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INTRODUCTION

Scottsdale Town Enrichment Program (S.T.E.P.) is now in its sixth year of existence. During November of 1964, the Mayor and City Council conceived the idea of citizen voluntary support in designing, projecting, planning, and implementing programs that would enhance the booming growth of Scottsdale. This rapid growth was causing a great deal of consternation for both old and new residents.

The community spirit was anything but unified. Some older residents thought such things as paved streets and street lighting were unnecessary frills. Newcomers felt that they were necessities. Buildings were being built, new industries were moving in, and tourists were flooding this southwestern mecca. Things were happening so quickly that no one was really paying sufficient attention to the direction the city was moving. We were becoming like most other cities—unruly, unplanned, and undisciplined in growth.

Recognizing this trend, the Mayor and Council organized the S.T.E.P. Committee to combat the problems confronting the City. The committees quickly gained the function of establishing a communication link between the citizens and the City Council. They began serving in an advisory capacity to the Council in aiding them to determine major City policies and then in gaining public support for the Council's decisions.

The problems mentioned above fell into seven categories:

1. Public Works
2. Public Utilities
3. Public Safety
4. Parks, Recreation and City Beautification
5. Civic Center
6. Libraries, Museums and Galleries
7. Airport
With these areas isolated, a S.T.E.P. committee was appointed to handle each specific area. After ten weeks of intensive research and study, involving thousands of man-hours of time and energy, the S.T.E.P. committees on January 20, 1965 presented their findings and recommendations to the City Council. Using the suggestions gleaned from the S.T.E.P. committees as a starting point to improve the city, the Mayor and Council directed the City staff to implement the programs outlined. Such accomplishments as the revised City Charter, Master Plan, Civic Center complex, airport, parks facilities, youth court, and street lighting improvement districts are but a few of the monuments that have been raised by the efforts of the original S.T.E.P. committees. Their capital improvement program is no less spectacular. They called for capital improvements that would cost $14,605,570 to be accomplished in three fiscal years. Most of those improvements, it should be quickly added, were accomplished in the time allotted. Reference to other recommendations can be found in the report prepared by the 1964 citizens committees.

The early S.T.E.P. program was so successful with municipal capital improvements that it was decided to request citizen support for long range planning. Such a request suggests the essential keystone in the City's philosophy--the city that governs best is the one that is responsive to citizen needs and desires. Naturally, the City can't respond if it doesn't know what the citizens see as their needs.

With this thought in mind, the Mayor and City Council called a public meeting on September 30, 1969, to discuss a new S.T.E.P. program. This program was to revolve around the concept of citizen participation in preparing long range goals and policies from which the City administration could draw its guidelines for the future. Six major areas
were chosen to be explored by the S.T.E.P. committees:

1. Community Development
   a. Beautification
   b. Redevelopment
   c. Planning and Zoning
   d. Housing
   e. Subdivisions

2. Transportation
   a. Street Development
   b. Air Transportation
   c. Municipal Transportation System

3. Community Affairs
   a. Education
   b. Arts and Crafts
   c. Museums
   d. Leisure Time
   e. Youth Affairs
   f. Social Welfare

4. Economic Development
   a. Commerce-Industry-Tourism
   b. Manpower Resources and Training

5. Community Services
   a. Present Services
   b. Potential Services and Resources
   c. Public Utilities - Water, Sewer, Power
   d. Community Relations

6. Community Improvements
   a. Storm drains
   b. Indian Bend Wash
   c. Parks
   d. Public Buildings
Although there are many short range goals in each area, the committees were to address themselves to long range policies and spend as little time and energy as possible on short range goals. It became apparent as time went on that some areas, because of their nature, were easier to plan for in a long range sense than were others. Nevertheless, the citizen groups progressed steadily in order to accomplish their assigned tasks.

After the initial meeting of September 30, 1969, each task force met separately to discuss their specific areas. Some committees met every week until the first part of April, 1970, to complete their work.

A trend that developed throughout the various units was to spend the first few weeks having the City staff and guest speakers present background information in order to save time and unnecessary repetition of areas being covered, or projects that were already being planned.

Thirty weeks and much hard work later, the committees stood ready to present the fruition of their labors. No one can question the unselfish contributions of over two hundred Scottsdalians who have attempted to push personal biases and prejudices aside in favor of the general public interest.

As individuals read through the findings and recommendations made by these committees, they will not find it difficult to recognize the tremendous task undertaken by these committees. Appreciation and thanks are in order to those who labored to make this age of S.T.E.P. a success.
Report of

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

Councilman: Robert L. Jones

Staff: George Fretz, David Harris

PLANNING

A. High-Rise Development: After considerable deliberation in the area of high-rise development and consideration of such factors as reasonable setback requirements, aesthetic quality, environmental blending, land value, expansion potential, public acceptance, and developmental trends, the committee recommends that the City Council amend the zoning ordinance as follows:

RECOMMENDATION:

(a) Those parcels zoned C-S (Regional Shopping Center) with a minimum lot size of 40 acres be allowed a maximum building height of 60 feet.

(b) The H-R (high-rise) zoning district be stricken from the ordinance.

B. Restrictions on Density Development: After careful consideration, it is recommended that the City Council consider the following:

(1) - A study and revision of apartment zoning to make the master plan more easily implemented.

(2) - The City's zoning ordinance should be amended to require a minimum lot area per dwelling unit in the R-5 zone to be 2,250 sq. ft. and that an additional zone of R-5R be created to permit a minimum lot area per dwelling unit of 1,750 sq. ft., and this new R-5R zoning should be restricted to that area surrounding the central business district as indicated by the General Plan.

(3) - The City zoning ordinance should be amended to require a minimum lot area per dwelling unit in the R-2, R-3, and R-4 zoning districts to be 4,500 sq. ft.

C. Master Plan: The Community Development STEP Committee continue as a study committee to consider the Master Plan.
D. New Subdivision Development: It is recommended that new large-scale subdivision developments be required to develop an overall master plan including park and school sites based on reasonable need.

E. Redevelopment

1. Civic Center Area: The committee recognizes the need for redevelopment of that area immediately adjacent to the Civic Center on its west side and that efforts to undertake this endeavor through private enterprise have failed in the past, due to such factors as multiple ownership, parcel size, zoning and high land cost.

2. Vista Del Camino Area: The committee recognizes the need for redevelopment in the Vista Del Camino Neighborhood which is in a deteriorated state due to such factors as flood hazards, low-income families, and poor construction techniques. Aligned with these factors exists a strong need for decent, safe, and sanitary housing which low income families can afford.

RECOMMENDATION:

It is hereby recommended that the City of Scottsdale proceed with its proposed program with the Department of Housing and Urban Development for assistance through the Neighborhood Development, Open Space, and Neighborhood Facilities Programs as this plan of action will provide an immediate, effective, and lasting solution to the problems in these above-mentioned areas and members from the Community Development STEP Committee be appointed to a committee to consider proposed plans.

F. Beautification: The committee recognizes that beautification of our community is a continuing process and that a standing committee should be established on a permanent basis to review beautification programs and make recommendations on specific beautification needs in terms of overall city development programs, and specific area developments. It is also recommended that a beautification award program be established to be administered by this committee.
Report of

COMMUNITY TRANSPORTATION

Councilman: William Jenkins

Staff: Marc G. Stragier, Don Skousen, Dick Brown, Dan Raby

TRANSPORTATION

STEP Committee

Final Report

Nowhere does the phrase "optimum level of operation" better apply than to the transportation operations of a city. Too little or too much of any part operates to the disadvantage of other parts. The system needs constant adjustment and rebalancing. The placing of a new industry or shopping center, the building of a new subdivision, an alteration of an adjoining community—all these factors and many more cause difficulty and call for re-evaluation of a system.

The particular needs of the several sectors of the community seldom have more than incidental similarities. Although all sectors share a proper concern for the health of the community, no two sectors would interpret that concern in identical terms. To some extent, every sector's needs violate the needs of every other sector. A good transportation system, therefore, is one which can constantly be readjusted to achieve the highest level of satisfaction for each sector—an optimum level of operation.

Predictably and necessarily, the proposals of the Transportation Committee will make no one sector of the community totally happy, and the proposals will make no one sector completely unhappy. A thoughtful appraisal of our proposals, however, should lead to the conclusion that the community as a whole will gain from the projections and alterations.

Every set of proposals such as this is valid only so long as the conditions maintain. All proposals should be continually re-evaluated and updated. Integration of these recommendations with those of other STEP committees should be achieved. Together the many recommendations should render an image that Scottsdale citizens hold of themselves and their community. Additional effort should be made to bring this image into focus.

In its proper place, the committee recommends the activation of a Transportation Advisory Board. The importance of this step cannot be overstated. There already exists Ordinance #309, which provides for a board such as this. It is believed the Council should activate this ordinance at once.
The work of the Committee was divided into four areas which encompass the foreseeable transportation concerns of Scottsdale: street classification; arterial streets and expressways; major non-federal aid projects and mass transportation; and downtown traffic and circulation. Charts and figures are appended for clarification and precision.

Street Classification

Streets and highways must serve two functions--provide access to abutting land and provide paths on which to go from one place to another. It is impossible for a single road to provide excellent service for both functions at the same time. The frequent turning, stopping and parking of vehicles necessary to provide access to land is not conducive to fast, safe movement of large volumes of traffic. The reverse is equally true.

Certain streets must be established for swift and efficient movement of vehicles and other streets for movement to abutting land. However, it is at once apparent that it is not possible to have all streets serve only one function. The compromise must be a system of streets which encompasses a wide range of streets with varying degrees of service to the two functions. On the one end is the freeway which, by its design, cannot serve adjacent land use; on the other is the cul-de-sac in a typical subdivision which, by its design, cannot move traffic and is used as much by children on bicycles as by automobiles.

The Committee has identified six street classifications:

- Freeway
- Expressway
- Major Street
- Minor Street
- Collector
- Local

Geometric and operational elements have been established to insure that a classification serves its intended function. Typical cross sections and plan views are attached where they are needed for each classification. These are firm recommendations to guide future street construction and operation.

Freeway

Freeways are the highest type facility used by automobiles and trucks. The primary purpose of these facilities is the move-
ment of large volumes of traffic over long distances. Studies indicate that on a properly planned freeway, the majority of vehicles will travel at least four miles on that facility. Obviously, the intent of freeways is to facilitate inter-community travel. For this reason, the design of freeways is the responsibility of the Arizona Highway Department and not the individual city. No cross sections have been developed.

Freeway construction cannot be dismissed, however. The location of a freeway and its interchanges can have a dramatic effect on the traffic patterns within a city. Any plans by the Arizona Highway Department, therefore, should be coordinated with the existing and anticipated street system of Scottsdale.

Expressway

Expressways are similar to freeways in that they are designed to move relatively large volumes of traffic over fairly long distances rather than to provide access to abutting property. They differ only in a matter of degree; that is, expressways have to move less traffic than freeways. Because lower volumes have to be served, at grade, traffic signal controlled inter­sections will suffice in most cases and replace the ramps and grade separations usually found in freeway construction. The advantages are a reduction in costs and a freedom from view-disrupting structures.*

To attract large numbers of vehicles away from more direct routes, an expressway must enable vehicles to maintain a relatively high speed and thus reduce travel time. This is accomplished by limiting access to expressways. The lowest class street permitted to intersect an expressway is a major street. Inter­sections should be spaced at least one mile apart and should be controlled by a system of intertied and synchronized signals to permit maximum flow and minimum delay. High speed right hand exits and entrances may be provided to feeder roads between the signalized intersections. Frontage roads should dead-end instead of connecting with major streets at intersections with the expressway. Given this design, average speeds of 40 to 50 miles

*The full development of Pima Road will be a typical example.
per hour can be maintained throughout the expressway.

The recommended cross section and plan is shown in Figure I. The sixteen foot median should be used for landscaping and for left turn storage at the major street intersections. The median should be unbroken between intersections to provide maximum safety and speed.

Shoulders should provide room for emergency parking. These shoulders should be used as right turn lanes at intersections and as acceleration and deceleration lanes at high speed entrances and exits between major intersections. The surface texture of the shoulders should differ visibly from that of the traffic lanes.

**Major Street**

The major street network is the most important traffic carrying system in the city. It is the real workhorse. It carries 60 percent of the travel, but only 20 percent of the street mileage. Major streets traditionally have had to serve both traffic movement and land access. Because these two functions are conflicting and because major streets are so essential to the vitality of the city, the Committee has studied major street problems in greater depth.*

In the development of cross sections and in the establishment of design and operational standards, the Committee adopted the view that movement of traffic on major streets is of prime importance and that service to abutting land is secondary.

Two major street cross sections are recommended and are shown along with their plans in Figures IIA and IIB. Type I (six lanes) and Type II (four lanes) are identical in design except for numbers of lanes. Type I constructions should be built when the streets predictably will have exceptionally high volumes of traffic or when the streets serve a large number of high traffic generators. In the latter case, the two additional lanes will serve vehicles turning into or out of parking lots.**

*Typical examples: Camelback Road east of Miller to Hayden Road; 68th Street immediately south of Indian School Road (Type II).
**A good example of this situation is the south side of McDowell Road on either side of Scottsdale Road.
There are several elements relating to the design and operation of major streets which the committee has discussed in depth. The following discussion represents the unanimous recommendations of the task force in these matters.

**Medians**

The median serves several functions: esthetics (via landscaping), separation of opposing traffic streams, and storage for turning vehicles. The latter function is the most important from the standpoint of safety and traffic movement. Vehicles stopped in regular traffic lanes waiting to turn left create very serious safety hazards. At the same time vehicles caught behind these turning vehicles can be extensively delayed. Both of these problems can be eliminated by the provision of medians with left-turn bays where turns are permitted.

The task force strongly recommends that medians, islands, or dividers be provided on all major streets. As noted on the major street cross sections, the recommended design is a raised median sixteen feet wide. However, several major streets have been constructed recently without medians. It seems unduly expensive to tear up new pavement to construct the preferred median. Therefore, it is recommended that a median twelve feet wide be painted on these streets. This will separate the vehicles wanting to turn left from those wanting to go straight through. The inclusion of a median on existing curbed streets will require the removal of parking as discussed in the next section.

Usually medians are designed to permit turns only at selected places. However, the task force is aware that left turns from major streets into places of business are desired by both merchants and shoppers. Since in some places businesses are located continuously along a street, left turn storage would have to be continuous. A painted median can serve as a continuous left turn lane. This is recommended only where existing business investments would be adversely affected by the prohibition of turns and where the safety hazards of turning vehicles would not be too great. On streets yet to be constructed, raised medians should be planned so that businesses can locate accordingly. Publicity should be given to the proper use of these types of medians.

**Parking**

The second element which the committee unanimously recommends
is the removal of parking from all major streets. Next to vehicles making left turns from through traffic lanes, vehicles in the act of parking and unparking create the most hazards and delay. Also, in many areas on-street parking is used very infrequently, and consequently this street space is wasted.

A much safer and more effective utilization of the street width could be obtained by taking two steps. First, parking space should be converted to through traffic lanes. Second, a portion of the new space available should be used for the median as discussed in the previous section. On most streets which are developed to their full, curbed width, the above steps would result in four full traffic lanes and a painted median twelve feet wide. This action should be initiated immediately.

Intersecting Streets

In general all classes of streets have been permitted to intersect with major streets. However, every intersection is an area of conflict and a potential spot for accidents and delays. Therefore, the number of streets intersecting with major streets should be limited if possible.

