not on opinions and emails and all sorts of other stuff. I could go on all night, but I think that's it.

Mayor Ortega: Thank you, Councilmember Graham and then Councilmember Caputi and Councilwoman Janik.

Councilmember Graham: Thank you, Mayor. Mark, can I ask you a few questions. I guess you

can stay there. Slide 17, I want to go to slide 17. Really what I will ask about slide 17, I would like -- I would kindly ask for the information that was all the units that were used -- that's not slide 17. That's slide 8. Oh, sorry. I didn't mean to rush you. Multifamily units.

I would kindly ask if you could send all the information that supports this to the council so we can review that. Is that possible?

Mark Melynchenko: Yes, Mayor and council, this information was provided to us from the planning department.

[Time: 03:44:40]

Councilmember Graham: Okay.

Mark Melynchenko: So we can provide that for you.

Councilmember Graham: Okay. Thank you. Next slide, 18, I believe. Where -- was this survey performed the Scottsdale residents?

Mark Melynchenko: Yes, it was Scottsdale residents and I think it's done every three years.

Councilmember Graham: So what was the difference between this and the other survey that we bought that Kelly walked us through at the --

Mark Melynchenko: It's the same type of survey.

Councilmember Graham: It's the same survey? Because where is the ease of travel? There was a question in there, I was wondering traffic flow. Where is that question?

Mark Melynchenko: Well, there's ease of travel by car and that is, as you can see, way up -- is it 26%. And 78% of those said either good or excellent that were surveyed in ease of travel by car through the city.

Councilmember Graham: Was there another question that said how do you rank traffic flow in Scottsdale?

Mark Melynchenko: I don't know. There could be.

Councilmember Graham: I thought there was and that got a pretty low mark. 58% or something. Last slide, real quick. The technology slide. When we talked about ride share and scooters. This is an unconvincing slide. It's ride share keeps the same number of cars on the road and I don't know anybody who is trading their cars for an escooter or a bike. When we put the data together for the road diet on 68th, just for clarity, what was the most recent year we used?

Mark Melynchenko: The most recent year?

Councilmember Graham: Yes, the latest year.

Mark Melynchenko: I would have to get that information for you.

Councilmember Graham: Was it 2020 or 2021.

Mark Melynchenko: Well, as I said on the slide there, the section for COVID, that data is not part of our analysis. We took the rate for the full year and did not include those months.

Councilmember Graham: Why did we not use more recent data from '21 or '22?

Mark Melynchenko: Because I think that's the data we have. We do this every two years.

Councilmember Graham: I liked what Councilmember Janik said, you have to look at a year in arrears; is that correct? Was that -- is that a true statement?

Mark Melynchenko: You know, I don't know. I have to provide you with this information.

Councilmember Graham: When will that newer data be available?

Mark Melynchenko: Phil Kerchner is here, our traffic engineer in charge.

Councilmember Graham: Hi, Phil.

[Time: 03:47:51]

Phil Kerchner: Mayor, members of council, your question was about our traffic volume.

Councilmember Graham: Correct.

Phil Kerchner: And we produce the traffic volume and collision report every two years. So it takes us two years to collect traffic volumes on the main streets we have in Scottsdale. And then we collect all of the collision data as well. And it takes some time to collect that and rectify it. We are in the process right now of producing the 2022 report.

Councilmember Graham: Okay. Do you think -- so I have a client in the gasoline distribution industry. It's directly related to the number of gallons that people are buying, they said 2022 was a record year for miles being driven and 2023 is shaping up to be bigger than that. Would you agree with that?

Phil Kerchner: I wouldn't in Scottsdale. When you look at the volume data as mark alluded to, we're not seeing trends of increased travel. That may change a year from now when we look at the data that's occurring now, the volumes. As was mentioned and shown, over the 20-year period from '98 to now, volume was higher in '98 because of the lack of freeways and then they dropped and stayed consistent. In the north area, on the arterials there's some increase. Since I have been with Scottsdale, not just in the past two years the past ten years and we had the new

developments downtown, there's a concern that we would overload the streets in the downtown area. And it hasn't happened. All the data has stayed pretty consistent.

Councilmember Graham: How would you respond to somebody who -- you can torture data and get it to say whatever you want. What would you say to someone who says I'm waiting more cycles at lights and there's more congestion.

