

Keep Sedona Beautiful
Membership Survey Report

ADOT Proposal for Continuous Roadway Lighting on SR 89A

August 2009

Background

The Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) has asked select parties, including Keep Sedona Beautiful, to provide “comments, concerns or issues” regarding ADOT plans to install continuous roadway lighting (76 to 128 Cobra-style lights on up to 50-foot poles) on West SR 89A between Airport and Dry Creek Roads. (A year ago, Sedona City Council directed ADOT to install this type of lighting.) The proposed lighting is standard big-city lighting, not the modest type of pedestrian sidewalk lights currently installed on SR 179 and in Uptown. The only place there is roadway lighting in Uptown and on SR 179 is at intersections and roundabouts.

ADOT defines the targeted stretch of roadway “as an ‘urban principal arterial’ roadway that serves as a primary transportation corridor to connect the central business districts of Sedona with the major suburban centers and the outlying rural areas.” According to the ADOT request, the project will be discussed “at one or more City Council meetings that will be open to public comment” this fall. The six-month installation of lights is scheduled to begin in summer 2011.

KSB issued the following initial response to the ADOT letter: “ADOT’s references to ‘urban principal arterial,’ ‘central business districts’ and ‘suburban centers’ are indications that this is being approached as a typical urban project. This comment period presents yet another opportunity for our community to provide ADOT with education about the impact of continuous roadway lighting and poles on our dark skies and red rock vistas. KSB welcomes the opportunity to engage in productive dialogue about realistic highway safety solutions that are in harmony with Sedona’s unique character as a small, rural town within the forest.”

To provide ADOT with an in-depth response, KSB conducted an online survey of its members this month.

Summary Results and Conclusions

Following are summary conclusions. Survey questions and detailed findings are reported in Attachment A.

- In a 10-day period, 49% of survey recipients (127 individuals) responded.
- Asked if they support ADOT plans to install continuous roadway lighting on SR 89A, 98% said “no.”

- On a scale of 1 (least likely) to 7 (most likely), respondents rated the likely effectiveness of the current ADOT proposal 1.6.
- On a scale of 1 (not important at all) to 7 (critically important), respondents rated the importance of preserving Sedona's dark night skies 6.8.
- According to 94% of respondents, the following statement most closely resembles their viewpoint about Sedona: "Sedona is a small town in the forest and must preserve this character, including the darkest possible night skies."
- On a scale of 1 (do not support at all) to 7 (support wholeheartedly), respondents rated the following possible safety solutions for SR 89A:
 - Continuous roadway lighting as proposed by ADOT (1.1)
 - Visually pleasing pedestrian barriers between the sidewalks and roadway in high-risk areas (4.7)
 - Continuous low-wattage sidewalk lighting (4.8)
 - Traffic light, crosswalk and associated street lights at Andante intersection (5.0)
 - Medians, with traffic turnouts at major intersections and other safe locations (5.2)
 - Stricter enforcement of Sedona lighting ordinance for properties along the roadway (6.5)
- Ninety-three percent of respondents believe ADOT should either: 1) hold separate public meetings with extensive opportunity for input (48.4%) or 2) revisit safety issues entirely, holding new public meetings (44.4%). Only two respondents (1.6%) said ADOT should proceed with current plans to meet only with the City Council, with limited public input.

Comment Highlights

Sixty-four respondents included detailed comments for ADOT's consideration. Thirty-six respondents provided additional comments associated with specific questions. (See Attachment B for all comments.) Following is a sampling of comments:

- Sedona is a small town in a rural area and must **preserve the character and spirit** of the area.
- **Follow the will of the people.** The facts do not support (that) continuous lighting will increase safety. There are (other) solutions...that will be a win-win opportunity.
- The standard urban major highway solution proposed by ADOT is wrong and wasteful. Moreover, it will move Sedona's main artery toward being **just another Scottsdale style strip...**
- The economy of Sedona runs on tourism, and access to the natural beauty of the area -- both during the day and at night -- are what drives tourism. I should know: I worked like a sled dog for 20 years to get here, with twice-a-year one-week visits to get a dose of sky and red rocks! This is also a **quality-of-life issue...**
- Creativity is what is needed, and honoring the wishes of Sedona's residents. **Dark skies inform our lifestyle here.** Additionally, tourists come to Sedona for dark skies, natural beauty and a sense of peace and calm we have here. Continuous lighting is incongruous with this and would leave Sedona poorer in many ways.
- The biggest hazard I repeatedly observe is **people trying to cross 89A DURING THE DAY** without bothering to walk a few steps to cross safely at signalized

intersections. They step out onto 89A willy-nilly, dodging cars, making traffic come to a screeching halt, causing accidents, and very nearly getting hit themselves....No one at Sedona City Hall or at ADOT has been able to explain to me how continuous roadway lighting addresses this and other DAYTIME safety issues.