Access to abutting land

Much the same can be said about land access points as about intersecting streets. Every access point is a point of conflict and hazard and, therefore, should be limited. Care should be exercised that all access points are well delineated and capable of being negotiated at a reasonable speed by most vehicles.

Special mention should be made of residential land fronting on major streets. In no instance should site plans be approved which would require vehicles to back onto the major street. This would create a very hazardous condition. Where this situation presently exists, every effort should be made to provide a frontage road similar in design to the frontage road on the expressway cross section.

If a developer wishes to build houses facing a major street, he should be required to donate 28 feet of right of way in addition
to that required for the major street cross section. On this additional right of way, the developer should construct a frontage road twenty feet wide and a landscaped barrier eight feet wide between the frontage road and the major street.

The developer should be encouraged to face the houses away from the major street and toward a local street. Thus, no access would be needed to the major street except at the collector street. Because an appropriately landscaped barrier or divider could be erected at the rear of the property (next to the major street) the noise received in the houses from the major street would be reduced. Noise level would be reduced and the view presented to passing motorists would be enhanced.

Traffic Signals

As volumes on major streets increase, increased difficulty is experienced by vehicles wanting to turn left onto, or to cross, major streets. Thus a demand is made for more and more signals at intersecting local and collector streets and at land access points. However, the Los Angeles Regional Traffic Study (LARTS)* and the local Valley Area Traffic and Transportation Study (VATTS)** clearly indicate that the single most important factor affecting average driving speed on a major street is the frequency of traffic signals. VATTS found that the installation of more than four signals per mile seriously reduces the average speed obtained on a major street during peak hours.***

Realizing that rare exceptions must be made, the Committee feels strongly that a policy should be established to guide the City Council and its staffs in the matter of signal warrants. Three signals per mile (one every half mile) will provide adequate opportunity to enter, exit, or cross major streets. This limitation will permit speeds consistent with major street design.

---

* LARTS, Appendix to the Base Report, 1968, p.10
*** Four signals per mile means one signal at the major street at each end of the mile section and two signals in between at collector streets.
At present five or more signals per mile exist on Scottsdale Road through the downtown area. These will be eliminated through implementation of recommendations contained in another section of this report).

All signals along a major street should be synchronized to provide the maximum flexibility to changing traffic demand and to achieve minimum delays to motorists.

In general, left turn signals should be installed at each major street intersection to facilitate movement and to achieve safety.

The recommendations of the Committee relating to medians, on-street parking, connecting streets, direct land access, and traffic signals are all made to promote good traffic movement throughout the city on the major streets. This is beneficial to the economy and increases the liveability of the city. Well designed free-flowing major streets will insure that traffic will not detour through neighborhoods to avoid bad conditions. Easy movement through the city, to commercial areas, and to points of interest will make Scottsdale attractive to resident and visitor alike.

Minor Street

Streets which serve to connect several neighborhoods with each other and with the major street system are called minor streets. These streets are usually continuous up to three or four miles. They are usually located between and parallel to major streets. In the mile square grid of major streets found in Scottsdale and throughout the Valley, these streets are usually at the half mile points.*

Minor streets are needed to serve areas of high residential density or to directly serve commercial and industrial areas.** Elementary and sometimes high schools are located along these streets.

*An example: Granite Reef from Indian School to McDonald.
**Cf., section entitled "Downtown Circulation and Parking."
As opposed to major streets, the prime consideration in the design and operation of minor streets is land access. Good traffic movement is necessary but is of secondary importance.

As seen in the recommended cross section in Figure IIIA, two traffic lanes are provided. These lanes are exceptionally wide to permit vehicles to pass between vehicles stopped to turn left and those parked along the curb. These lanes also may permit the passing of vehicles temporarily stopped in a "double parked" position without encroachment into opposing lanes.

As seen in the plan (IIIA), to increase safety and to provide room for a left turn lane, parking should not be permitted near intersections with major streets.

The recommendations for minor streets may be summarized:

1. Medians are not recommended, but left turn lanes should be provided at intersections with major streets;

2. Parking should be permitted except near intersections with major streets. (Downtown parking is considered in another section of this report.)

3. Left turn signals should not be provided.

4. No limitations should be placed on the number of street intersections, or traffic signals, or accesses to abutting land.

**Collector Street**

A street which connects a single neighborhood to the major or minor street system is called a collector street.* These streets are usually not continuous for more than one mile or the distance between major streets.

The primary consideration in the design and operation of collector streets is land access. Speeds should be kept low to provide maximum safety for pedestrians and for vehicles which are turning or parking.

*An example: 86th Street parallel to Granite Reef and Pima Road between Camelback and McDonald.
The recommended cross section is illustrated in Figure IIIB. Room is provided for two standard traffic lanes and for on-street parking. Parking, number of intersections, land access, and signalization are limited and determined only by the needs of the area through which the street passes.

Local Street

The purpose of a local street is simply to provide a path for a vehicle to reach its destination. Obviously, land access is the only function of this facility. Care should be exercised in the design of subdivisions and industrial and commercial areas to discourage traffic which is not destined for the area from using the local streets within that area.

MAJOR STREETS AND EXPRESSWAYS

The network of major streets and expressways in Scottsdale represents an opportunity for orderly accommodation and enhancement of the city's growth. Conversely, failure to develop the network in concert with the city's growth can produce an acute constraint on travel to factories, offices, schools, and recreational areas, thereby diminishing the usefulness and attractiveness of the community. The Committee has reviewed the present status of the street system, its present and future traffic volumes, and the likely impact of future freeway construction throughout the Valley. This section contains findings and recommendations based on five key assumptions:

1. The general development of the city will not vary appreciably from the General Plan adopted in 1967.

2. The traffic projections prepared by the Valley Area Traffic and Transportation Study indicate that by 1995 the traffic demand in many areas of the city will approach the capacity of any foreseeable street and freeway network that might be constructed by that time. Thus, some form of mass transportation system must be developed in Scottsdale between 1980 and 1995.

3. Size, location, and timing of freeway development is still a matter of speculation. In addition, there is a need for extensive examination of the economic, esthetic, and sociologic impact of freeway construction. The Committee, therefore, chooses not to address itself to the specifics of freeway development.
4. Regardless of the ultimate placement of freeways or the development of mass transportation, the construction of Scottsdale's basic major street network to its maximum capacity will be the vital community program for this decade.

5. Rapidly increasing costs of both highway construction projects and right of way acquisitions make projections inadvisable. Therefore, this Committee will make no recommendations for financing and construction.

Recommended Projects and Priorities*

Delay in proceeding with major street and expressway projects because of the vagaries of funding will produce a rapid decline in levels of service, an increase in the frequency of traffic accidents, and a deepening of frustrations among the residents of Scottsdale, who have no alternative to the automobile as the basic mode of transportation. Put most simply, the pace of Scottsdale's past and anticipated development makes it mandatory that a 10-year street program be undertaken and completed in less than 6 years.

One significant project is in progress. The Committee concurs with present plans:

Scottsdale Road between Osborn Road and Indian School Road is being improved to a Type II facility by widening the surface and by installing medians, curbs, gutters, and signals. This is the maximum feasible capacity for this portion of Scottsdale Road. Immediate implementation will provide badly needed relief until "by-pass" or "inner city loop" routes can be developed (vide section "Downtown Circulation and Parking"). Federal monies available under the Traffic Operations Program to Improve Capacity and Safety (TOPICS) are being utilized.

The following new projects are listed in descending order of priority. Some projects include more than one major street because the development of one street implies the development of another street or section at the same time. Occasionally, the immediate construction recommended is less than that ultimately contemplated.

*Three maps are appended: Figure 4, Proposed Major Street Network; Figure 5, Width of Present Right of Way; Figure 6, Projected Traffic Flow in 1980.
In such cases it is intended that right of way for the ultimate construction be acquired as part of the initial project since this will result in lower total costs.

1. Scottsdale Road
   A. From Roosevelt to Osborn Road should be constructed to Type I, 6 lanes (Fig. IIA), within the existing 105 foot right of way. Although the existing right of way from McDowell to Osborn is less than the Type I standard, further acquisition of property solely from Scottsdale funds is felt to be too costly. Monies obtained under the Federal Aid Secondary System (FAS) should be used.
   B. From Shea Boulevard to Thunderbird Road should be constructed to Type II with right of way acquisition for a future Type I facility. This project will eliminate the dangerous bottleneck on the present two-lane road. It is the final section needed to make Scottsdale Road at least four lanes from the southern city limits to the airport. FAS funding is recommended but general city funds should be used if FAS aid is not available in 1970.

2. 64th Street
   A. From McDowell to Chaparral should be constructed as a Type II facility with right of way acquisition for the ultimate expressway, which would include grade separation at Thomas and Indian School Roads.

   It is recommended that constructions at these two intersections be designed so that conversion to grade separations with diamond interchanges can be accomplished at a later date with minimum cost and inconvenience. Our suggestion is to construct only ramps initially and to use these for surface crossings. Size and importance of this project dictate that designation as an FAS route be applied for and that funding should be obtained under the FAS program.

   Presently there is no access to 64th Street between Thomas and Indian School. If this situation is maintained, it may be possible to reduce right of way requirements by constructing the expressway without service roads and barriers.
This approach would reduce needed right of way from 176 feet to 128 feet.

Oak Street would dead-end at 64th Street without access to the expressway. This would require a bridge across the canal to provide access to McDowell and to Thomas for residents living west of the canal.

B. **Chaparral** from 64th Street to Pima Road should be constructed as a Type II facility (Fig. IIB) coincident with Part A, above. FAS designation and funding is necessary.

Projects 2A and 2B are especially significant because they meet the need for a high speed facility west of Scottsdale Road and complete an arterial loop around the "inner city." In addition, they provide a traffic demand-oriented access route to the community college site and serve the projected Papago Freeway traffic regardless of where the freeway may be placed. The costs of these projects will be substantial, both for land acquisition and for construction. The designers will have to give particular attention to the residential areas along the routes. Salt River Project must cooperate to accomplish the canal crossing. Without these projects there appears to be little hope of avoiding rapid deterioration of north-south traffic flow. Design studies and FAS applications should be completed as soon as possible and construction be completed by 1973.

3. **Van Buren**

From Scottsdale Road to Hayden Road should be constructed to a Type II (Fig. IIB) facility utilizing existing right-of-way. Basically this project involves widening the existing two lane facility. This will provide significant service improvement to the immediate area and will add a needed section of the final major street network. Monies from the Major Streets Fund Gas Tax or other city sources should be used.

4. **Pima Road**

A. **Pima Road Expressway** should be developed to four (4) lanes from McDowell Road to Shea Boulevard with right
of way acquisition included for the ultimately needed six (6) lane expressway. FAS funding is both appropriate and necessary. Ultimate construction might well include separations of grade at major intersections.

B. **Indian School Road** should be constructed to a Type II facility (Fig. IIB) between Hayden Road and Pima Road concurrent with the development of the Pima Road Expressway. This single mile precludes use of FAS funding. (FAS funding requires a two mile minimum). It is recommended, therefore, that monies from the Major Streets Fund Gas Tax or other city sources be used.

The Pima Road Expressway has the dual purpose of providing a high speed route for traffic originating in the north part of Scottsdale and terminating in the south part, and of providing adequate capacity for traffic to and from the community college. Ultimately it will be the major east side link to the envisioned Indian Bend Freeway. The companion project (4B) is considered essential because it will provide a direct east side route to the projected Civic Center site and because Camelback Road will not be built through to Pima Road.

5. **Hayden Road**

Between **Indian School Road** and **Indian Bend Road** should be constructed to a Type II facility (Fig. IIB). However, acquisition of the remaining right of way sections for a Type I facility should take place concurrently. Although it is the only arterial between Scottsdale and Pima Roads, the Committee believes that Hayden Road should not be widened to six lanes unless traffic conditions make it mandatory. The Pima Road Expressway should alleviate traffic build-up on Hayden Road. Local traffic, however, will require additional capacity and, for this reason, the Committee does recommend the Type II construction. Monies available from the Major Streets Fund Gas Tax or other local sources should be used as FAS designation is not appropriate.

6. **McDowell Road**

A. From 64th Street to 70th Street should be constructed to a full Type I facility (Fig. IIA). Right of way
acquisition is required. FAS funding should be used for this FAS designated route.

B. From 70th Street to Pima Road should be widened from four (4) lanes to six (6) lanes and upgraded to a full Type I facility. Here, too, FAS funding is appropriate.

Implementation of this project will provide the major east-west facility for the south portion of the city and will provide a relatively high speed link between the two north-south expressways (64th Street and Pima Road). The Committee believes the existing facility will prove adequate until the higher priority projects are completed, if they are completed with all possible speed. The possibility must be faced, however, that continued rapid growth of major commercial and industrial centers along McDowell Road could necessitate earlier implementation of the Type I construction. The long term (1980 and beyond) future of McDowell Road is tied closely to the location of the Papago Freeway. The Committee believes that placement of the Papago Freeway in proximity to McDowell Road (one mile or less) would be undesirable because it would further intensity traffic demand in an area of high volume and limited capacity. Of course, should a mass transit system be developed in Scottsdale to provide a link to the McDowell Road commercial and industrial centers, the Type I construction recommended by the Committee should meet foreseeable needs.

7. Scottsdale Road

North of Chaparral Road, the developing city, together with increasing traffic to the Scottsdale Airport and to Carefree, will mandate further improvement of Scottsdale Road from a Type II to a Type I facility.

A. Chaparral to Shea should be constructed to a full Type II facility (Fig. IIB) concurrent with anticipated development of McCormick Ranch. Right of way acquisition is necessary, and this should be for the ultimate Type I facility. This is an FAS project. Medians, left turn bays, and signalization may be accomplished prior to implementation of this project.
as major developments are undertaken by landowners having frontage on this section of Scottsdale Road.

B. Thunderbird to Bell should be constructed as a Type II facility (Fig. IIB) with concurrent right of way acquisition for Type I. This, too, is an FAS project and is designed to meet the increasing traffic demand in this area.

8. Shea Boulevard

From 64th Street to the Pima Road Expressway should be constructed to a Type II facility (Fig. IIB) with right of way acquisition for an ultimate expressway construction. The timing of this project will be determined by traffic volume and safety considerations. The major uncertainty, of course, is the possible future development of Fountain Hills. FAS funding is especially appropriate because only a small portion of the traffic will originate in Scottsdale.

The timing of the following projects is probably linked to the implementation of a Lincoln Drive improvement project originating with the Town of Paradise Valley and with Maricopa County.

9. McDonald Drive

From Granite Reef Road to the Pima Road Expressway should be constructed to a full Type II facility. Monies from the Major Streets Fund Gas Tax are recommended for this project.

10. Indian Bend Road

From Scottsdale Road to the Pima Road Expressway should be constructed to a Type II facility (Fig. IIB). The timing of this project is probably dictated by the future development of McCormick Ranch property. If this project is tied to a Lincoln Drive project, FAS designation and funding may be appropriate. Otherwise, city funding is recommended.
THE PAPAGO AND OTHER FREeways

The Committee feels a deep anxiety concerning the implications of construction of the Papago and other freeways in Scottsdale and adjoining areas. Traffic projections for 1980 and 1995 prepared by the Valley Area Traffic and Transportation Study under the auspices of the Maricopa Association of Governments indicate that, on a demand assignment basis, the proposed freeway projects would deposit (and attract) such a large volume of traffic on Scottsdale's major street network that levels of service would deteriorate to a wholly unacceptable condition. In fact, traffic volume would severely stress the maximum capacity it is feasible to construct.