Phil Kerchner: I would say there's always -- traffic is dynamic and there's always, you know, changes and volumes on streets and traffic patterns. Yes, there may be one location you might see more congestion but the data we collect hasn't shown that. And again, as Mark alluded to, the freeway changed travel patterns. Right now Pima road is under construction. That's affecting all the streets in that area, Scottsdale Road, dynamite, and Pinnacle Peak. And traffic is dynamic. As also mentioned, I don't think we want to keep building out of that. I don't think we want to add lanes to Indian School or Scottsdale Road four lanes each direction.

[Time: 03:50:51]

Councilmember Graham: This federal grant is congestion mitigation. Is there congestion on 68th Street?

Phil Kerchner: I would say that based on our data there's not. I do know, you know, that Indian School, yes, there's some queues that occur. Maybe at Thomas, but, you know, the project that we are doing is not necessarily removing the lanes at the signalized intersections, the major intersections. We are trying to maintain right turn lanes left turn lanes and there might be a reduction, but we are keeping other turn rains.

Councilmember Graham: Why do you think the federal grant was called congestion mitigation then? I mean that's what we are applying for and we say it will mitigate congestion.

Phil Kerchner: I'm not sure the answer to that. The grants are focused -- most of the grants I have seen are focused on improving safety, improving traffic flow, and whether they use the term "congestion mitigation" or not, I'm not sure why they would use that.

Councilmember Graham: How do we determine -- this type of question -- thanks, Phil. You can stay but it's also for both of you. How do you think we'll decide at what point that this 68th Street diet -- what's the benchmark for determining a road diet suck Soldier Fields and -- succeeds and when is that determination made?

Phil Kerchner: That's a great question. I think those of us who work in transportation, in the city of Scottsdale, we hear from the residents. If there's a problem, signal timing, we hear from the residents.

Councilmember Graham: So it's public feedback.

Phil Kerchner: But we will keep monitoring and traffic data but most of the time if there's something that's not working, we hear about it from the residents and you mentioned, we have

been doing restriping. We have projects that we completed, and we are not hearing from the residents that things have gotten worse. There's a lot of fear about what will happen but also as has been stated we are not moving curb lines and some of the road diets they are narrowing the streets. We are keeping the curbs where it is and it's painting.

Councilmember Graham: What is the process to converting it back if we decided it wasn't successful?

[Time: 03:53:20]

Phil Kerchner: The best thing is to wait until the next restriping.

Councilmember Graham: Would we have to pay the money back to the federal government if we decided it was unsuccessful? You knew that question was coming.

Nathan Domme: Senior transportation planning manager. We have been talking to ADOT, who we coordinate with on our federal funding, and there would be a time limit. So about -- the next pavement cycle we would not have to pay that money back.

Councilmember Graham: What is the pavement cycle five years?

Nathan Domme: It would be about ten years.

Councilmember Graham: Okay so we got it for ten years, right?

Nathan Domme: I'm sorry, what was that?

Councilmember Graham: So we have the road diet for ten years.

Nathan Domme: We need ten about ten years to evaluate whether it's successful and get the data and determine how it's going.

Councilmember Graham: People talk about -- we get a lot of feedback about strings attached to this grant. Would you say that there are strings attached?

Nathan Domme: I would not. We applied for federal funding. We send in the application for what we would like to see. So if anything, we were establishing our own strings.

Councilmember Graham: On the record, would you say there were no strings attached.

Nathan Domme: There's criteria for applications that we try to adhere to, but we look for grants that we would like to apply for that would benefit our community, and we fill out the application for that. So the criteria, I guess you could say have strings.

Councilmember Graham: This project has seven main items. Adding bike lanes, removing car lanes and applying a slurry coat, we're going to replace five ADA ramps and adding seven

sidewalk offsets and replacing an SRP pipe, crosswalk signs and new poles and so about seven main features of this federal grants paying for, would you agree with that?

[Time: 03:55:22]

Nathan Domme: I would agree we are doing all of these things during this project.

Councilmember Graham: Could we do six of those and not seven, and keep the money?

Nathan Domme: The bike lanes are essential for the grant application. You said it's congestion mitigation. It's also a big component is adding bike facilities.

Councilmember Graham: So you think there's congestion to mitigate.

Nathan Domme: I'm saying there's a big bucket attached to it. Some of it is bike infrastructure. We are specifically looking for the bike infrastructure.

Councilmember Graham: So if we applied the slurry scope and replaced ADA ramps and if we did six of those but we set aside the bike lanes and or we made them smaller could we do that?