- The signalized intersection at Andante should have been installed 3 years ago. That's the area of 3 of the (nighttime) pedestrian fatalities; the 4th was outside the corridor area. **84% of accidents are daytime**...lights do nothing for daytime accidents.
- I feel that **a few people** in power positions **were allowed to override the will of the people**....ADOT should recognize that 4 people in a city power position do not clearly represent what the majority of the people in Sedona really desire.
- While ADOT's solution might fit Phoenix, **it certainly has NO place in Sedona.**
- **Sedona is unique**, not like other urban communities!
- This Sedona issue presents ADOT **a chance to make a progressive, thoughtful and non-invasive solution** that does not do permanent damage to the Sedona character....We have a priceless natural wonder here in central Arizona - let's not have an unnatural decision spoil it.
- ADOT knows that the best solutions **focus on day-time remedies like medians**, as well as addressing the Andante intersection. ADOT, please don't destroy our rural community with big-city lights.
- I do not think anyone would consider installing lighting or guardrails or billboards on the rock formations or hiking trails, but the beauty and majesty of Sedona's night sky is just as much **a part of the magic of this area** as those things that are seen and enjoyed by residents and visitors in the daylight.
- I believe the report done by **the (city-appointed) special committee ... should be followed**. It was a comprehensive study on the issue and brought out the following: Continuous lighting, as proposed by ADOT, would NOT have any significant impact on the safety of 89A.
- We believe **input by all residents** of the greater Sedona area should be permitted on this important issue. It has been denied at Sedona City Council meetings. 89A is a state road which our tax dollars help maintain, and what Sedona proper decides to do with its lighting affects all of us living in this area! ... We are stunned that such a vast number of tall bright lights is even being considered, when there is much evidence that less lighting would prove safer with less glare. ...My husband and I understand that such lighting as is being proposed by ADOT is now being removed in areas of California because of its inefficiency. Please, please rethink this terrible decision...(Village of Oak Creek resident)
- Sedona **needs a context-sensitive solution** to pedestrian and driver safety. We deserve in West Sedona nothing less than the solutions that Uptown and (SR) 179 received.
- If Sedona is stripped of its peaceful, small town flavor, which include(s) its gorgeous night skies, **it becomes nothing more than another gas stop between Phoenix and Flagstaff.**

Survey Approach and Response

KSB members with a valid e-mail address (258) were notified about the survey on August 6, 2009. The 12-question survey was available online only via KSB's private

section on the Constant Contact website. During the survey period (Aug. 6-16, 2009), 127 individuals (49% of those surveyed) completed and submitted the survey. Survey-integrity protections allowed only one response per e-mail address to which the survey was sent. Thus, multiple KSB members in the same household are represented in the responses. The 258 e-mail addresses to which the survey was sent represent about 65% of all KSB member households. The 127 individual responses represent about 32% of all KSB member households, and comprise a statistically significant sampling of the KSB membership. Sixty-four respondents provided detailed commentary and input to share with ADOT. Thirty-six respondents provided additional comments associated with specific questions. All survey responses were confidential and all data and comments are reported anonymously.

About Keep Sedona Beautiful

Founded in 1972, KSB is a not-for-profit educational organization focused on embracing and enhancing community that is in harmony with the unique environment in which we reside. KSB “promotes conservation of the greater Sedona area, and, by all practical means, seeks to preserve the unique natural environment and to enhance the quality of life for future generations,” according to its mission. KSB is best known for its educational, community and recognition endeavors. For decades, hundreds of volunteer KSB Litter Lifters diligently have removed roadside debris and trash. KSB also sponsors free monthly lectures, scholarships, an annual photo contest, and an annual Awards of Excellence program to recognize environment-friendly business practices. At the same time, KSB members are at the forefront of issues critical to Preserving the WonderSM of Sedona. KSB is governed by a 20-member Board of Trustees.