A kind of Parkinson's Law operates in street and highway construction: road capacity built in response to new traffic needs is at once consumed by additional traffic generated by road construction. Massive 8-lane elevated, depressed, or surface freeways may be envisioned dissecting the City of Scottsdale and creating traffic bottlenecks wherever they discharge their streams of vehicles. The implications are profound:

Land Use. Freeways consume major amounts of land at high cost of acquisition and with considerable dislocation of businesses and residences. It occurred to the Committee that the Salt River Project canal network could be covered and used to transport people throughout the Valley. Electric transmission structures along much of its length suggest the feasibility of an electrified mass transit system. A resultant reduction in water loss through evaporation could, perhaps, compensate the Salt River Project. Such a positive approach to land use could sharply reduce the land requirements of transportation construction.

Pollution. Reduction in pollution produced by vehicles equipped with emission control devices will be more than offset by the increasing number of vehicles generated by freeways.

Costs. Limitation of funds, which caused the existing shortage in freeway mileage, will not be overcome. The rising costs of land acquisition and construction will mean that even fewer miles than planned will be built with available resources.
Aesthetics. Freeways are essentially functional structures and as such produce major changes in the looks, the feel, the overall character of a community.

Cultural. Freeways tend to make possible the contemporary phenomenon of the urban center surrounded by radiating bedroom communities. The absence of a freeway system tends to encourage epicenters or self-sustaining communities which provide employment for a large portion of their residents and which develop the basic cultural activities needed to meet the expectations of those residents. It can be argued, surely, that a sense of belonging to the community is created and enhanced.

The Committee does not presume to assert the "best" answers for Scottsdale to the question, "What kind of city do we really want to have?" The point is that current freeway development programs may determine Scottsdale's future character before the residents can reach a decision. Master planning and zoning cannot be divorced from the transportation plan, and all are integral to the determination of Scottsdale's future.

Major Non-Federal Air Projects and Mass Transportation

Although Scottsdale's heaviest traffic in and out of town is east and west, a very large part of that traffic must turn north or south to reach or come from its destinations. East bound traffic stops or is diverted at Pima Road or Scottsdale Road. These two are the only north-south major streets. Nearly one hundred per cent of traffic originating with Scottsdale residences must travel either Pima or Scottsdale Roads, or shorter feeder roads, to arrive at the east-west grids to move out of Scottsdale to adjoining communities.

In addition, the peculiar north-south axis of Scottsdale caused by Phoenix on the west and the Indian Reservation on the east serves to intensify every major grid problem. Lying astride the axis and a barrier to north-south free flow on Scottsdale Road (one of the two north-south major traffic carriers) is the city's major business district. The resulting traffic glut is already most inconvenient.

In addressing itself to the matter of mass transportation, the Committee found itself stymied by too little data and too
few definitions. To facilitate discussion it was convenient to define mass transportation very simply: the movement of groups of people between specified points in conveyances not directly under the control of the individuals being transported. The recommendations later made were predicated on this definition.

A final introductory observation should be made. Major street building is inconvenient and costly. There is no way to avoid costs. They can be minimized, however, by careful design and expeditious execution. Delay can only add to the cost. Inconvenience is another matter. Much inconvenience can be avoided by early and integrated storm sewer and utilities installation. Too often Scottsdale streets are torn up at the convenience of builders and utility companies. It seems to the Committee not illogical to require that storm sewers and utility installations be immediately integrated. It may be desirable to require that utility installations be made under or outside sidewalk areas.

It is recommended that streets crossing streets being constructed be upgraded at the same time to a reasonable distance to avoid later traffic interruption at the intersection.

**East-West Street Development**

1. **Chaparral Road**

   From 64th Street to Pima Road.

2. **McDonald Road**

   From Pima Road west to 64th Street (now being widened and improved to Scottsdale Road).

3. **Indian Bend Road**

   From Pima Road to 64th Street.

4. **Jackrabbit Road**

   From Pima Road to 64th Street.

The Committee recognized that development of Indian Bend Road and Jackrabbit Road go beyond the authority of the city. We believe, however, that Scottsdale should take the initiative and explore with its neighbors every possibility of mutual interest and benefit.
North-South Street Development

1. 64th Street

From Washington Street to Indian Bend Road as an expressway.

2. Hayden Road

From Indian School Road to Indian Bend Road as a major street (Type I).

Many suggestions have been made relative to Hayden Road and development of the Indian Bend Wash, including the possibility of a north-south expressway. However, the Wash may be developed as a flood control project; plans should call for the evolution of Hayden Road into a parklike drive.

Utilization of the Arizona Canal (along with the Crosscut Canal) as a roadway presents stimulating possibilities. With limited access, one-way roads could be constructed to either side of the canal. Traffic could be carried on a diagonal northeast-southwest from 64th Street to Pima Road Expressway. Sophisticated intersections with the major street grid could greatly facilitate long trip movement and reduce volumes of traffic on the major street grid.

Related Projects

1. Helipad

From which travellers could move with speed and convenience from central Scottsdale to Scottsdale Airport and Sky Harbor Airport.

2. Transportation Center

At which buses, taxis, limousines, and public conveyances could terminate. Car rental agencies and travel agencies would lease space. The helipad might be located nearby.
3. **Mass Transportation**

   A. A study should be made to determine the city's image and its goals; to determine its population structure as to age groups, employment groups, leisure groups, and so on; to determine and locate anticipated traffic densities.

   B. Specific recommendations should be made based on Item A.

4. **Inter-City Cooperation**

   A. That Scottsdale take the initiative to draw our neighboring communities into a cooperative street planning pact for both short range and long range planning.

   B. That implementation take place at the highest administrative level in all communities so that lower working levels may go ahead without being hampered or jeopardized by jurisdictional limitations.

5. **Transportation Advisory Board**

   A. To be permanent and composed of citizens interested in or qualified in transportation.

   B. Whose charter would direct that implementation of recommendations of the STEP Transportation Committee be achieved; that assistance be given the city transportation staff; that the Board be involved consistently in long range studies and planning for roadways, freeways, and commercial transportation systems.

**DOWNTOWN CIRCULATION AND PARKING**

**Observations**

1. Downtown traffic at the present time is undesirably congested:
A. Much traffic lingers to find parking space;

B. Left-turning traffic at permissable intersections finds it difficult to complete its turn;

C. Right-turn-to-go-left traffic automatically increases traffic at four additional intersections in an already congested area;

D. Sophisticated signalization presently at the Camelback and Indian School roads intersections with Scottsdale Road is inadequate for traffic north and north-to-west bound;

E. Width of right of way does not permit a solution at either Camelback or Indian School roads;

F. Backed up traffic all along Scottsdale Road makes a cross traffic movement nearly impossible.

G. Scottsdale Road is the primary north-south carrier.

2. Downtown parking at the present time is inadequate and discourages downtown shopping:

A. On-the-street parking has reached a saturation point;

B. Off-the-street parking provided by business houses and required by ordinance is not feasible at most locations.

Assumptions

1. That Scottsdale Road downtown cannot be widened beyond its present and proposed width and, therefore, can never carry efficiently both shopping and through traffic.

2. That to designate Scottsdale Road a one-way carrier either north or south would necessitate a concomitant parallel carrier. The creation of the latter does not seem feasible.

3. That north and south bound through traffic must be provided alternate routes.
4. That shopping traffic must be afforded easy access to downtown shops and services and be provided safe, adequate, and convenient parking space.

5. That to facilitate present commercial capacities and to promote future increased commercial capacities is imperative.

6. That Scottsdale's growth along a north-south axis is inevitable and that provision must be made now for an orderly and productive growth.

Solutions

1. Because a commercial area which straddles a primary traffic and growth pattern works to the detriment of both the commercial area and the pattern, and because area shoppers have demonstrated a clear preference for shopping malls, it is urged that through traffic in downtown Scottsdale be interrupted and channelled to either side and that a shopping mall or malls be created in downtown Scottsdale.

A. Mall #1 should take its shape and extend from existing conditions; that is, on the east is the Civic Center, on the north is Indian School Road (a main east-west artery), on the west is an area of limited residential-commercial use and a resort complex, on the south is a second area of limited residential-commercial use. More than sufficient parking space must be placed inside a traffic pattern devoted solely to parking and shopping.

B. Mall #2 should take its shape and extent from existing conditions in the "Fifth Avenue" area. Obsolete and non-conforming streets must be altered and already congested areas must be freed of street traffic. Peripheral parking areas must be established and efficient traffic movement achieved.

C. Both malls should be traffic-free and attractively landscaped--designed for pedestrian patronage of substantial shops, restaurants, and service facilities.
D. Merchants should be encouraged to develop parking areas as opportunities to acquire property arise. The "City" should not provide parking areas, but the City Council should appoint a funded committee, with a one year limitation, to study and obtain a realistic, approximate cost of acquiring the designated parking areas (See map: "Projected Plan for Downtown Scottsdale"). This committee should report back to the Council and the two groups, with the addition of seven local businessmen, should develop a purchase plan to include funding through bonding, direct investment, lieu contributions, and other appropriate methods, along with the necessary zoning and acquisition ordinances to facilitate the immediate purchase of this land.

2. The remaining commercial consideration lies north of the Canal and west of Scottsdale Road—the Fashion Square and Paradise developments. Inner traffic links must connect together the several areas so that shoppers and short-trip traffic can move freely from area to area.

3. Emerging in downtown Scottsdale is a medical, recreation, civic and cultural and convention belt or zone which extends from Osborn Road on the south to Sixth Avenue on the north. It presently contains Baptist Hospital and related service facilities, the ballpark, the city park, the library and city hall, and Scottsdale High School. It must be assumed that the hospital and present medical establishments to either side will grow to be a medical center of large proportions. To the north of the Civic Center is Scottsdale High School. It must be assumed that this is improper utilization of land. The school is presently outmoded and somewhat overcrowded. A better location and better facilities are needed. Exchange of land and purchase monies of interested parties should make a relocation possible and feasible. The city should play a motivating and mediating role in bringing together the parties interested in a better utilization of these school lands. The city should find it desirable to create a convention center to enhance an already tourist-oriented economy. It is suggested that most of the existing school structures could be advantageously modified to this end. Areas for adequate convention parking exist. The balance of the school lands should be zoned carefully for convention center-supporting
businesses (lodging, dining, and specialty shops) and developed privately. In addition, this would be an appropriate location for a transportation center.

4. We, therefore, are speaking of three categories of traffic: parking traffic; linking traffic; and through traffic.

A. Parking traffic must be of a self-regulating order which circulates around and through the several parking areas. It is slow and terminal.

B. Linking traffic must be just outside the parking pattern and must move easily from, around, and to the several parking patterns, and must furnish access to the through pattern from the parking patterns and to the parking patterns from the through pattern.

C. Through traffic must travel around linking and parking patterns and must furnish quick movement from east to west and north to south. East-west routes long have been determined by Camelback, Indian School, Thomas, and McDowell Roads. New routes must be developed for north-south movement.

It is vital when considering downtown circulation problems that Hayden Road be developed on the east as a prime mover of north-south traffic as well as Pima Road and that 64th Street be developed as a north-south prime mover on the west. The full development of both becomes imperative as the Papago Freeway releases high volumes of traffic into Scottsdale.

5. Inner north-south through traffic routes which bracket the downtown commercial area must also be developed. The natural routes seem to be only Miller Road on the east and 70th and 68th Streets on the west. Although both Miller and 68th extend south to McDowell, neither extends effectively beyond Camelback on the north. In addition, 70th begins at Thomas on the south and extends only to Indian School Road on the north. Neither Miller nor 70th extends over the Canal. All three routes should extend north of and south of the present and foreseeable commercial areas. It would seem reasonable to assume
36.

that all traffic travelling north and south beyond the reaches of the downtown area could be carried by the extensions of 64th, Scottsdale Road, Hayden Road, and Pima Road. Through traffic, therefore, travelling Miller, 68th, and 70th could be safely channelled back to Scottsdale Road once clear of inner city traffic patterns. It would seem this could not occur south of Chaparral Road.

It seems clear that Miller Road should link with Scottsdale Road in the vicinity of Chaparral Road on the north and in the vicinity of Earll Drive on the south; that 70th (and 68th) should link with Scottsdale Road at Chaparral Road on the north and Thomas Road on the south. This through traffic bracketing of downtown Scottsdale should free the commercial areas for linking and parking traffics only.

**Priorities**

It is assumed that existing plans for the redevelopment of the area just west of the Civic Center will be carried forward and that 74th (George) will be curved to intersect Indian School Road at the extreme northwest corner of the redevelopment area; that is, at the point where Brown alley intersects Indian School Road.

1. Miller Road (4 lanes) to Chaparral Road and across the Canal to Scottsdale Road.

2. Miller Road connecting link at about Earll Drive (4 lanes) to Scottsdale Road.

3. 70th Street north from Thomas Road to Chaparral Road (4 lanes), with overpass at the Canal.

4. Chaparral Road (4 lanes) from Scottsdale Road to 68th Street, with a major channelling of traffic into 70th. (The extension should be made to 64th Street when 64th is developed.)

5. 74th Street (4 lanes) from Indian School Road (at Brown alley) north to just north of Stetson Drive, where it shall curve to an intersection with Scottsdale Road and Camelback Road.
6. 74th Street (4 lanes) from Osborn Road south to McDowell.

7. Inner parking loop east of and parallel to 70th Street from First Avenue to 2nd Street.

8. Mall #1 should be created by cutting Scottsdale Road at 1st Avenue and 2nd Street.

9. Develop 3rd Avenue (4 lanes) from Craftsman Way to the extension of 74th Street (Brown alley).

10. Close 6th Avenue and 5th Avenue west of Scottsdale Road and create Mall #2.
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COMMUNITY AFFAIRS

Councilman: Dr. Heinz R. Hink

Staff: Brad Simon, L. B. Scacewater, Jerrye Champion

Citizens: Prof. Leland S. Ax, Virginia Baumgartner, Mary Bell Norma Bond, Beverlie Carter, Rose and Howard Cox, Sharon Frost, David Garten, Dr. Kent Hansen, Mrs. Harold Jackson, Mrs. Robert Jones, Lawrence Lyman, Miss Virginia Maze, John Miklos, Andrew Parlogian, Joan Rickenberger, Mrs. Vern Schoeneman, Boyd Baker, Clara Beauchamp, Wendy and Robert Bochek, Robert Bridges, Mr. and Mrs. Robert Churbuck, Wayne Farley, John Gallagher, Priscilla Gittus, Lucille Hanson, Mrs. Thomas Jensen, Dolores Lihosit, Dr. Robert Mattson, Dr. Leroy Meiring, Myrna Parker, Reitta Petty, Mrs. R. T. Sanderson, Dale Shepp, Thomas Stapleton, Jr., Rev. Roger Stressman, Mrs. Carl Trexler, Robert Usdane, Tami Wilkinson, Peter and Helen Zeeveld, Phyllis Drake, Ann Hosmer, Mrs. A. H. Peterkin, Mrs. Jack Wilson, Mr. and Mrs. Warren Parker, John C. Eichennauer III, Doris and Charles Still, Jack and Jacqueline Taylor, Roberta Unterberger, Beverly Verden, Robert and Jeannette Yount, Peggy Jo Zude, Harold Kennedy.
The Committee's Background

The Community Affairs Committee consisted at one time or the other of fifty-four citizens. The City Council assigned Councilman Heinz R. Hink to chair the Committee and Jerrye Champion was appointed staff coordinator. The Committee studied and evaluated City activities, services, interests and needs in six areas: Education, Arts and Crafts, Museums, Leisure Time, Youth Affairs and Community Services.