Nathan Domme: I would say first this would be back in the design phase and we are past that now. But during the design phase we could have gone back to MAG and ADOT and requested that change. And I would say it would be highly unlikely that they would agree to that change on the application.

Councilmember Graham: So it sounds like the bike lanes are conditioned the on the money; is that right is and if we remove the bike lanes in then or 12 years we would have to pay the money back?

Nathan Domme: No, we would not have to pay the money because we would go past the term of having to pay them back. The bike lanes were part of how we were rated. And if we take that out, I think ADOT and MAG would find it disingenuous.

Mayor Ortega: Councilmember Graham, I think we will focus on the work study general, not on 68th Street. I say that because it's -- that project has been approved and now I believe the work is underway. Including repaving and so forth. And so --

Councilmember Graham: Mr. Mayor --

Mayor Ortega: I don't see any use.

Councilmember Graham: It's not speculation.

Mayor Ortega: We have something that's underway for pedestrians and you are speculating whether it will work out or not. It's not relevant right now.

Councilmember Graham: Well, to me this is relevant because it's germane to the 68th street topic and these conditions are on the grants for all the future ones we might do.

Mayor Ortega: The general topic is, you know, whether or not we are able to evaluate through a process and communicate to the public not whether or not some administrator some time from now will evaluate that cars are superior to bikes or to ADA. That's not something we can speculate on. Securing some questions that ifs, ands or buts.

[Time: 03:58:26]

Councilmember Graham: These are very -- I will move along.

Mayor Ortega: You can contribute to that discussion with a separate email of some sort on that specific subject.

Councilmember Graham: Now I will go back to the criteria of danger. Is this street, 68th Street say serious danger.

Mayor Ortega: The empirical information is already on file.

Councilmember Graham: I promise I have a point here.

Mayor Ortega: You are asking for data that we are not prepared with the file to necessarily answer or speculate about. I just if you want to do a forensic audit on this thing, this is not the appropriate time for that.

Councilmember Graham: What I'm getting at --

Mayor Ortega: With the preparation of this matter.

Councilmember Graham: What I'm getting at, people say this is not a safe street or something like that, is this the least safe street in the city? Or are there streets that are less safe?

Mayor Ortega: Sir, you are again, asking a relative question that has nothing to do and no bearing on what we are -- you have to focus on that the work study.

[Time: 03:59:44]

Councilmember Graham: I want to hear that from staff. I want the public to hear it.

Mayor Ortega: Well, you are -- you can --

Councilmember Graham: You can scoff at it Tom, I don't appreciate you scoffing at it.

Mayor Ortega: I want to stay on clear. The topic is the general application of it. Not whether or not 68th Street is more or this or that compared to some other comparison nobody is going to

make.

Councilmember Graham: Let me back up. It sounds like we don't want to drill into the 68th Street.

Mayor Ortega: That's right.

Councilmember Graham: Even though that was brought up by many of my other colleagues. Do road diets have a diversionary effect? Do think divert traffic? Do you expect them to divert traffic in general?

Nathan Domme: Any of the reclassification, we don't see anybody being diverted to different lanes. There's an extremely disparity on those roads. We would be bringing capacity down and maintaining the same level of volume on those roadways.

Councilmember Graham: You don't get sigh drivers using 64th or Scottsdale Road as a result of the road diet in this particular case or in other cases you don't see diversion going on?

Nathan Domme: Not at an overwhelming level. Maybe one or two drivers but on a whole looking at the total volumes, it would be able to maintain the same level of volumes.

Councilmember Graham: I hear some of my colleagues suggest this will slow traffic down in the area and they will drive elsewhere. That was stated tonight. You don't agree with that?

Nathan Domme: I would agree it will reduce speeding over the speed limit.

Councilmember Graham: But the other part that the drivers will drive elsewhere as a result of this road diet. Some of my colleagues said that.

Nathan Domme: From any of the roads, that are suggested in the transportation action plan, I would not see that.

Councilmember Graham: So you would not agree with that.

[Time: 04:01:49]

Nathan Domme: We are facing several roads that have 5,000 cars on them and are built for 35,000 cars. We're bringing it down to where there's still drastically underneath capacity.

Councilmember Graham: And we agreed we don't have recent data. And we asked about future data forecast data because we have thousands and thousands of apartments yet to be built. Any other information on road diets on 68th.