Attachment A: Detailed Survey Questions and Results

Total Unique Responses: 127

1. Do you support continuous roadway lighting on West SR 89A as proposed by ADOT and described above? (Required response)
 - Yes (1) (0.6%)
 - No (124) (97.6%)
 - I don't know (2) (1.8%)

2. To what extent do you believe that the ADOT continuous roadway lighting solution addresses all the safety issues raised by our community? (1 = Least likely, 7 = Most likely) (Optional response)
127 responses; Rating: 1.6

3. Please indicate your level of support for this safety solution: Installation of a traffic signal, pedestrian crosswalk and associated street lights at the Andante intersection. (1 = Do not support at all, 7 = Support wholeheartedly) (Optional response)
126 responses; Rating: 5.0

4. Please indicate your level of support for this safety solution: Continuous low-wattage sidewalk lighting (like that found in Uptown and on SR 179). (1 = Do not support at all, 7 = Support wholeheartedly) (Optional response)
124 responses; Rating: 4.8

5. Please indicate your level of support for this safety solution: Medians, with traffic turnouts at major intersections and other safe locations. (1 = Do not support at all, 7 = Support wholeheartedly) (Optional response)
126 responses; Rating: 5.2

6. Please indicate your level of support for this safety solution: Visually pleasing pedestrian barriers between the sidewalks and roadway in high-risk areas. (1 = Do not support at all, 7 = Support wholeheartedly) (Optional response)
126 responses; Rating: 4.7

7. Please indicate your level of support for this safety solution: Stricter enforcement of the Sedona lighting ordinance for properties along the roadway to reduce glare and improve visibility for drivers. (1 = Do not support at all, 7 = Support wholeheartedly) (Optional response)
126 responses; Rating: 6.5

8. Please indicate your level of support for this safety solution: Continuous roadway lighting as proposed by ADOT (between 76 and 128 Cobra-style lights and poles, up to 50 feet high, that illuminate the entire roadway). (1 = Do not support at all, 7 = Support wholeheartedly) (Optional response)
127 responses; Rating: 1.1

9. Please select the statement that most closely reflects your viewpoint about Sedona. (Please select only one.) (Optional response; 127 total responses)

- Sedona is a small town in the forest and must preserve this character, including the darkest possible night skies. *(119 responses, 93.7%)*
- Sedona is a city and must provide urban features such as bright lights, even if these affect the natural environment in which the community is situated. *(1 response, 0.8%)*
- I have another point of view. *(7 responses, 5.5%)*

10. Please rate the importance of preserving Sedona's dark night skies. (1 = Least important 7 = Most important) (Optional response)
125 responses; Rating: 6.8

11. Please indicate your preference for community input on ADOT's final plans.

(Please select only one.) (Optional response; 124 total responses)

- As currently planned by ADOT: Presentation at one or more City Council meetings; limited public input *(2 responses, 1.6%)*
- Hold separate public meetings with extensive opportunity for public input *(60 responses, 48.4%)*
- Present to City Council only; no public input *(0 responses, 0%)*
- Don't present ADOT plans; revisit the safety issue entirely; hold new public meetings *(55 responses, 44.4%)*
- I have another preference *(7 responses, 5.6%)*

Attachment B: Detailed Comments from Respondents

Verbatim Comments (Edited* for Anonymity) Received as Part of KSB Survey Conducted Aug. 6-16, 2009

*Typographical errors have not been corrected

Comments Regarding Question #9: "Please select the statement that most closely reflects your viewpoint about Sedona." Response: "I have another point of view."

Visitors do not understand that 89A is the ONLY direct route through West Sedona. There are not enough pedestrian crosswalks or traffic lights along 89A to accomodate the amount of traffic which comes uses this route daily. Shielded, low lighting in targeted (high risk) areas seems reasonable, so long as it in no way affects our dark skies and residential neighborhoods adjacent to the highway. Also, local businesses should be held to the same standard to reduce lighting overspill.

Our scenery (including our night skies) is our most valuable asset and must be preserved, regardless of whether we are a small town or an urban area.