From the onset, the Committee was challenged to extensively study existing community activities, events, services and programs in the aforementioned areas of concentration in order to present recommendations to Council which would expand and/or create new services, programs of activity and facilities which will compliment those already existing in Scottsdale.

With this viewpoint, the Committee participated in the following series of educational lectures, discussions, and tours designed to acquaint the membership with services and needs in the six areas.

October 14, 1969. Lecture on the Scottsdale Fine Arts Commission's responsibility to coordinate the City's art program, its role in the past and its plans for the future. Speaker: Paul Huldermann, Chairman, Scottsdale Fine Arts Commission.

October 28, 1969. Tour of Scottsdale Public Library and discussion of the library program - its services, needs and goals. Speakers: Jerrye G. Champion, Head, Public Services, and Don Dresp, Coordinator of Services.

November 11, 1969. Discussions of the objectives, services and operating procedures of the Scottsdale Youth Services Program and special programs and services available in the City for senior citizens. Speakers: John Seaman, Youth Services Coordinator, and Tom Despain, Senior Citizens Specialist.

November 25, 1969. Lecture on teen activities sponsored by the Parks and Recreation Department. Speaker: Jonnie Gordon, Youth Program Specialist.
December 9, 1969. Discussion of the City's manpower program and its involvement in neighborhood development. Speaker: David Harris, City Personnel Director.


January 24, 1970. Conducted a workshop to create advertising media for the establishment of a City art museum.

After undergoing this education program, it was apparent that the primary interests of the Committee involved community services (this term, rather than social affairs, was agreed upon as being more appropriate), education, museum and library services and facilities. Therefore, two sub-committees were established: (1) Community Services with Mrs. Joan Rinkenberger and Dr. Charles Still as co-chairmen, and (2) Education, Museum and Library with Mr. Dale Shepp as chairman.

AREA OBJECTIVES AND RECOMMENDATIONS

COMMUNITY SERVICES

Objectives

I. To establish a central referral agency as a separate City department to interpret the community service needs of the people and to channel their needs to sources of assistance.

II. To study and review existing community services and to create an ongoing agency to plan future improvements and developments, upgrade services when needed, eliminate duplication, and present valuable ideas that might improve the quality of life of our citizens.

Recommendations

I. The STEP Community Affairs Committee recommends that in addition to and in conjunction with the existing services for senior citizens and young people a central referral services center be established immediately along the following lines to minister to the needs of the people in these areas:
Physical and mental health
Services for the aged
Family counseling
Financial counseling
Legal aid
Homemaker services
Home nursing services
Transportation

Location

This program is to be housed in a separate office located in the Scottsdale Civic Center area. This central location facilitates access to resources in Tempe, Mesa and Phoenix and would not necessitate toll charges for telephone service.

Facility

In the early months of operation, it can be housed in a small office equipped with a desk, appropriate files, indexes, ready reference tools and a telephone. A program of expansion should be followed to facilitate new and expanded services.

Staff

One full time person trained in the field of social work could direct this service with clerical assistance at the onset, but provisions should be made to expand the staff as needed to cope with service demands. The Committee promotes the utilization of senior citizens and other dependable volunteer groups to assist the Director. It further urges that all volunteers be trained by the Director. The Director might be paid a suggested salary of $650.00 monthly by the City of Scottsdale.

Resource Contacts

The following departments and agencies will serve a resource and liaison function to facilitate cooperation, information and service:

- Social agencies
- Local churches
- Hospitals
- Other City departments
- Local schools
- Civic groups
- City Police Department
- Service groups and organizations
Publicity

The Committee urges the development of a strong and meaningful public relations program from the onset.

To establish a productive relationship with newspaper editors and broadcast personnel.

To make verbal contacts with all local groups.

To publicize available services to the citizenry.

To publish a directory of available services.

II. The STEP Community Affairs Committee recommends the creation of an on-going study and review committee with a full-time director (who should be a qualified department head or some other capable full-time City employee). This committee might be able to do the following:

Enlist the assistance of various specialists as needed so that the growth of our community would have adequate and continued supervision.

Work with City officials and department heads.

Act as liaison with county, state, and federal agencies and planning departments of existing organizations so that adequate information would be available for City Planning at all times.

Hopefully, this on-going committee could be of special assistance to the City Manager in obtaining pertinent information to be used for applying for grants for not only governmental agencies, but also from non-profit organizations as well. Another function of the committee in creating a better balance of services might be obtained by studying and reviewing some of the City's departments that are already operating basic programs. This committee should have at least one member with expertise in each of the following basic services:

- Transportation
- Income maintenance and job opportunities
- Housing or living facilities
- Youth services
- Senior services
- Health services
Knowledgeable individuals could create active sub-committees to assist the City Administration in setting up priorities in future programs, evaluating existing agencies and departments, and considering the techniques of financing worthwhile federal programs that are being financially phased out. Other important studies could be developed as future needs are encountered and other grants become available. A progressive city like Scottsdale should benefit greatly by using ALL available methods of researching community needs and reviewing existing services - considering at ALL times maximum use of the total human resources of the area.

III. The STEP Community Affairs Committee has received a recommendation from the Senior Citizens Club of Scottsdale for the establishment of a Community Adult Center. The Committee wishes to forward their recommendation to the Council for its consideration. Their recommendation is appended to our report.

YOUTH AFFAIRS

The STEP Community Affairs Committee has heard reports from Judge Ed Boyle and Mr. John Seaman, Youth Services Coordinator. The Committee is of the opinion that the area of Youth Services is well-handled at the present time, but also is of the further opinion that future periodic reports to citizen groups on the activities of the Youth Service Coordinator are in order.

ARTS AND CRAFTS

Upon considering the areas of arts and crafts, the Community Affairs Committee came to the conclusion that these areas appropriately fall under the jurisdiction of the Parks and Recreation Department.

LEISURE TIME

The Community Affairs Committee felt that leisure time is an area that falls under Education, Museum and Library.

EDUCATION, MUSEUM AND LIBRARY

Objectives
Art Museum

I. To provide for the establishment of a City supported art museum.

II. To define the relationship between the Art Museum Committee, Fine Arts Commission and the Historical Society.

III. To investigate methods of financing the Museum.

IV. To investigate possible building sites.

V. To determine the scope of the museum.

Library

I. To evaluate lighting in the parking lot.

II. To study the feasibility of developing a City branch library program.

III. To evaluate the need for increasing the library collection.

IV. To emphasize the significance of displays and advertisement to public relations.

Education

To tie in educational goals with museum, library and recreational goals and activities.

Recommendations

The STEP Community Affairs Committee recommends:

I. That an Art Museum Committee under sponsorship and control of the City Council be given authority in conjunction with other groups to take all steps necessary to finance, implement and operate an historical, western, and fine arts museum.

II. That at this time, the City not consider the establishment of branch libraries, but instead, make every effort to strengthen the collection at the Main Library.
III. That consideration be given to increase lumens of light in the library parking lot.

IV. That consideration be given by the City Council to declare an annual "Historical Day" under the auspices of the Scottsdale Historical Society.

V. That a kiosk be utilized in the Civic Center area to inform the citizenry of community affairs.

NOTE: Since receiving the original report of the Community Affairs STEP Committee, the following supplements were received by the Chairman of the Committee. They were felt to be of enough importance to include them as an appendix to the final report.

RECOMMENDATION OF EDUCATION, MUSEUM AND LIBRARY SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE COMMUNITY AFFAIRS COMMITTEE OF S.T.E.P.

Recommendation, as first submitted:

A. That an art museum Committee under sponsorship and control of the City Council be given sole permission and power to take all steps necessary to finance, implement, and operate an Historical, Western and Fine Arts Museum.

B. Recommendation re Library. That consideration be given to increase lumens of light in the library parking lot.

C. Consideration be given to declare an annual "Historical Day" under the control of a committee appointed by the Council. This should be changed to read: Consideration be given that the City declare an annual "Historical Day: under the control of the Historical Society.

D. Endorse using kiosks to inform citizenry of community affairs.

E. Endorse a city branch library in the distant future.

Dr. Hink: As you may remember, I was not in accord with the wording of recommendations regarding Museum, as written, and stated that I had no authority to speak for the Historical Society, but as a member I felt that the Society should not be
put under an Art Museum Committee. Due to the fact that the Historical Society had already presented to the Council a request with over 1500 signatures to preserve the old red brick School Building on East Main Street for an historical museum (and for the information of the committee members present), stated that the Scottsdale Historical Society was organized at the request of the City Council, after the Fine Arts Commission had suggested it, as a means of preserving the history of Scottsdale.

After our organization, under the guidance of Councilman William Jenkins and the Fine Arts Commission Chairman, Paul Huldermann, we immediately decided to work to establish a Historical Museum.

Prior to that first meeting a group of interested citizens had started a movement to preserve the old red brick Schoolhouse that was then being used as a city library on East Main Street, for a Historical Museum. They had conducted a public opinion poll and secured over 1500 signatures of persons in accord, which had to be presented to City Council.

Mayor Tims, at that time, gave us the assurance that our request would be considered and that nothing would be done to destroy the building then or in the near future. Also, they would keep us informed of any plans that would affect the building.

Re: Recommendation
The wording was then changed to read:

A. That an Art Museum Committee under the sponsorship and control of the City Council be given authority, and in conjunction with other groups, to take all steps necessary to finance, implement and operate an Historical, Western and Fine Arts Museum.

Re: Recommendation
I did not vote for the recommendation and did not hear the no vote called. I am not against an art museum, but personally, I feel that the Historical Museum should have priority. We are losing much of historical value by this delay. We presently have a working group of people dedicated to the preservation of the history of, and the historical buildings of Scottsdale.
We are fortunate in having several small art galleries that are very good and for the present fill the need for an art museum here. Also, there are two large art museums in Phoenix.

Museums are very expensive to build and maintain. They are usually financed by private funds—not an impossible task, but it will take a little longer, and with the fine group of interested workers it will be accomplished.

Library. Re enlarging parking area. Instead of providing more parking space why not work for good public transportation or putting passengers in with the drivers in every car on the highway. Save that valuable land to build on, or plant trees and flowers for the peace, comfort and welfare of our fellow neighbors. Submitted by Clara P. Beauchamp.

COMMUNITY AFFAIRS STEP COMMITTEE

SUB-COMMITTEE ON MUSEUMS

Reasons for a Museum Complex

Scottsdale's officially recognized Historical Society has in possession and "on hold" by original owners, items of historical value. These need a place for filing, and display for public use and enjoyment.

To prevent the loss by destruction and/or removal from the city of other such items of historical value to the City. Provide a place to reconstruct the first Scottsdale school, with suitable historical display.

The Indian Arts Group have expressed a desire for a permanent building for offices, gifts and donations of Indian works and suitable place for their highly successful National Indian Arts Exhibition. These facilities are presently rented.

Educational and research center. Where the unique culture of our city and the Southwest area be organized and available for students, residents and visitors to use and enjoy.

A place to display donations of art and culture.

A central complex near the civic center to attract visitors.
A city of the size of Scottsdale, and with the large population of artists (amateur and professional), requires an art museum, a building for art use.

A center to present lectures, demonstrations, film, classes, etc. on the various interest of the museum complex. A service and means of helping to support the center.

Recommendations and Suggestions

The Historical Society members of our Museum Committee stated the urgency of their need to house items acquired of historical value. A building of approximately 5000 square feet to start is believed to be adequate for a while, with plans for growth incorporated. This would provide filing, display and research space for important papers, documents, pictures, and larger items; where the citizens, students and visitors can see and enjoy their value. We recommend this as a priority goal in the museum complex. This also includes a place to reconstruct the first Scottsdale school which is about to be taken down.

Mary Bell suggested the joining of museums, going out in different directions for convenience. The committee agreed.

Bob Yount suggested a multi-purpose assembly type room for use of all the museums. The committee agreed. This cuts the cost for the total museum complex and could provide a larger space, say 500 seat capacity.

Bob Bochek sketched a suggested way to do both of these things, to show the practical way of using both ideas. The committee agreed to the interest and feasibility.

It was also suggested a site, possibly on the 27 A south of the Civic Center be allotted for such a museum complex, and the Council choose an architect to make a master plan to include such a complex and provide unity for the 45 A Civic Center Complex. The committee recommends interested members and artists, and other museum groups be included in the planning of a museum complex, for maximum use for each group.

It is recommended the Library auditorium, board room, and mezzanine be used for programs, meetings, and displays, etc. where those interested can start this Museum Complex program.
The Historical Society, when such use is confirmed, would prepare a display to initiate interest in the program.

The committee expressed interest in involving the entire community through participation programs. One such is to have the High School Art students compete to provide a trade mark, suitable for use on stationery, etc. We recommend this and similar ideas be pursued now, to stimulate wide community interest and support.

We recommend good publicity of all activities and meetings to interest as many citizens as possible to join the program.

We also recommend a fully representative expression of our unique--Southwestern, Spanish, Indian, Western--art and architecture be emphasized to make this a truly outstanding display of our culture, for all to enjoy.

The culture of past civilizations is all that remains in the present. Let us preserve ours for the future.

Respectfully submitted by Members of STEP Subcommittee on Museums of the Committee of Community Affairs.
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INDUSTRIAL AND COMMERCIAL DEVELOPMENT

Scottsdale is a widely recognized, highly desirable residential area and a nationally known tourist resort center. Any future industrial and commercial development should be on a highly selective basis so as to complement rather than detract from Scottsdale's established qualities.

INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT

Selected industrial development of the non-nuisance light manufacturing type is desirable to broaden the tax base and further diversify our local economy. Scottsdale is in an advantageous position to be able to be highly selective in the type of industry that is established here because of limited available industrially zoned land. The only large tract of industrial land available in the Scottsdale area is the 422 acres at the Thunderbird Industrial Air Park adjacent to the Scottsdale Municipal Airport. Every effort should be made to encourage new plant locations in this industrial park.

Examples of non-nuisance industries that appear desirable to attract to Scottsdale include: electronics, plastics, arts and crafts, housewares, plus a wide variety of research and development facilities.

Expansion of industrial development in Scottsdale could create a corresponding need for local vocational education and training which presumably could be satisfied by courses at the new Scottsdale Community College.

The City of Scottsdale should formally go on record as favoring industrial expansion. Scottsdale needs to develop a favorable image as a site for quality industrial plants. This could partially be accomplished by selected advertising in national publications.
COMMERCIAL DEVELOPMENT

It appears that the growth of retail outlets—restaurants, motels and related service businesses will develop naturally with the growth in population and tourist-winter visitor activity. To retain Scottsdale's present image, future commercial buildings should be developed in accordance with existing zoning codes with a de-emphasis on high rise structures. Immediate attention should be given to providing additional off street parking, particularly in the Fifth Avenue and downtown shopping districts.

There seems to be a need for additional quality general office buildings. An active program should be undertaken to sell Scottsdale as an ideal site for national or regional headquarters for such businesses as insurance companies, professional associations, computer data centers, franchise operations, and various service industries.

Other desirable commercial developments include warehouse and distribution facilities, particularly in the South Scottsdale area. The limited commercial acreage off Hayden Road south of McDowell would appear ideal for such usage.

ECONOMIC BASE STUDY—COMPREHENSIVE GENERAL PLAN

In 1965 the consulting firm of Eisner, Stewart & Associates with the help of federal funds, prepared an economic base study which was to be used by city planners for the future economic development of Scottsdale. The comprehensive general plan adopted by the City Council in July, 1967 was also based on recommendations by Eisner, Stewart & Associates.