Nathan Domme: We use MAG's forecasted data. We use our trends much more because they are real on-the-ground counts, but we compare them with MAG's 2040 and future forecasted data to do an accurate comparison of what the road will be like in the future.

Councilmember Graham: Generally about a road diet, are you familiar with any road diet that's been in place that has led to an increase in collisions or fatalities?

Phil Kerchner: The road diet is where with you have a four-lane street and it's converted to one lane in both direction and center lane and bike lanes and parking. I'm sure there's studies out there that say this specific road diet are cleared. It's in the FHWA proven safety counted measures. The federal government says it reduces collisions.

Councilmember Graham: We researched road diets.

Phil Kerchner: Yes, we researched the federal guidelines.

Councilmember Graham: But not how they have failed or succeeded in other cities?

Nathan Domme: We looked at their case studies.

Councilmember Graham: Are you familiar of any situations where collisions or fatalities increased.

Nathan Domme: I am not aware.

Councilmember Graham: Have you encountered a situation where they road dieted a street and changed it back?

Phil Kerchner: Yes, I have seen reports of some of those in other cities that have converted back.

Councilmember Graham: Can you talk more about that.

Phil Kerchner: I don't have the specifics, but we can send you some information if you would like.

Councilmember Graham: Has a road diet in your experience ever to your knowledge ever violated a fire code or impaired the flow of an emergency vehicle?

Phil Kerchner: In other cities?

Councilmember Graham: Yes, just from what -- your studies across the country?

Mayor Ortega: Councilman, you are asking something that may have legal liability and our staffers are not prepared to testify as to the viability or the circumstances on any particular case. To say that, you know, accidents happen on sidewalks in parks or –

Councilmember Graham: That wasn't --

Mayor Ortega: Is generally possible but to say -- to quote and ask our staff to cite particular

cases which could be interpreted as -- excuse me, which they may not be prepared to cite a day case or casualty, that may or may not have involved alcohol or not and so forth is just not part of what we're doing today.

[Time: 04:05:19]

I say that because you are probing into an area when we are looking at the basic analysis of whether or not -- whether or not technically we can rely on traffic information to make a traffic decision. Not acting as a court to decide, as a jury to decide whether or not something was negligent or causing more of any such incidents. We are not prepared to lay out a legal case for any claim based on any facts of anything that staff may or may not know about.

Councilmember Graham: Mr. Mayor I have to respectfully disagree. I asked a question, if some staff who has researched road diets across our country. We may do many of them across our city if they knew about cases where it caused an increase in collisions or fatalities. I think that's relevant.

Mayor Ortega: I'm trying to clarify this because again the term "road diet" in many other cases where there have been failures involves a physical narrowing, a widening of sidewalks. It requires construction effort. It requires a lot of things that are not in our consideration today. So the wide term that is not appropriate. And I'm being very specific. You could ask that question.

Councilmember Graham: Thank you.

Mayor Ortega: Staff doesn't have to answer that question. They are not prepared to answer that. That's what I'm telling you right now.

Councilmember Graham: They're allowed to say we don't know the answer and we will follow up.

Mayor Ortega: You are trying to box them into a question.

Councilmember Graham: No, Mayor. You are casting aspersions about my intent. You don't know.

Mayor Ortega: I'm saying that for the record, it's not necessary, and I highly recommend that we --

Councilmember Graham: I'm asking professional -- I'm asking professional dispassionate questions and inquiries from the public staff.

Mayor Ortega: I think you heard from the police and fire that they are not endangered and any individual or claim coming to any municipality is not the subject of -- of the scope of tonight's discussion. So I have to close that.

[Time: 04:07:42]

Councilmember Graham: I will wrap it up.

Mayor Ortega: If you have other topics that's up to you.

Councilmember Graham: I will start to conclude here. So, you know, I think with the opposition letters, we received copious amounts of opposition letters it does feel to me that we stirred up controversy, with strings attached money at the expense of a small group for a larger group. I think some of my colleagues have suggested that you have been misled, but I think with your own eyes and hear with your own ears what is going on.

They suggested that this is a small thing. Don't worry about over here, but I think you get to decide what you worry about and what concerns about your city. I don't think we should be walling off topics or questions and it should be open to public scrutiny. I think the residents deserve to hear the questions and the answers. So with that I want to thank Phil and his colleague for taking my questions and city staff and the presentation, and the opportunity to have the work study tonight and with that, Mayor, thank you very much.