If push comes to shove, then solar and LED lighting should be considered.

Only way I would support side-walk lighting is if it were "on demand" -- someone walking turns lights on. Not to have them on all the time. Thank you for offering us a chance to voice our opinions about our home. Bless your hearts

Sedona is a small town in a rural area and must preserve the character and spirit of the area. Preservation includes dark skies where appropriate as well as safety measures to protect the safety of residents and visitors alike. Measures exist that meet both these goals and should be explored as alternatives to blaring lights.

Why those damn bright lights way up in the sky at the roundabouts? Some reasonable low lighting is all that is needed, lighting to show that there is a traffic circle coming, nothing more.

Why make it all or nothing, low elevation and power lights would be okay. It is just those high bright things that light up the sky that I object to.

Keep The Sedona envirmment small townish. I do not want it to become a smaller version of Prescott.

If this lighting is installed it will be a huge waste of time and money to solve a problem that has been taken care of by reducing the speed limit and enhanced police patrols. We will be contributing to the loss of a unique environment. It's unfortunate that there have been fatalities in one area, but intrusive, expensive lights will not change the drinking habits of people. We all need to be personally responsible and proactive in safety matters. You can't protect dysfunctional behavior.

Don't want continuous lighting at all, spoils night time view and atmosphere of Sedona

The 89 A Safety Panel was convened at the request of the Sedona City Council and worked for one year to make educated recommendations regarding safety. The Panel found that lowering the speed limit, installing medians, addressing the Andante intersection, and considering on-demand pedestrian lighting all contributed to increased safety, based on research data, whereas installing lights did not. I agree that Sedona needs to have dark skies and a rural character. Innovate and protect6 our town.

People come to live and visit Sedona for the very special views and character that it has had both day and night. Do not let special business and private interests irrevocably ruin it as has happened in so many other lovely places. Greed in the guise of "public benefit" is too prevalent. Let us speak up and stop it here now before it is too late.

Sedona is/was a typical small western town, and should strive to maintain that image. Therefore, continuous roadway lighting should not be considered in any context. I will support lights at Andante because we do have to have safe auto traffic, but continuous roadway lighting does not do anything for safety in my viewpoint. People love a little western town, let them see it as it is, not artificially lighted with big unnecessary obtrusive light poles and lights.

Sedona is a unique type of city. Those who would oppose supporting the darkest possible night skies need to spend a few years somewhere where virtually NO stars are seen. When they return to Sedona, these people will begin to truly appreciate what a gem we have and MUST preserve! The set of facts (presented before the survey started) clearly shows LIGHTS ARE NOT THE ANSWER TO OUR PROBLEM.

How many of us have gazed at the night time starry sky and felt the presence of something majical,

mystical and holy? When humans loose touch with the natural world, we loose touch with our inter-connectedness and to eachother.

Increased lighting has already statistically proven not to be a deterrent in pedestrian accidents. It would however spend money that could be used elsewhere, and decrease the small town atmosphere.

Stop light with pedestrian walkway should be put near Circle K where the accidents occur.

Yes, Sedona is a small town in the forest, but it must also address safety issues with appropriate lighting as it grows. Other low-level lighting options are available for safe Highway 89A crossings.

As a resident of West Sedona who enjoys both walking and biking to close-in businesses and public facilities, I strongly recommend that the 89a corridor be treated as West Sedona's Main St.,and not as an urban arterial roadway.

Please do not turn Sedona into a little Scottsdale in northern Arizona!

"Dark skies" cities are essential to our environment and natural resources preservation. Sedona is a growing city and can be a leader in its commitment "dark skies" for a) residents, b) guests and c) the environment.

What makes this short stretch of roadway dangerous is not the roadway but the availability of liquor in the neighboring store and the nature of the surrounding population. As long as people, already drunk are allowed to buy another bottle of booze, then some additional light on the road will be needed, but just in this area.

need to stop pedestrians trying to cross mid-block. Lights won't stop stupidity. Put in a few crosswalks w/ signs advising that pedestrians IN THE CROSSWALK have the right of way. It's a very long way between signalized intersections and pedestrians just want to get to something right across the street. Where there is a hotel or motel on one side and a restaurant across the street sounds like a good place to start. Big lights will ruin the whole atmosphere of Sedona

We pass through that corridor frequently when in Sedona. There is absolutely no need for the cobra style lights & poles. We also have a residence in Rockaway Beach, Queens, just opposite JFK...now even in that is an urban setting that needs lights because of the high volume of traffic, both vehicular & pedestrian (which include some personal safety issues). Please don't destroy the very beautiful character of Sedona for both the people, wildlife population, & vegetation. Thank you.