The Scottsdale of 1970 is considerably different economically than the Scottsdale of 1965 when the economic base study was compiled. Following is a partial list of recent developments which combined will have a profound effect on the future economic development of Scottsdale:

1. Rapid residential and commercial development in the Scottsdale Road—Shea Boulevard area.
2. Influence of the nearby Fountain Hills development.

3. Imminent development of the McCormick estate property.

4. Influence of the Los Arcos Mall complex.

5. Heavy population density in the Northeast Scottsdale area.


7. Possible residential and industrial development on lease Indian land.

8. Effect of high rise structures.

9. Rapid increase in apartment units and row houses.

In view of the above and similar developments affecting the economy of Scottsdale our committee strongly recommends exploring the possibility of revising or updating the economic base study. Also, serious consideration should be given to possible revisions to the comprehensive general plan as may be necessary to allow for the orderly growth of Scottsdale and yet maintain our high standards as a prime residential area and tourist-resort center.
MANPOWER DEVELOPMENT

The Manpower Development and Resources Subcommittee of the Economic Development Committee submits this as a final draft of its recommendations to the City Council.

The first need and the basis for sound planning in a community as rapidly growing as the City of Scottsdale is accurate knowledge of the economy, particularly with regard to population characteristics and employment trends. The Economic Base Study, using as a base the 1965 special census for the City, projected a population through some fifteen years. The complete 1970 census reports should become available early in 1971 and this information should be used as the basis for updating the Economic Base Study, including projections of population characteristics and employment trends.

Initial inquiry seems to indicate that the City's problem is not one of providing employment for residents of Scottsdale, but of providing an adequate labor force for whatever industrial or commercial development is sought. Or, conversely, the City should seek a type of industry whose manpower needs can be satisfied from the existing or projected population.

More specifically, in 1965 it was estimated that only about one of every three Scottsdale residents was working or looking for a job, and one of every four employed Scottsdale residents was employed elsewhere. This indicates a somewhat low participation in the labor force by our residents and approximately three-fourths of our employed residents are employed in the City. Furthermore, nearly half of those persons employed in Scottsdale live elsewhere.

The conclusion must be that a prospective employer, considering Scottsdale as a location, must either induce Scottsdale residents into the labor force or draw from outside Scottsdale to meet his manpower needs. We submit that this latter course is most desirable from a revenue/cost comparison to the City. Those groups and individuals engaged in industrial or commercial development should be aware of this and include it in their planning.
Manpower training resources available to the community include the emerging Scottsdale Community College. The college is designed to serve the specific needs of the community of which it is a part. Scottsdale needs are not only for academic preparation for its young people, but also for vocational skills training for people of all ages.

inasmuch as the Community College is responsive to the needs of the community, the City should take advantage of this opportunity by supplying to the college an accurate indication of its plans and requirements. The college normally develops its knowledge of community needs through a series of curriculum advisory committees staffed by knowledgeable and interested citizens of the community. The City should, in some form, develop a continuing liaison with the College so as to assist them with the staffing of these committees as well as make the college administration aware of future planning.
Following are recommendations which are felt will enhance the development of the tourism industry in the City of Scottsdale:

1. The development of Scottsdale Municipal Golf System

   Our committee feels that the City of Scottsdale can operate golf facilities at a profit!

   Based on construction costs and income statements received from various city and county government sources, it is our opinion that the City of Scottsdale can economically satisfy the immediate need for additional golf facilities. (Scottsdale Chamber of Commerce officials report that the lack of local golf facilities is a major complaint of many tourists and winter visitors.) At the same time, Scottsdale can offer its local residents a reasonable priced source of outdoor recreation.

   The first priority in the sequence of developing a Municipal Golf System should be an 18-hole championship golf course. The City should also consider short or medium length 9-hole golf courses, some of which might be lighted for night use, especially during the summer. Information received from such areas as Denver, San Diego, Los Angeles, and City of Phoenix show that shorter courses are being operated very profitably.

   Potential sites for local golf facilities might include the following:

   (a) Leased Indian Land
   (b) Indian Bend Wash
   (c) McCormick Estate Property

   The City of Scottsdale should not overlook the possibility of acquiring and improving existing private golf facilities.

   Detailed financial information received from city and county governments currently offering golf facilities are being submitted as a supplement to this report.
2. The development of Scottsdale's cultural facilities which could include the following:

(a) A Southwestern oriented Fine Arts Center. This complex could combine a permanent display of Southwestern history (Mexican, Indian, and Cowboy), with rotating displays of current art exhibits.

(b) The City should initiate a study regarding the feasibility of a moderate size multipurpose municipal convention center. This could be used for small to medium size conventions, exhibits, and/or musical or theatrical productions.

(c) A new rodeo grounds with increased seating capacity.

(d) Modernize or replace the present municipal baseball stadium.

It is our feeling that the Fine Arts Center and baseball stadium should be located in close proximity to downtown Scottsdale. (Perhaps the Fine Arts Center could be located near the present Civic Center with a building that is architecturally compatible to the present City Hall and Library.) The rodeo grounds and convention center need not be located in the downtown area and could possibly be located north of the City. (Perhaps on the McCormick Park property.)

NOTE: The golf and cultural facilities as outlined in proposals No. 1 and 2 above would be utilized to lengthen our tourist season by the staging of major events prior to and after what is now considered our present peak tourist season.

3. The levy of a tax on temporary housing in Scottsdale:

The revenue generated by this tax should be an earmarked fund and used to finance one or more of the above recommendations regarding golf and cultural facilities. It is recommended that this revenue should not go into the City's general fund. Our tentative recommendation would be a tax very similar to that being levied in Phoenix, i.e. one percent on temporary housing agreements of less than one month.
4. The attraction of additional resort facilities to the City of Scottsdale to satisfy the demand for additional quality temporary housing and related resort facilities.

5. An intracity transportation system.

A transportation system appears to be needed to transport shoppers from Fashion Square through downtown Scottsdale to Los Arcos Mall on a regular basis, at least during our tourist season. A sort of tram or shuttle bus may be the logical answer for such a transportation system. Another unique idea that conforms to the "West's Most Western Town" would be some form of horse-drawn transportation, that would double as a tourist attraction, sort of the "cable car" of Scottsdale.

6. Other tourist oriented forms of recreational facilities should be developed and made available. Some of these suggestions include tennis, shuffle board, croquet, lawn bowling, etc.
### SUMMARY OF GOLF COURSE OPERATIONS

#### ATTENDANCE & REVENUES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No. of Players</td>
<td>Total Green</td>
<td>Average Per Player</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encanto 9-Hole</td>
<td>68,219</td>
<td>$68,219</td>
<td>$1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encanto 18-Hole</td>
<td>101,967</td>
<td>166,040</td>
<td>1.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryvale</td>
<td>85,908</td>
<td>138,265</td>
<td>1.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Papago</td>
<td>89,656</td>
<td>154,376</td>
<td>1.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>347,750</td>
<td>526,900</td>
<td>1.52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### EXPENDITURES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Courses</th>
<th>Personal Services</th>
<th>Contractual Services</th>
<th>Commodities</th>
<th>Total Outlay</th>
<th>1968-1969 Expenditures</th>
<th>1967-1968 Expenditures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Encanto 9-Hole</td>
<td>38,040</td>
<td>14,169</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>615</td>
<td>615</td>
<td>56,824</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encanto 18-Hole</td>
<td>92,341</td>
<td>41,010</td>
<td>12,556</td>
<td>2,459</td>
<td>2,459</td>
<td>148,366</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryvale</td>
<td>102,513</td>
<td>36,541</td>
<td>12,708</td>
<td>3,956</td>
<td>3,956</td>
<td>155,718</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Papago</td>
<td>99,031</td>
<td>58,767</td>
<td>20,036</td>
<td>5,320</td>
<td>5,320</td>
<td>183,154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>331,925</td>
<td>150,487</td>
<td><strong>49,300</strong></td>
<td>12,350</td>
<td>12,350</td>
<td><strong>536,348</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### PROFIT OR LOSS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Encanto 9-Hole</td>
<td>69,172</td>
<td>56,824</td>
<td>12,348</td>
<td>66,338</td>
<td>48,155</td>
<td>18,183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encanto 18-Hole</td>
<td>172,666</td>
<td>148,366</td>
<td>24,300</td>
<td>152,551</td>
<td>150,693</td>
<td>1,858</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryvale</td>
<td>146,220</td>
<td>155,718</td>
<td>(9,498)</td>
<td>136,012</td>
<td>164,257</td>
<td>28,245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Papago</td>
<td>165,818</td>
<td>183,154</td>
<td>(17,336)</td>
<td>149,117</td>
<td>173,243</td>
<td>(24,126)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>553,876</td>
<td>544,062*</td>
<td>9,814</td>
<td>504,018</td>
<td>536,348*</td>
<td>(32,330)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Includes $26,114 in Prorated Administrative Costs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Encanto 9-Hole</td>
<td>69,172</td>
<td>56,824</td>
<td>12,348</td>
<td>66,338</td>
<td>48,155</td>
<td>18,183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encanto 18-Hole</td>
<td>172,666</td>
<td>148,366</td>
<td>24,300</td>
<td>152,551</td>
<td>150,693</td>
<td>1,858</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryvale</td>
<td>146,220</td>
<td>155,718</td>
<td>(9,498)</td>
<td>136,012</td>
<td>164,257</td>
<td>28,245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Papago</td>
<td>165,818</td>
<td>183,154</td>
<td>(17,336)</td>
<td>149,117</td>
<td>173,243</td>
<td>(24,126)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>553,876</td>
<td>544,062*</td>
<td>9,814</td>
<td>504,018</td>
<td>536,348*</td>
<td>(32,330)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Includes $23,872 in Prorated Administrative Costs

#### AVERAGE PER PLAYER

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Encanto 9-Hole</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encanto 18-Hole</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>1.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryvale</td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td>1.77</td>
<td>(.11)</td>
<td>1.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Papago</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>2.04</td>
<td>(.19)</td>
<td>1.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combined, 4 courses</td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>1.42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Area Cost Distribution

### Golf Courses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Personal Services</th>
<th>Contractual Services</th>
<th>Commodities</th>
<th>Capital Outlay</th>
<th>Total 1969 Expenditures</th>
<th>Total 1968 Expenditures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PAPAGO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golf Course</td>
<td>$99,031</td>
<td>$39,722</td>
<td>$19,122</td>
<td>$5,320</td>
<td>$163,195</td>
<td>$154,561</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locker and Restrooms</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3,307</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3,520</td>
<td>3,959</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maint. Bldgs.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>923</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>961</td>
<td>1,059</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clubhouse Grounds</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2,829</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2,829</td>
<td>3,198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adm. Costs (Prorated)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8,767</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8,767</td>
<td>7,673</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pro Shop</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,757</td>
<td>490</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2,247</td>
<td>1,813</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coffee Shop</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,462</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,635</td>
<td>980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Expenditures</strong></td>
<td><strong>331,925</strong></td>
<td><strong>150,487</strong></td>
<td><strong>49,300</strong></td>
<td><strong>12,350</strong></td>
<td><strong>544,062</strong></td>
<td><strong>536,348</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Comparison of Golf Courses Expenditures and Revenues with Total Department Expenditures and Revenues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Department</td>
<td>$825,202</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>$779,799</td>
<td>.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golf</td>
<td>553,878</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>504,018</td>
<td>.94</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Golf Revenues % of Department Revenues: .67
Golf Revenues % of Department Expenditures: .14
Golf Expenditures % of Department Expenditures: .14

Depreciation not accounted for.
## AREA COST DISTRIBUTION

### GOLF COURSES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1968</th>
<th>1969</th>
<th>Total 1968</th>
<th>Total 1969</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ENCANTO</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>9-HOLE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golf Course</td>
<td>$38,040</td>
<td>$6,920</td>
<td>$3,712</td>
<td>$49,287</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restrooms</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2,225</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adm. Costs (Prorated)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2,798</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pro Shop (50%)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2,226</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$38,040</td>
<td>$14,169</td>
<td>$4,000</td>
<td>$615</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>18-HOLE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golf Course</td>
<td>$88,931</td>
<td>$24,122</td>
<td>$10,884</td>
<td>$2,459</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locker &amp; Restrooms</td>
<td>3,410</td>
<td>4,182</td>
<td>845</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adm. Costs (Prorated)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7,088</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pro Shop (50%)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3,908</td>
<td>765</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snack Bar</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,710</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$92,341</td>
<td>$41,010</td>
<td>$12,556</td>
<td>$2,459</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MARYVALE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golf Course</td>
<td>$102,080</td>
<td>$21,906</td>
<td>$11,836</td>
<td>$3,956</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locker &amp; Restrooms</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>1,223</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maint. Bldgs.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,528</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clubhouse Grounds</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adm. Costs (Prorated)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7,461</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pro Shop</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3,060</td>
<td>413</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coffee Shop</td>
<td>289</td>
<td>1,047</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$102,513</td>
<td>$36,541</td>
<td>$12,708</td>
<td>$3,956</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### REPORT OF ENCANTO 9-HOLE GOLF COURSE OPERATION

**COMPARATIVE STATEMENT**


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Green Fees</strong></td>
<td><strong>No. of Players</strong></td>
<td><strong>Total Revenues</strong></td>
<td><strong>Green Fees</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Daily</strong></td>
<td>$1.00</td>
<td>68,219</td>
<td>$68,219</td>
<td>$1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$ .75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### EXPENDITURES

**Fiscal Year Ending June 30, 1969**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Average Per Player</th>
<th>Average Per Player</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Golf Course</td>
<td>$52,085</td>
<td>$44,444</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pro Shop Snack Bar</td>
<td>4,739</td>
<td>3,711</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SUMMARY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>REVENUES</strong></td>
<td><strong>EXPENDITURES</strong></td>
<td><strong>PROFIT OR (LOSS)</strong></td>
<td><strong>REVENUES</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golf Course</td>
<td>$68,219</td>
<td>$52,085</td>
<td>$16,134</td>
<td>$65,293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pro Shop</td>
<td>953</td>
<td>4,739</td>
<td>(3,786)</td>
<td>1,045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>69,172</td>
<td>55,824</td>
<td>12,348</td>
<td>66,338</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Per Player Excluding Pro Shop</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Per Player Including Pro Shop</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.83</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
City of Phoenix, Arizona  
Parks and Recreation Department  
REPORT OF ENCANTO 18-HOLE COURSE OPERATION  

### ATTENDANCE AND REVENUES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Green Fees</td>
<td>No. of</td>
<td>No. of</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tickets</td>
<td>Players</td>
<td>Revenues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily</td>
<td>$ .75</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily (2)</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>6,595</td>
<td>6,595</td>
<td>6,595</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily Twilight</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>14,236</td>
<td>14,236</td>
<td>14,236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily (2)</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>65,267</td>
<td>130,534</td>
<td>130,534</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>86,098</td>
<td>$151,365</td>
<td>$151,365</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Monthly Individual | 8.00 | 246   | 1,968     | 8.00 | 153   | 1,224   |
| Yearly Individual  | 110.00| 78    | 8,580     | 110.00| 68    | 7,480   |
| Yearly Family (2 people) | 180.00 | 23 | 4,140     | 180.00| 18    | 3,240   |
| TOTAL             | 347   | 15,869 | 14,688    | 239 | 14,084 | 11,944  |
| Bad Checks & Refunds | (13) |        | (13)      |       |       | .85     |
| TOTAL             | 347   | 166,040| 166,040   | 239 | 97,500 | 146,257 |