Mayor Ortega: So that was a second round of comments. So you we are second round with Ms. Caputi, and second round with Ms. Janik and Whitehead and Durham. Councilwoman Caputi.

Councilwoman Caputi: All I want to say is, you know, there's been a lot of talk we don't listen. So it's 9:30 at night. We are all listening carefully, again, about a topic that has impacted less than one mile of roadway in the time that we have been on the council in the last three years. We have read all of the hundreds of emails that we have gotten and we tried really hard to respond to most of them.

Our police and fire chief are still here at 9:30 at night. Talk about a waste of time and resources. Again, we are listening. We are taking your comments and incorporating them into our policies and trying to make them better and more responsive. I think we are doing a great job. If this topic is the most controversial thing that we have seen in forever, then, I think we are super blessed here in Scottsdale. Wow!

[Time: 04:10:04]

A mile of roadway and we have done an excellent job of aligning it with the existing roads and all the different criteria. We all live here too. We want roads that are easier to drive and work well and we want to match the traffic again to the roadways. That's what we are trying to do. We are certainly not trying to take roads are wildly used and decrease them. I can assure you, we are reading and continually trying to improve our policy and went certainly have everyone's best interests at heart. Thank you.

Mayor Ortega: Councilwoman Janik and Whitehead and Vice Mayor Littlefield.
Councilwoman Janik.

Councilwoman Janik: Thank you. First of all, not all the data knows that these are successful. Somebody up here said all the data does or the data does or the federal things he's read. I have also read. I have read numerous reports, many of the West Coast cities have had a very sad unsuccessful experience with road diets. Don't tell me that they all work because they don't. One of the predictors if they are successful, based on a very thorough study by Rice University says if the people do not accept them, they are not successful. You need to prove to them that they work. And if you can't do it, we should not impose them on the people and as far as saying let's have a vote of the people, that's the only way we will find out what the majority thinks.

Now, when it comes to things like parking, which a couple of weeks ago we overrode the parking regulations on Hyatt. If we say no road diets and the people love them and want them, they come to us and we will change the decision for them. We will say, fine, you can have a road diet and I believe with Mountain View Road, that has been used as an example several times.

Transportation wanted to use Mountain View Road to relieve the traffic on Shea. The neighbors said no and transportation listened. And that's all I'm asking for right now. The data is out. We have seen the results. I think we need to listen to the people who are impacted by this. And from what I see today, we are not listening to them. Thank you.

[Time: 04:12:48]

Mayor Ortega: Councilwoman Whitehead, councilmember --

Councilwoman Whitehead: I -- what I want to do is get consensus. The purpose -- I did call this meeting and I thank all of my councilmembers who agreed to have it and the purpose is to correct a problem not to try to find some fault or sneaky little staff member trying to get federal dollars. And let me tell you something about federal dollars. We pay those taxes. And if we don't use them for our road projects, then Tempe will get to use our taxes. So there are no strings attached to these federal grants other than you have to use them for the purpose stated otherwise it's fraud. And so that is true whether we get federal Grants or whether we get a grant from any other entity. When you file for a grant, you have to use it for the stated purpose. Again otherwise it's fraud. This whole business of strings attached. And the majority of the dollars on 68th Street were to pay for crosswalks. That's what's expensive.

Again, the lane of striping doesn't cost money. But the crosswalks do. And as we know, there was, you know, again last month, there was someone very badly injured on 68th Street on a bike, and we had a disabled person killed crossing a road without a crosswalk. I think these crosswalks were good ideas and they are paid for by federal dollars and the federal dollars or paying for maintenance that we would have to pay for if we didn't get the grant.

We are listening to the people. This have been three miles of road diets in the last 20 years. So this is not a problem, but we do have a transportation action plan that has upset people, and the purpose of tonight's meeting is to fix it. And a lot of the problem as the Mayor has pointed out has to do with communications. So one thing, there was -- I think Councilwoman Littlefield mentioned Portland. What we learned tonight is road diet is just a vague -- it's a broad term that could be many things. So many of the cities and, from fact, I spent a lot of time in Portland, they

have -- they have made infrastructure changes.

They have physically removed lanes. So what we need in our transportation action plan is a definition of the road diets that the city of Scottsdale is considering. And those road diets and Councilwoman Janik, you too, they do not change the infrastructure. They are paint jobs. That cannot affect public safety and doesn't have added cost. I would like consensus from this council, do you agree that the transportation action plan should have a road diet definition?