#### EXPENDITURES

Fiscal Year Ending June 30, 1969

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Golf Course</td>
<td>$141,921</td>
<td>$1.39</td>
<td>$145,307</td>
<td>$1.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pro Shop &amp; Snack Bar</td>
<td>6,445</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5,386</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Facilities</td>
<td>148,366</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>150,693</td>
<td>1.55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SUMMARY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1968-1969</th>
<th>Profit or (Loss)</th>
<th>1967-1968</th>
<th>Profit or (Loss)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Golf Course</td>
<td>$166,040</td>
<td>$24,119</td>
<td>$146,257</td>
<td>$950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pro Shop</td>
<td>3,604</td>
<td>(1,069)</td>
<td>3,910</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snack Bar</td>
<td>3,022</td>
<td>1,250</td>
<td>2,384</td>
<td>779</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>172,666</td>
<td>24,300</td>
<td>152,551</td>
<td>1,858</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Green Fees
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1968-1969</th>
<th></th>
<th>1967-1968</th>
<th></th>
<th>Profit or (Loss)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Revenues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Per Player</td>
<td>$ 1.63</td>
<td>$ 1.39</td>
<td>$ 1.50</td>
<td>$ 1.49</td>
<td>$ .01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excluding Pro Shop &amp; Snack Bar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Per Player</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Including Pro Shop &amp; Snack Bar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
REPORT OF MARYVALE 18-HOLE GOLF COURSE OPERATION

ATTENDANCE AND REVENUES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Green Fees</td>
<td>No. of Tickets</td>
<td>No. of Players</td>
<td>Total Revenues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily - Student</td>
<td>$ .75</td>
<td>4,461</td>
<td>3,346</td>
<td>$ .75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily - Student</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5,256</td>
<td>12,444</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily - Twilight</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>54,937</td>
<td>109,874</td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>72,634</td>
<td>127,571</td>
<td>1.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monthly Individual</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>319</td>
<td>2,552</td>
<td>8.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yearly Individual</td>
<td>110.00</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>4,730</td>
<td>110.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yearly Family (2 People)</td>
<td>180.00</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3,420</td>
<td>180.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>381</td>
<td>15,274</td>
<td>10,702</td>
<td>.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bad Checks &amp; Refunds</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>87,908</td>
<td>138,265</td>
<td>1.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>381</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

EXPENDITURES
Fiscal Year Ending June 30, 1969

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>$ 150,886</th>
<th>Average Per Player</th>
<th>$ 158,308</th>
<th>Average Per Player</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Golf Course</td>
<td>$ 150,886</td>
<td>$ 1.72</td>
<td>$ 158,308</td>
<td>$ 1.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pro Shop &amp; Coffee Shop</td>
<td>4,832</td>
<td>1.77</td>
<td>5,949</td>
<td>1.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>155,718</td>
<td></td>
<td>164,257</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## MARYVALE 18-HOLE GOLF COURSE SUMMARY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Revenues</td>
<td>Expenditures</td>
<td>(Loss)</td>
<td>Revenues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golf Course</td>
<td>$138,265*</td>
<td>$150,886</td>
<td>$(12,621)</td>
<td>$127,872*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pro Shop</td>
<td>4,810</td>
<td>3,473</td>
<td>1,337</td>
<td>4,898</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coffee Shop</td>
<td>3,145</td>
<td>1,359</td>
<td>1,786</td>
<td>3,242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>146,220</td>
<td>155,718</td>
<td><em>(9,498)</em></td>
<td>136,012</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Green Fees

Average Per Player
(excluding pro shop and coffee shop)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$1.57</td>
<td>$1.72</td>
<td>$(.15)</td>
<td>$1.45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average Per Player
(including pro shop and coffee shop)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td>1.77</td>
<td>(.11)</td>
<td>1.54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# REPORT OF PAPAGO 18-HOLE GOLF COURSE OPERATION


## Attendance and Revenues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Green Fees</td>
<td>No. of Tickets</td>
<td>No. of Players</td>
<td>Total Revenues</td>
<td>Av. Per Player</td>
<td>Green Fees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily - Student</td>
<td>$ .75</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ .75</td>
<td>5,714</td>
<td>$ 4,286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily - Student</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>6,930</td>
<td>6,930</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>9,618</td>
<td>9,618</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily - Twilight</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>11,295</td>
<td>11,295</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>24,805</td>
<td>37,207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>2,362</td>
<td>2,362</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daily</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>64,760</td>
<td>129,520</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>83,506</td>
<td>135,487</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>82,985</td>
<td>147,745</td>
<td></td>
<td>89,656</td>
<td>154,376</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monthly Individual</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>1,912</td>
<td></td>
<td>169</td>
<td>1,352</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yearly Individual</td>
<td>110.00</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>3,080</td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yearly Family (2 People)</td>
<td>180.00</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>540</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>540</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>89,656</td>
<td>154,376</td>
<td>1.72</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>89,212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bad checks, refunds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theft &amp; insurance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>89,656</td>
<td>154,376</td>
<td>1.72</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>89,212</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## EXPENDITURES

**Fiscal Year Ending June 30, 1969**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Golf Course</td>
<td>$179,272</td>
<td>Average Per Player: $2.00</td>
<td>$170,450</td>
<td>Average Per Player: $1.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pro Shop &amp; Coffee Shop</td>
<td>3,882</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,793</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Facilities</td>
<td>183,154</td>
<td>2.04</td>
<td>173,243</td>
<td>1.94</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
City of Phoenix, Arizona
Parks and Recreation Department

SUMMARY OF REPORT OF PAPAGO 18-HOLE GOLF COURSE OPERATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Revenues</th>
<th>Expenditures</th>
<th>Profit or Loss</th>
<th>Revenues</th>
<th>Expenditures</th>
<th>Profit or Loss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Golf Course</td>
<td>$154,376$</td>
<td>$179,272$</td>
<td>$24,896$</td>
<td>$138,357$</td>
<td>$170,450$</td>
<td>$(32,093)$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pro Shop</td>
<td>$7,252$</td>
<td>$2,247$</td>
<td>$5,005$</td>
<td>$7,002$</td>
<td>$1,813$</td>
<td>$5,189$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coffee Shop</td>
<td>$4,190$</td>
<td>$1,635$</td>
<td>$2,555$</td>
<td>$3,758$</td>
<td>$980$</td>
<td>$2,778$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>$165,818$</td>
<td>$183,154$</td>
<td>$2,555$</td>
<td>$149,117$</td>
<td>$173,243$</td>
<td>$(24,126)$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Green Fees

Average Per Player
(excluding pro shop & coffee shop)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$1.72</td>
<td>$2.00</td>
<td>$(.28)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$(1.55)</td>
<td>$(1.91)</td>
<td>$(.36)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average Per Player
(including pro shop & coffee shop)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>2.04</td>
<td>$(.19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>$(.27)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### DEPARTMENT OF PARKS AND RECREATION  
#### CITY AND COUNTY OF DENVER

#### MUNICIPAL GOLF COURSE REPORT - - - 1969

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EXPENSES</th>
<th>KENNEDY</th>
<th>CITY PARK</th>
<th>OVERLAND</th>
<th>WELLSHIRE</th>
<th>WILLIS CASE</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Permanent Salaries</td>
<td>$45,602.00</td>
<td>$41,020.00</td>
<td>$40,704.00</td>
<td>$42,055.00</td>
<td>$41,740.00</td>
<td>$211,121.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temporary Salaries</td>
<td>36,696.00</td>
<td>26,314.00</td>
<td>22,591.00</td>
<td>25,423.18</td>
<td>27,579.07</td>
<td>139,003.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Material Expense</td>
<td>20,225.00</td>
<td>13,346.68</td>
<td>13,346.68</td>
<td>13,346.68</td>
<td>13,346.68</td>
<td>73,611.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golf Maintenance from other appropriation</td>
<td>3,401.90</td>
<td>3,891.71</td>
<td>7,678.11</td>
<td>1,550.18</td>
<td>3,750.53</td>
<td>20,272.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision and Clerical</td>
<td>5,049.00</td>
<td>3,366.00</td>
<td>3,366.00</td>
<td>3,366.00</td>
<td>3,366.00</td>
<td>18,513.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment (1)</td>
<td>13,248.00</td>
<td>6,755.00</td>
<td>5,779.00</td>
<td>8,853.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance and Construction Charges</td>
<td>4,315.84</td>
<td>7,496.92</td>
<td>5,591.41</td>
<td>3,003.02</td>
<td>6,106.36</td>
<td>26,513.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Expense 1969</strong></td>
<td>128,537.74</td>
<td>102,190.31</td>
<td>99,456.20</td>
<td>97,597.06</td>
<td>103,992.64</td>
<td>531,773.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Income 1969</strong></td>
<td>131,731.21</td>
<td>65,869.21</td>
<td>108,598.89</td>
<td>114,432.98</td>
<td>103,339.57</td>
<td>523,971.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Difference</strong></td>
<td>+3,193.47</td>
<td>-36,321.10</td>
<td>+9,142.69</td>
<td>+16,835.92</td>
<td>-663.07</td>
<td>-7,802.09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) DEPRECIATED OVER 5 YEAR PERIOD

**NOTE:** EXPENSE FIGURES DO NOT PROVIDE FOR AMORTIZATION OF FIXED ASSETS.
## MUNICIPAL GOLF COURSE REPORT

### 1969 - INCOME AND EXPENSE STATEMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>KENNEDY</th>
<th>CITY PARK</th>
<th>OVERLAND</th>
<th>WELLSHIRE</th>
<th>WILLY CASE</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Concession Operation (Revenue received by the City)</td>
<td>$7,389.31</td>
<td>$3,438.06</td>
<td>$8,615.24</td>
<td>$17,528.33</td>
<td>$7,814.17</td>
<td>$44,785.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sale of Golf Tickets</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Hole</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>43,023.00</td>
<td>30,954.50</td>
<td>35,990.75</td>
<td>50,940.00</td>
<td>48,048.75</td>
<td>208,957.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Resident</td>
<td>15,710.75</td>
<td>4,250.00</td>
<td>10,350.00</td>
<td>17,770.00</td>
<td>20,449.50</td>
<td>68,530.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Hole</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>46,648.50</td>
<td>22,561.50</td>
<td>39,618.00</td>
<td>19,298.25</td>
<td>15,965.25</td>
<td>144,091.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Resident</td>
<td>16,887.50</td>
<td>2,075.00</td>
<td>11,952.75</td>
<td>6,824.25</td>
<td>8,989.75</td>
<td>46,729.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual</td>
<td>272.15</td>
<td>272.15</td>
<td>272.15</td>
<td>272.15</td>
<td>272.15</td>
<td>1,360.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Sale of Golf Tickets</strong></td>
<td>124,341.90</td>
<td>62,431.15</td>
<td>99,983.65</td>
<td>96,904.65</td>
<td>95,525.40</td>
<td>479,186.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Income 1969</strong></td>
<td>131,731.21</td>
<td>65,869.21</td>
<td>108,598.89</td>
<td>114,432.98</td>
<td>103,339.57</td>
<td>523,391.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Income 1968</strong></td>
<td>122,985.33</td>
<td>60,281.49</td>
<td>103,561.94</td>
<td>121,155.67</td>
<td>88,974.67</td>
<td>496,959.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1969 - Gain/Loss</strong></td>
<td>8,745.88</td>
<td>5,587.72</td>
<td>5,036.95</td>
<td>-6,722.69</td>
<td>14,364.90</td>
<td>27,012.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Regular Golf Tickets Sold 1969</strong></td>
<td>59,201</td>
<td>37,451</td>
<td>56,439</td>
<td>45,412</td>
<td>40,555</td>
<td>239,058</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31,922</td>
<td>4,221</td>
<td>16,859</td>
<td>16,006</td>
<td>13,530</td>
<td>88,538</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GOLF EXPANSION FUND</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Receipts</strong></td>
<td>161,704.28</td>
<td></td>
<td>116,035.58</td>
<td></td>
<td>162,101.16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expenditures</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>79,936.91</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>239,488.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Balance</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YEAR</td>
<td>RECEIPTS</td>
<td>EXPENDITURES</td>
<td>BALANCE 12/31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1954</td>
<td>$39,742.02</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$39,742.02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1955</td>
<td>37,758.88</td>
<td>4,416.20</td>
<td>73,084.70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1956</td>
<td>40,559.38</td>
<td>88,896.92</td>
<td>24,747.16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1957</td>
<td>43,367.19</td>
<td>45,132.60</td>
<td>22,981.75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1958</td>
<td>51,310.15</td>
<td>3,642.53</td>
<td>70,649.37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1959</td>
<td>51,190.95</td>
<td>6,983.41</td>
<td>114,856.91</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>66,220.15</td>
<td>16,313.88</td>
<td>164,763.18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1961</td>
<td>113,314.53</td>
<td>209,488.08</td>
<td>68,589.63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1962</td>
<td>127,067.47</td>
<td>96,542.59</td>
<td>99,114.51</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1963</td>
<td>105,420.50</td>
<td>74,542.11</td>
<td>129,992.90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1964</td>
<td>135,079.00</td>
<td>92,054.80</td>
<td>173,017.10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1965</td>
<td>132,016.50</td>
<td>117,852.07</td>
<td>187,181.53</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1966</td>
<td>140,362.99</td>
<td>168,824.22</td>
<td>158,720.30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1967</td>
<td>151,989.62</td>
<td>194,277.46</td>
<td>116,432.46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968</td>
<td>161,704.28</td>
<td>116,035.58</td>
<td>162,101.16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1969</td>
<td>157,323.75</td>
<td>79,936.91</td>
<td>239,488.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$1,554,427.36 $1,314,939.36
1. **Fund** | 2. **Function** | 3. **Dept. No.** | 4. **Department**  
--- | --- | --- | ---  
100 | Parks and Recreation | 24.00 | Recreation  
Golf Division  

### GOLF DIVISION STATEMENT OF REVENUES AND EXPENSES

**ACTUAL**  
**FISCAL 1967** | **ACTUAL**  
**FISCAL 1968** | **ESTIMATED**  
**FISCAL 1969** | **ESTIMATED**  
**FISCAL 1970**  

#### 24.02 Balboa Park Golf Course  
- **7546 Rentals and Concessions**: $16,588 | $16,024 | $16,500 | $17,500  
- **7771 Fees**: 183,624 | 178,844 | 182,000 | 189,400  
  - **Total Revenue**: $200,212 | $194,868 | $198,500 | $206,900  
  - **Less Direct Expenses**: 168,311 | 173,041 | 186,332 | 185,426  
  - **Sub-Total**: 31,901 | 21,827 | 12,168 | 21,474  
  - **Indirect Expenses**: 37,906 | 37,844 | 49,192 | 39,788  
- **General Fund Subsidy**: $6,005 | $16,017 | $37,024 | $18,314  

#### 24.03 Torrey Pines Golf Course  
- **7545 Rentals and Concessions**: 40,685 | 44,658 | 46,000 | 48,000  
- **7772 Fees**: 324,908 | 335,799 | 336,900 | 343,200  
  - **Total Revenue**: 365,593 | 380,457 | 382,900 | 391,200  
  - **Less Direct Expenses**: 241,051 | 281,775 | 278,112 | 276,302  
  - **Sub-Total**: 124,542 | 98,682 | 104,788 | 114,898  
  - **Less Indirect Expenses**: 38,317 | 46,361 | 50,562 | 50,024  
- **Return to General Fund**: 86,225 | 52,321 | 54,226 | 64,874  