Councilmember Durham: Yes.

Councilwoman Whitehead: I think we have consensus. I think we all agreed and Councilmember Durham mentioned that we need to clarify the language that public safety is first and community input and traffic flow, they were all equal. There was an idea that traffic flow was inferior to public safety and community -- I don't know, community enjoyment or some other term.

So let's make that equal, that traffic flow is a priority. Everybody agree? Okay. Good.

Councilwoman Janik: No. I think we need to make sure that everybody raises their hand.

Councilwoman Whitehead: Okay. So the -- let me read -- it was actually an idea that came from Tom Durham and something that Mr. Kube brought up. Make throughput an equal priority with safety and livability in the transportation action plan. Do people agree with that.

Councilmember Durham: And multimodal access.

Councilwoman Whitehead: Okay. I just had --

Councilmember Durham: Multimodal community access.

Councilwoman Whitehead: I think that's livability. Okay. Okay.

[Time: 04:16:57]

Councilwoman Janik: I want definitions of safety. How are we going to measure it. People are killed riding their bike on streets that are marked perfectly with the wide lanes.

Councilmember Whitehead: People are killed on sidewalks.

Councilwoman Janik: Your implication is that if we do it right, we will stop deaths.

Councilmember Whitehead: No. The complaint from the citizens was that we have put traffic flow -- we have put throughput inferior to safety and livable. So my recommendation is that we change the language to demonstrate that throughput and public safety and livability are all priorities when we look at road configuration changes.

Councilwoman Janik: You just added livability.

Councilmember Graham: We are not voting on it. We are voting to talk about and vote on it in the future.

Councilwoman Whitehead: And this is in the transportation action plan today.

Councilmember Durham: It's already there.

Councilwoman Whitehead: It looks as though throughput is inferior to --

Councilmember Graham: There's no action item. There's no action.

Councilwoman Whitehead: Let's raise hands just to make it equal. This is what I'm hearing from the residents.

Councilmember Graham: We can't vote.

Councilwoman Whitehead: No, we're not voting.

Councilmember Graham: We just raised hands.

[Time: 04:18:27]

Mayor Ortega: As I announced the purpose of the work study is to have an informal casual discussion and free questions on the topic. Now, some of the clarifications that we can get have to do with clarification and perhaps definitions and for that reason staff is looking for some gaps that may not seem as clear as possible.

For instance, if someone said let's define road diet in Scottsdale. And it shall say there shall be never triple widths of sidewalks so that the curb to curb will not change that. Might be a definition. I'm not asking us to vote on it but that's part of the discussion.

The other problem was in Portland or somewhere else, they do put 12-foot sidewalks on each side and call it road diet and everybody has a cow because they go out of business because they can't stay in business with a 12-foot new sidewalk in front of them and it's true in that case. The broad discussion of road diet becomes a -- definitely business killer, right?

Mark Melnychenko: Mayor?

Mayor Ortega: So when mark Melnychenko said our definition is we are not changing the curb. But we do it at intersections because we need turn lanes. So that was part of our discussion that might be useful, we are noting to compare ourselves to Portland right away or Waverly, Iowa or somewhere else.

We will say for Scottsdale standards that's useful. I think Councilmember Durham tried to get a

grip to say what can we sort of agree with. I was also hearing that from Solange and I was hearing that from you, Betty. I want to double check the data so make sure what is communicated is accurate. I can agree with that.

In other words, I want them to do a car count on that and they probably have one. It may run ahead of getting the one out in -- I don't need the whole year's report to find out what we are doing here on this particular street. That's the positive expectations versus the wild concept that, you know, Jenny Craig diet is better than another type of diet. I don't get it that way.

So helping is useful and I think we are trying to get a grip on this so we can give staff some direction.

[Time: 04:21:21]

Councilwoman Whitehead: We have already voted not to put this on the ballot. I don't know how we could put 30 lane miles we would have 30 questions. That vote has already happened and so the goal of this council should be to make this a document that you support, especially those of you who voted for it. So another thing is to remove some of the inaccuracies.

So Councilwoman Littlefield in her comments mentioned that the citizens were pretty mad when they found out that 30 miles of road were going to have lane reductions but that's not true. But it's not clear that it's not true in our transportation action plan. So we need to clarify that.

What I would like to suggest is that we have that table with the data, that's the traffic data and that's where we classify roads and then we pull out any language associated with that table that suggests in any way that those roads will have road diets. On top of that, we need to -- I lost my train of thought. So remove the road diets from the actual traffic table where we reclassify it and put a timeline on it. This road data is collected every two years and this data represents such and such a time frame and if there's -- and expand -- go ahead, mark.

Mark Melynchenko: Mayor and Councilwoman Whitehead, what we also need to consider is this went through a large citizen process. It went through the Transportation Commission, our chair is here. It went through nine sessions with them. This is a well-vetted document. And it also is a continuation of what we have been doing for a long time.

We have expert staff that make the right decisions as was shown on the -- on the slides today. I think it's probably when we're looking at reworking a recently adopted document that has gone through the process. I think that's a problem.

Councilwoman Whitehead: I agree. However, what I think we need, based on a lot of input I have received is clarification, added language in this one section. I've got to tell you, I love this document. But in this one section, I think we need some added language so that there isn't this misinformation.

[Time: 04:24:04]

It's very unclear to me looking at it now again, after passing it, when you have a table that says these are the reclassifications of roads. That's data driven. Traffic driven. But then in addition, a sentence that says these are candidates for road diets. And there's no real definition of road diets and we don't mention lane width reductions. I think we need some embellishing here and what I'm trying to do is get a consensus from my colleagues on where that embellishment should happen.

Mayor Ortega: I think recommendations are thoughts can be entertained by the transportation commission. That's what they are there for is to filter and digest and then report back to us. I don't know that we're ready to rescript anything. And I think Mr. Melnychenko is correct. We have invested the technical staff. We are not traffic engineers. We will not be able to override traffic decisions individually. That could result, again many some legal action or other. It has to be a methodical approach. I am somewhat agreeing, it's not necessary to try to massage certain things but just to call to attention some of the things that came forward with this healthy discussion.

Councilmember Durham, Vice Mayor Littlefield and Councilwoman Janik.

Councilmember Durham: Thank you, Mayor. I don't want to beat this to death. I think what we are looking for is clarifications. There were practices that you already do, that are not necessarily set forth in here. For example, you talked to the police and the fire before you change a road. That's something you do. But it's not in here.

You do this for safety, to stop speeding and so forth. So there are a lot of things that you are doing but they're not necessarily written in here. So I view this more as a clarification certainly not a rewrite. We are trying to clarify what your practices are and the definition of a road diet is a perfect example. You are absolutely right if you have seen road diets in New York, it's a completely different animal than what we're talking about here. So all we are trying to do is clarify the terms. Thank you.

Mayor Ortega: Thank you. Vice Mayor Littlefield and then Councilwoman Janik.

Vice Mayor Littlefield: First of all, I would like to thank the gentleman who stood up and talked to us about bicycling. I appreciate you coming down here. I want to say thank you. I think none of us are again bicycles. This is not a pro car, anti-bike or pro bike, anti-car scenario. This is what do we do to best utilize the streets that we have, the roads that we have, the sidewalks, the bike lanes, the turn signals and all the paraphernalia that we put together to try to keep our streets safe and usable for all of our people.

Who come and go and work and play and live and play in Scottsdale. And so to me, it's not I hate bicyclists, I don't. I used to be one when I could do it and it's not that I hate cars. I don't. I drive them every day. It's a case of what's the best scenario, what is the best use of the land that we have. What is the best use of the streets that we all share. And that is something that I think our citizens should have a say in. I think they should have a vote and have a say in how it happens and falls out. We get a lot of negative emails but it may be that the people aren't saying

anything or talking to us all are in the majority and want us to go ahead and do this. I don't know that. But I'm not going to find out if we don't ask them. So that's what I would suggest is the ultimate answer to all of this. Thank you.

Mayor Ortega: Councilwoman Janik.

[Time: 04:28:40]

Councilwoman Janik: I would agree with Tom and Solange that we need to define "road diet". Is it narrowing a road from 12 to 11 feet or is it taking a lane away? And I think that probably is part of the problem that we are having that we need to better define some of these very key words. That's it.

Mayor Ortega: Thank you. And in conclusion, I'm very glad that we had a full regular city council meeting. I hope that as we move forward, we'll look at all the budget consequences so that we can make all the pedestrian, biking and cars work in a good way. With that, I ask for a motion to adjourn.

Councilwoman Whitehead: So moved.

Mayor Ortega: Moved and seconded. Please indicate your vote. We're outta here.