**Golf Division Summary**  
- **Total Revenue**: 565,805 | 575,325 | 581,400 | 598,100  
  - **Less Total Direct Expenses**: 409,362 | 454,816 | 464,444 | 461,728  
  - **Sub-Total**: 156,443 | 120,509 | 116,956 | 136,372  
  - **Less Total Indirect Expenses**: 76,223 | 84,223 | 99,754 | 89,812  
- **Total Return to General Fund**: 80,220 | 36,304 | 17,202 | 46,560  

---  
1. Indirect expense includes maintenance and improvements performed by Public Works, plus social security, group insurance, compensation insurance and retirement.  
2. Does not include $5,000 annual payment to Utilities Department for rental of San Carlos Golf Course.  
3. Does not include lease income from Torrey Pines Inn.
### GOLF DIVISION

#### Work Unit

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Balboa Park Golf Course</th>
<th>Torrey Pines Golf Course</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. No. of Rds. Played</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. 9-Hole Course</td>
<td>$93,083</td>
<td>$64,534</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. 18-Hole Course</td>
<td>$51,082</td>
<td>$64,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$144,165</strong></td>
<td><strong>$154,784</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Last Year</strong></td>
<td><strong>51,082</strong></td>
<td><strong>5,671</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>This Year</strong></td>
<td><strong>$51,082</strong></td>
<td><strong>$6,153</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>This Month</strong></td>
<td><strong>$5,940</strong></td>
<td><strong>$8,890</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. Income from Rds. Played</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. 9-Hole Course</td>
<td>$61,844.00</td>
<td>$64,534</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. 18-Hole Course</td>
<td>$65,103.00</td>
<td>$64,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Monthly Ticket Sales</td>
<td>$31,927.50</td>
<td>$26,835</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$178,874.50</strong></td>
<td><strong>$155,519</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Last Year</strong></td>
<td><strong>$60,146.50</strong></td>
<td><strong>$5,671</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>This Year</strong></td>
<td><strong>$97,202.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>$6,153</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>This Month</strong></td>
<td><strong>$8,463.25</strong></td>
<td><strong>$8,890</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3. No. of Reservation Tournaments</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>76</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>77</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Report for Month June, 1969

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Last Year</th>
<th>This Year</th>
<th>This Month</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. No. of Rds. Played</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. 9-Hole Course</td>
<td>$151,417.75</td>
<td>$150,948.00</td>
<td>$14,083.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. 18-Hole Course</td>
<td>$130,748.25</td>
<td>$130,507.50</td>
<td>$12,959.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. 9-Hole Rounds</td>
<td>$30,735.50</td>
<td>$28,089.25</td>
<td>$2,420.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Monthly Ticket Sales</td>
<td>$27,740.50</td>
<td>$28,803.50</td>
<td>$2,408.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$340,642.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>$338,348.25</strong></td>
<td><strong>$31,871.00</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Last Year</strong></td>
<td><strong>$14,215.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>$12,104.50</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2,224.00</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>This Year</strong></td>
<td><strong>$12,959.50</strong></td>
<td><strong>$12,104.50</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2,312.00</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>This Month</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2,420.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2,312.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>$13,794</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3. No. of Reservation Tournaments</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>136</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>139</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Report of

COMMUNITY SERVICES

Councilman: Leonard Johnson

Staff: Marc Stragier
Chief Walter Nemetz
George Ianella
Fire Chief Lou Witzeman

Citizens: Sam Childs, Hoby Morris, Beth Guild, Kenneth Hoyt,
Edward Outhouse, Richard Simmon, Wendy Bochek,
Lou Jekel, Peter Paster, Father Wilfred Stewart
RECOMMENDATIONS

THE COMMUNITY SERVICE STEP COMMITTEE, on the basis of a thorough review of the policies and practices and of many ideas and proposals for improving them, respectfully submits the following recommendations.

A. REFUSE COLLECTION


   The Committee has been impressed with the significant contribution that the City of Scottsdale is making to the field of municipal management with its residential collection mechanization experiment. The Committee feels that the work will produce a system which will provide substantial savings and improvement in service. The City should continue to work with the Federal Government to continue the experiment and to expand its application to the community. Additionally, the City should pursue the development of additional experimental work to improve efficiency of collection and to develop a means for classifying waste so it can be converted to a raw material, as well as other developmental work.

   Specifically, the Committee feels that grant requests should be considered for the following purposes:

   a) Containerization of the remainder of our single family residences. This will include the following items:

      1. 4000 ea. 400-gallon containers for families living on alleys  $320,000
      2. 4000 ea. 80-gallon containers for families with curb collection service  140,000
      3. 4 Barrel Snatcher-type collection vehicles  150,000

      $610,000

   b) Transfer trailers to serve the refuse collection vehicles. These will permit the collection fleet to expand its collection capability by providing a simple, efficient transport of refuse to the landfill. This will include the following items:
1. 3 ea. 100 cubic yard transfer trailers $90,000
2. 1 ea. Tractor to serve the above 15,000
3. Conversion of 6 collection vehicles to accommodate the trailer transfer system 60,000

$165,000

c) Classification of waste material. This experiment proposes to experiment with various air magnetic and other classification systems to separate refuse into many of its various components -- wood, paper, metal, vegetation, organic waste, etc. Each of these may then be further processed to create reusable materials. A very general estimate of the costs would include some of the following:

1. Purchase and installation of the equipment for grinding and shredding $100,000
2. Purchase and installation of equipment for air and magnetic separation $100,000
3. Operation of the facility to produce raw materials for further experimentation for each year, at $50,000 per year $150,000

$350,000

d) Classification of sweeper waste. This work would separate sweepings into the sand and gravel which could be salvaged and used for construction or repair of alleys, and streets, and other purposes, and into the waste materials including dust, dirt and organic waste.

1. Experimental work to determine feasibility $7,000
2. Construction and installation of prototype equipment $3,000

$10,000

e) The experiment under way in the City to use plastic refuse can liners should be expanded and continued. If they prove to be a preferred level of service, then the work of mechanizing collection and offering the service at cost to homeowners should be developed further.

2. Containerize the single family residential area of the City. The Committee urges that containers be provided and the mechanized system made available to all of the residences in the Community. Should the Federal Government be unwilling to finance this program, the Committee feels that the Council should undertake the containerization on its own.
3. Consider various means to raise additional funds to provide the containerization. The Committee feels that the Council can make a decision on the best means of providing the needed funds. We would, however, wish to offer these considerations:

a) Service charge. The Committee has been surprised to learn that the refuse collection system for both residential and commercial generators is either entirely or substantially subsidized by property taxes. The Committee considers that, at the time the Council authorizes a program to provide containers, and a substantially improved level of service, the citizens might more readily accept service charges. Accordingly, if the Council should feel that service fees will ever be charged, they may wish to include the charges with the installation program. The fees could easily be adjusted to reflect actual costs. A rough estimate of the rather substantial revenues that might become available through this means would be:

- 17,000 single family dwellings at $2.00 each per month
- 3,000 apartment and townhouse units with commercial containers at $1.50 each unit per month
- 700 commercial generators who would pay for subsidized service, 1st 3 yards twice per week at $5 per yard per month

Total estimated revenue per year $588,000

The Committee feels that, in any case, the commercial charges should be increased as discussed. The Committee does not feel that Commercial refuse collection should be subsidized.

b) Increase property tax. Paying for the refuse collection system by increasing the property tax would have the advantage of providing for the additional costs on a tax deductible basis. That is, citizens could deduct on their individual income tax increased property tax whereas service charges would not be deductible except for commercial generators. In this connection, a tax increase of about 75¢ which would represent about 6% of the present tax rate, would be needed to produce an income of $600,000, equivalent to that discussed above.

4. Improve information distribution pertaining to refuse collection services, especially for newcomers.

The Committee feels that newcomers should receive more attention and information about their new City. It has observed that
new citizens often object strongly to City procedures and practice because they don't understand them. New citizens often fail to appreciate and use the many services and advantages available in the community. The Committee feels, therefore, that the Council should develop a comprehensive program employing several people full time to meet and greet new citizens and to help them make their homes here. In addition to explaining the refuse, sewage, police, fire, library and other public services, the representatives should also explain the Master Plan and its implications for the neighborhood, explain the future use and development of neighboring property and traffic facilities.

The Committee recognizes that such a program might be expensive, but feels that it would pay off in improved community spirit and public relations.

The Committee has found that at least 200 new families have entered the community each month for the past couple of years. Three full time personnel would be needed to carry on an aggressive program at that rate. Considering the needed space, equipment, publications and other materials, costs would approximate, $30,000 per year.

5. Collect refuse from commercial generators at night. This would create minor problems at the landfill, but would substantially improve efficiency of operation and make some contribution to reduced traffic congestion. Collection routes should be routed and planned to create a minimum disturbance in residential areas.

6. Clean up alleys and containers. The new mechanized system will produce substantial savings. The Committee feels that some of these savings should be used to install a program to regularly clean and sanitize containers. They should also be used to set up a regular program for thoroughly cleaning, regrading, graveling and sterilizing alleys. These services will encourage residents to keep their alleys clean and attractive.
Private Utilities

The Committee is concerned about the problems created by builders who bury utilities on lots which are encountered and must be moved by homeowners who construct swimming pools, patios, plant trees or undertake construction in their backyard area. The Committee recommends that the following requirements be considered and adopted:

1. At least 50% of the rear yard area should be required to be kept free and clear of any utilities, either above or underground.

2. Prior to issuance of the occupancy permit, builders should be required to file an As-built drawing showing the location of all underground utility services. The drawing should be microfilmed and retained for examination by future owners.

3. Telephone services should not be exposed to vandals on the outside of buildings. The Council should work toward giving assurance that burglars or others cannot easily interrupt telephone services.

Street Lights

The Council should develop a set of policies for installation of street lighting in the community. A program considering the following recommendations should be developed:

1. Intersections of arterial streets should be adequately lighted as a matter of first priority.

2. Intersections of arterial streets with collector streets should be lighted.

3. Intersections of collector streets should be lighted.

4. Arterial streets should be lighted between intersections.

5. New developments with frontage of more than 250' on arterial or collector streets should be required to install street lighting in accordance with a master street lighting plan, and to sign a petition for operation and maintenance.

6. The Council should encourage petitions for creation of new street lighting districts.
7. The Council should undertake a program to transfer street lighting, now or later, to be paid for by the City to street lighting districts. Arterial lighting in addition to the normal residential level of lighting should be paid for by the City.

Water System

The Committee feels that the Council should accelerate its program to acquire water companies and, particularly, that it should work toward acquisition of those companies which are now small, but which have prospects for considerable expansion. The Committee also feels that those water companies which have created the most problems for their customers should be acquired as soon as possible.

The Committee has made a crude estimate of the value of each of these companies:

1. Ocotillo $ 120,000.00
2. Mockingbird $ 270,000.00
3. Desert Springs $ 250,000.00
4. Indian Bend $2,200,000.00
5. Phoenix $5,000,000.00

The Committee also recommends that the Council work with the State Legislature with a view toward increasing the control of local jurisdictions over public utilities. The Committee would hope that the State might require the Corporation Commission to obtain concurrence, or at least the recommendation of local jurisdictions before taking action on a franchise within, or within three miles of any incorporated cities.

Sewer System

The Committee feels that plans for growth of the sewerage system are adequate. The use of sewer service charges as a source of funds for capital improvements is objectionable and the Committee would recommend that these charges be reduced if adequate funds could be provided on some other basis. If interest rates should make it practical to sell bonds, the Committee would recommend reduction of charges.
Recommendations: STEP Committee
Capital Improvements and Fire Protection

A. Fire Hydrants: As discussed with the Committee, there are a number of possible formulae on which to figure the community's hydrating needs, depending on the eventual standards to be established in part through problems encountered in the grading of the city by the Arizona Fire Rating Bureau. The Department and the City believe that 1320-foot spacing is adequate in residential areas with the fire fighting technology being developed. Conventional standards call for installation of hydrants at 660-foot spacing in residential areas and at approximately 330-foot spacing in commercial areas. We tentatively subscribe to the recommended commercial spacing but not, certainly, to the residential spacing.

At the present time, to hydrant the entire developed portion of the community to 1320-foot spacing involves the installation of approximately 110 fire hydrants. Another 220, approximately, will be required to bring the existing developed commercial areas to 330-foot spacing. Estimating installation at $700 per hydrant, there is thus an acknowledged need for 330 fire hydrants at an estimated cost of.......................... $231,000.00

Commitment of the community to this program at this time could have an affect on the impending grading if this commitment were in an irrevocable form acceptable to the Fire Rating Bureau.

Installation of the intermediate hydrants--the 660-foot units--involves approximately 558 additional hydrants, at $700 per hydrant, which would cost the City $390,600 additional. Importance of establishment of the 1320-foot criterion is quite obvious when this figure is developed.

While we suggest firm inclusion of only the $231,000 figure at the present time, some consideration of the possibility of additional funding must be made.

B. Fire Stations: We recommend inclusion of two additional stations in the STEP program. They should be located, generally, in the area of Jackrabbit and Scottsdale Roads, and on or near the Airport. We believe the stations should have truck room area of approximately 1200 square feet and space for living quarters, etc., of approximately 1000 square feet. The existing station
was built for about $17 per square foot; we would estimate current costs of about $21 per square foot, or, for two stations................................................................. $46,000.00

Land, if available at the airport, would presumably have a negligible cost; however, land for the Jackrabbit Road location might be estimated in the neighborhood of...... 16,000.00

Equipping the buildings (communications is probably the heaviest single item of cost) should approximate $6,000 per building, or a total of.............................. 12,000.00

C. Training Grounds: We recommend expansion of the existing drill grounds through purchase or construction of the following:

1. Fencing, to slow down existing problems of pilferage and mischief............................. 1,000.00

2. Installation of paving of ½ of the drill grounds.......................................................... 3,334.00

3. Installation of flammable liquid pits, drafting pit, related items.................................. 2,500.00

4. Installation of thermocouples, recording equipment, for existing drill structure............. 5,000.00

5. Installation of minimal night lighting to improve safety of evening drills...................... 2,000.00

We believe most of the above items are self-explanatory. In essence, we suggest improved equipment for training on flammable liquids fires, for securing the drill grounds, for making it safer. Installation of the thermocouples and recording equipment (Item 4) would make it possible for us to record temperatures inside the structure during fires, thus evaluating various fire attack techniques and the characteristics of different types of fires.

D. Existing Building: We believe it would be prudent to contemplate provision of additional space in the existing Central Fire Station. This could be done by roofing, flooring and partitioning the existing interior patio or by construction of an addition. Either way, we believe, the cost would be in the neighborhood of.............................................. 8,000.00
This would provide additional space for existing office functions, a small laboratory and shop. Except for some laboratory equipment, furnishings would be built by the existing crew of men or come from the existing plant. We would estimate equipment would not exceed the sum of... $1,500.00

February 23, 1970

POLICE SERVICE

In order of priority, the following recommendations are set forth:

I. New Police Headquarters and Court Facility

Data: The original Police-Court-Council facility of 8,205 square feet, was constructed in approximately 1961; 2600 square feet added in 1964, providing for a total existing facility of 10,805 square feet.

It is obvious that at the time of the original planning for the facility, very little foresight was employed. The rapid growth of the city, as well as the police force, soon made it necessary to add additional floor space primarily used as administrative office space and a property room. Even in 1964, when the addition was constructed, it was realized that because of the continual rapid growth of the city and department, that the facility would soon be inadequate. However, the lack of available funds precluded any further expansion.

Within the original facility was a combination Council Chambers and Courtroom. Prior to the occupation of the new City Hall, the combination Court-Courtroom was in frequent use for Council meetings, commission meetings and board meetings, as well as being utilized during the daytime hours as the City Court. Subsequent to the occupation of the new City Hall, this large room is used almost exclusively for court hearings.

The present room used for daily roll call, as well as police academy operations, was originally designed and built to be a drunk tank. Conversion of a concrete and metal drunk tank to a classroom has left much to be desired. Temperature control is bad, acoustics very poor, and the size of the room precludes a class of more than 20.
There is considerable loss of usable space in the present facility in unnecessary hallways. The roof leaks with every rain and the refrigeration and heating are totally inadequate, which cause very poor working conditions for office personnel.

During the night and morning hours, the Patrol Watch Commander is the supervising officer of the facility, and in no way is he capable of providing immediate needed supervision to the Communications Operations or the area in which arrestees are brought in to be processed, nor the jail in which prisoners are incarcerated.

Covered area to store property and evidence is totally inadequate, evidenced by the fact that much property and evidence must be stored in jail cells. Bicycles are stored outdoors, exposed to the weather and deteriorate rapidly from the time they come into our possession and are sold at auction, six months to one year later.

Approximately two years ago, the existing deficiencies in the present police-court facility were recognized and an architect was employed to draft plans for remodeling and addition to the facility. The remodeling plans called for redesign of the total existing facility, except for the jail, (total area of 10,805 square feet), and new construction of approximately 23,000 square feet. It was determined at the time of this planning that the facility would be adequate for approximately the next twenty (20) years.

The committee believes that while the proposed remodeling and new addition would create a more workable and more efficient facility, its total adequacy would still be lacking and that the functional use would not be as efficient as a totally new facility and the cost would be approximately the same.

Recommendation: It is the committee's recommendation that a new police and court facility be planned and constructed on the Civic Center property, or as near as possible, and that it be started as soon as possible.

Cost: The estimated cost for the proposed new facility would be in the neighborhood of $500,000.
Police Academy

Data: The committee is aware that the present Scottsdale Police Academy facility is housed in an abandoned and converted drunk tank located in the present police facility.

The committee is also aware that preliminary steps have been taken to propose to the State Justice Planning Agency that Scottsdale be the home of Region II Law Enforcement Officers Training Academy. If the regional police training academy is located in the City of Scottsdale, as a separate facility, it would eliminate the need for an academy facility in the proposed police headquarters building.

The City presently owns adequate acreage adjacent to the Scottsdale Municipal Airport and it is the committee's understanding that such land would be made available as part of the matching funds that may be obtainable under the Omnibus Crime Bill to construct the police academy.

Recommendation: It is the committee's recommendation that the program of locating the regional training academy in Scottsdale be vigorously pursued. (In the event Scottsdale is not selected as the regional training academy site, the committee recommends that favorable consideration be given to the construction of a modified Scottsdale Police Academy in the aforementioned location).

Cost: In the range of $450,000 for construction and necessary equipment.

Police Assistant Program

Data: It is the committee's opinion that the implementation of this proposed program will relieve the uniformed patrol officers of considerable clerical duty that is presently required of them and permit this time saved to be spent in the areas of traffic enforcement and crime prevention. Following is a letter from the City Manager to Senator Barry Goldwater relative to this subject, and the Senator's response:
Recommendation: The committee recommends full Council support in the obtaining of the Federal grant to fund the Police Assistant pilot program and support its implementation at the earliest possible date.

Continued Education for Police Officers

Data: The committee recognizes the need for continued education beyond high school for law enforcement officers. The committee further recognizes the present efforts by the Junior Colleges to provide academic studies in the law enforcement field, but are aware that such achievement leads only to a two (2) year Associate in Arts degree.

The committee is also fully aware that a deficiency in the Public or Police Administration undergraduate program exists at Arizona State University.

Recommendation: The committee recommends that efforts be made to encourage the university administration to adopt a curriculum for students that would lead to a four (4) year degree in Law Enforcement Administration or Public Administration, with a major in Police Science.
February 3, 1970

The Honorable Barry Goldwater
240 Senate Office Building
The Capitol
Washington, D.C. 20510

Dear Senator Goldwater:

The Scottsdale Police Department, as well as other police departments, continually encounters the problems of either insufficient budgetary sources or inability to recruit sufficient numbers of qualified candidates to fill authorized positions to meet the ever-increasing public demands for police service and to cope with the spiraling crime rate.

To solve this problem we propose to revolutionize the major portion of the uniformed officer's routine assignment and responsibility, i.e., taking crime and accident reports. Everyone agrees that report taking occupies the bulk of the officer's time during his tour of duty and minimizes the available time that needs to be spent on crime deterrence and traffic law enforcement.

Let us face facts. A large number of police reports are generated for insurance purposes only. Is it necessary to have highly trained police officers do rather routine clerical work? We think not, and have submitted a request for a nominal Federal grant to prove our point.

We believe that intelligent young men and women, properly trained, can efficiently and adequately investigate and report such police oriented incidents as thefts, burglaries, missing persons, vehicle accidents and many others.

We propose to recruit from the ranks of the Junior College police science majors. However, we suggest that recruitment need not be limited to this level in other areas. Minority group members and certain physically handicapped individuals could be trained equally as well.

The title of our proposed pilot program is "Police Assistant." The assistant will have no power of arrest and in cases of traffic accident violations, he will proceed against the violator by summons.

We have initiated a grant request through Governor Williams' office for Federal monies under the U.S. Department of Transportation in the amount of $34,742 to implement
this pilot program for four (4) police assistants, at salaries less than that paid to officers, and the necessary equipment to operate the program.

Attached is a copy of our grant request and your considered support for the approval of said grant is respectfully requested.

Sincerely yours,

/s/ William V. Donaldson

William V. Donaldson
City Manager

(Response of Senator Goldwater is as follows:)

February 10, 1970

Mr. William V. Donaldson
City Manager
Scottsdale, Arizona

Dear Bill:

You guys are really running a think-tank down there to keep coming up with these innovative schemes.

The police assistant idea is inspired, and I have given your application my full endorsement. When I have some further word on its progress, I'll pass it on.

With best personal wishes,

/s/ Barry

Barry Goldwater
Supplementing the study of services provided by the City, the Committee has considered the corporation facilities operated by the City. The Committee found that the rental facility at Second Street is inadequate and much too small for the level of service it is expected to provide. It is also located so that it has a blighting influence on the downtown area. The Committee feels that this facility should be relocated and that the facility at Van Buren and 76th Street should be expanded along the relatively attractive lines that it has been started.

The Committee would offer the following recommendations for consideration:

1. Traffic Maintenance facility should be relocated to the Corporation Yard ........................................ $ 40,000

2. The Street Administrative and storage functions should be relocated ........................................ 80,000

3. Anticipating the City purchase Indian Bend Water Company and possibly other water companies in the foreseeable future, additional facilities should be provided to house the meter repair shop and to provide open storage for water system materials ........................................ 40,000

Air Pollution

Although the subject of air pollution does not fall into the category of any particular committee, this committee feels strongly about the vital and eminent problem.

The Committee feels that the City should endorse and implement, where possible, new county, regional, or federal standards and enforce existing controls, especially with respect to dust and toxic atmospheric pollutants.
Report of

COMMUNITY IMPROVEMENTS

Councilman: C. Ken Murray

Staff: Marc G. Stragier, L. B. Scacewater, Richard Pearce, Doug Hood

Citizens: Meredith Bushnell, Gerald Cook, Ralph Gordon, Leonard Huffman, Lawrence Lyman, Dan Waterstradt, Violet Parenteau, Joan Goodpaster, Wendy Bochek, Americo Carvalho, Charles Kalinowski, John Stanzel, Clarence Whalin, Art Frishman, Margaret Hopkins
GENERAL RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Wherever possible, the Council should obtain assistance from the Federal government for possible aids or grants on any or all of the projects.

2. Where land acquisition is necessary, the Council should first investigate purchasing land presently owned by Federal, state and county governments, rather than buying privately-owned property.

A. STORM DRAINS. The City is working with the engineering firm of Yost and Gardner to prepare a storm drain study. The study should provide a priority list of needed projects.

Recommendation: That the City adopt the Yost and Gardner plan with appropriate revisions incorporated with the Indian Bend Wash development and in the following areas:

1. Culvert and pump station at Thomas and the new Cross-Cut Canal.
3. Culvert at McDowell and through Papago Park.
4. Indian Bend Wash crossing at Thomas Road.
5. Make a recommendation that the City acquire right-of-way to construct earth channel from Chaparral to Salt River (including culvert improvement).
6. Storm drain with side canal at Chaparral to Hayden.
7. Chaparral, Camelback, Indian School and Thomas storm drains:
   a) Chaparral - 86th to Wash
   b) Camelback - 86th to Wash
   c) Indian School - 87th to Wash
   d) Thomas - 88th to Wash
8. Thomas - 76th to Wash (this project should be from Pinchot and 70th to Indian Bend Wash).

Include items (1) through (4) above in the Capital Improvements Budget for 1970-71.

As the City grows and develops we are finding an increasingly urgent need for the development of storm drainage facilities and are hoping that the Yost report will
provide a suitable plan for providing facilities in the city.

B. INDIAN BEND WASH. The Corps of Engineers proposed construction of a wide concrete-lined channel to carry the storm runoff in the Indian Bend Wash. After studying the matter, the City Council proposed the upstream construction of a reservoir which could be drained slowly by a relatively small earth and grass-lined channel. This later design is the so-called Erickson Plan for the development of the Indian Bend Wash. As in all other projects the city should make every possible effort to obtain Federal funds in implementing the Erickson Plan. However, if this is not possible, then the City ought to develop the Wash by providing its own funds.

Recommendation: That the Erickson Plan be adopted by the City Council with specific area develops as follows:

AREA 1. A minimum 40-acre lake and park will be developed, using the existing boundaries of the Arizona Canal. Access to the lake and park could be provided by riding trails located within the wash, or by providing some means of access through right-of-way in which public streets could be developed.

AREA 2. McDonald Drive to Chaparral Road. It was recommended that a 600-foot wide strip east of the wash be retained as a green belt and extend from McDonald Drive to Jackrabbit Road. The area east of the wash between Jackrabbit Road and Chaparral Road would be set aside for a 40-acre park and that a top priority be placed on land acquisition for the 40-acre park.

AREA 3. Chaparral Road to Camelback Road. This area is fairly well developed inasmuch as the Villa Monterey Golf Course is located in the middle of the wash and provides the desired green belt. The 40 acres directly west of the wash, north of Camelback and east of 76th Street, is a proposed high-rise development and as such, would require Site Plan approval and Design Review Board approval. It is expected that when the development is approved, the City would have some means of controlling the area directly west of the wash and it would be maintained as Open Space in addition to the 170' green belt channel.
AREA 4. Camelback Road to Thomas Road. Since this area has relatively little development, it was felt that this is one area in which the City could acquire the maximum amount of Open Space and thus provide the Green Belt concept. For this reason, it would seem possible that an irregular 600-foot-wide strip from Camelback extending beyond Indian School Road down to Earll Drive could be acquired. In some spaces the proposed Open Space could be reduced to approximately 200 feet. This would allow for development on both sides of the wash and could use an offsetting type of boundary instead of one 600-foot-wide strip bisecting the area. The area between Earll Drive and Thomas Road is partly acquired by the City and the Committee would recommend 200 feet as adequate.

AREA 5. Thomas Road to McDowell Road. As in Area 3, at this time we have approximately 85% of the wash developed or in conformity with the Open Space Plan. In this area, the wash goes through the existing Coronado Golf Course, Eldorado Park, which extends almost to McDowell, and a new pitch and putt golf course directly south of Thomas Road.

AREA 6. McDowell Road to Van Buren Street. This is in the Vista Del Camino subdivision and plans for redevelopment and design of the wash have already been started and will readily reflect the Open Space and Green Belt Concepts.

In lieu of the above 6 areas, the Committee is recommending that a 170' flood control channel be maintained, and that the 170' easement be considered a part of the recommended Green Belt area.

C. PUBLIC BUILDINGS. It is the recommendation of this Committee that a Master Plan be developed and adopted for the total development of the Civic Center complex. Federal funding for the study should be pursued and the study should begin immediately.

Many multi-purpose recreational facilities are needed in the community. A police training facility, neighborhood libraries, museums, branch fire stations, and additional facilities at the Corporation Yard to house the Street Maintenance Division should be provided, as the need arises. If the City purchases a water system, it will also need to provide shops and administrative spaces to support that function.

Recommendation: Two branch fire stations should be established. The first would be south of the Arizona Canal and east of the wash. This would always provide some fire protection for the
eastern section of the City during any flooding that might cut off the east side from the west. The second location would be in the vicinity of the Scottsdale Municipal Airport. In addition to serving the northern section of town, it would also provide a base of operations adjacent to the airport. Some consideration should be given to locating the second station in order to provide a well-balanced fire protection system for the airport and industrial park complex.

The existing police facilities should be expanded by implementing plans for the redevelopment of the existing police facilities. If new facilities are required it is recommended that they be located on property in the vicinity of the existing City Hall and Library complex and not on the same site.

Every effort should be made for the establishment of a permanent Scottsdale Policy Academy.

Incorporate a branch Public Works yard in the vicinity of the Airport to provide facilities for the Street Maintenance Division, and Refuse Division.

With the existing Library facilities, it is essential that branch libraries be developed and that more bookmobiles be added to the city to provide more comprehensive service for the entire community.

A performing arts complex and museum should be developed, preferably in the Civic Center area, which would house plays, light operas and other performing arts.

**D. PARKS.** The City of Scottsdale, for the past few years, has enjoyed an increasing amount of land set aside for the development of recreation facilities. As any community grows it becomes more apparent that the need for such open spaces be maintained. With this in mind, and considering our current level of parks, the Committee has made the following recommendations:

1. That the top priority for the parks program, as well as all other phases of our study, be the land acquisition. It was felt that since the premium of land is running high at this time, the more land we can acquire would insure the development of our parks system. When acquiring land for developing the park system a recommended guide to follow would be to use one acre of usable park land for every 100 population.

2. That the existing athletic fields be provided with adequate
lighting facilities and that this begin with the lighting of the Eldorado Park recreation facilities.

3. That the 100-acre McCormick Park be developed with facilities for horse shows, dog shows, and pony club exhibitions. Also, that a multi-use stadium be developed for baseball, football, field hockey, and other related uses; that a certain amount of land be set aside for camper and trailer facilities; that tennis courts, handball courts and shuffleboard courts be incorporated as well as other garden areas and related uses for park functions.

4. That the establishment of mini-parks be adopted and that they be interconnected by riding trails. The proposed riding trails would be developed in the Indian Bend Wash, and utilized to serve as a trunk line for the mini (pony)-park system and connected to the sunset trail system. Additional trail systems should extend along the cross-cut canal and throughout the northern portion of Scottsdale where one-acre zoning is predominant.

5. That the Parks Department work with the County and State in order to provide a facility at the northeast boundaries of the city for a combination gun, rifle and field archery range.

6. Presently there is one major swimming pool facility in Scottsdale. At our current growth rate it would be desirable to have a second major facility constructed in an appropriate area.