Comments Regarding Question #11: "Please indicate your preference for community input on ADOT's final plans." Response: "I have another preference."

It seems unreasonable that the suggestions made by the original committee appointed by the city were not used. These were good solutions which have been ignored. Why do this all over again? Their ideas were well founded and doable...use them!

My second choice -- if we can not avoid ADOT's plans -- is to hold separate public meetings with extensive public input. This ADOT solution is costly, ineffective and unsafe; it must be amended or thrown out entirely and start over.

public meetings which provide the necessary input from our community is the way to go

I believe it would be appropriate to revisit this issue: in the past neither ADOT nor our publicly elected officials have listened to or honored the opinions of the residents of Sedona. Yes, safety at Andante with a traffic light. The bars that caused the deaths are no longer there so the whole reason for extended night lights is erroneous. Thank you for listening to we the people.

Any approach is for 'naught' if ADOT refuses to listen to community. ADOT should have an opportunity to present to the community - not just City Council. Limited or no public input is a "shame on you" approach by both ADOT and CC.

Accept the recommendations of the Safety Panel, as ADOT was prepared to do before the City Council asked ADOT to abandon this course of action and proceed as if Sedona were an urban location. Base action on research and fact regarding safety, and not on financial ability alone. Find ways to raise money if necessary, but do it right. We need public forums to air these issues in a democratic way, with full freedom of speech.

I would prefer a roundabout similar to Uptown with those lights at Andante,if possible, as it not only makes it safer due to forced slower traffic, it avoids unnecessary idling while waiting for a light to change.

Electronically submit ADOT's plan for public viewing, allow time for input to our Councilmembers via phone, email, and face-to-face. Allow City Council to vote at a regularly scheduled meeting and as directed by the majority of the citizenry and their own consciences.

Engage objective lighting experts, such as Chris Lugenbuhl, to educate the public in a series of workshops on how correct lighting can improve safety and how incorrect lighting can reduce safety. Then gather public comments for ADOT, and inform ADOT that they work for the citizens of Arizona (Sedona included) and not the other way around.

The council needs to know that Sedona does not want or need the street these lights. More public hearings will drive this message home. The street light at Andante offers an interim remedy for the the long distance between safe crossings for pedestrians. West Sedona is not a highway town on the way to Sedona as was in 1972 when I moved to the area. Today it is a thriving, vibrant community that will be better served with the designation and subsequent treatment of it's main st. as a true Main

There has been plenty of "community input", enough that the idea of installing lights should be abandoned.

How about a debate held publicly, with say two council members, two Sedona ploice , two ADOT four Sedona residential property owners

The people of Sedona voted for the dark sky initiative. Follow the will of the people. The facts do not support continous lighting will increase safety. There are solutions above that will be a win win opportuniy.

General Comments (Question #12): "Please provide any comments you wish to share with ADOT. KSB will compile and report these anonymously."

We purchased a home here because of the beautiful scenery and especially the dark skies. Shortly afterwards I purchased a very high end telescope in San Diego for here. Everyone at the store there told me how truly lucky I was to be able to use the telescope in such a perfect location. This was from employees and customers alike. All know the dark skies draw of Sedona. I have no intention to lose the dark skies in Sedona without a protest. Thank you

I have noticed that since I acquired a new vehicle (2007 model), that its headlights make the street in West Sedona more visible than in the previous car. Maybe others believe the same. And with the advent of more recent models on the streets, that may help with the visibility, and with the 76 lights currently projected to be installed, could we then have too much lighting? Our dark skies should be preserved. I do not see how 76 lights on 50 foot poles will preserve our dark skies!

Communities in which ADOT projects are being completed should have a "major say" in design and development of those projects. A good example of an ADOT fiasco is the Oak Creek pedestrian bridge!

Please preserve the small community atmosphere and dark skies in Sedona. Lower speed limits and pedestrian crosswalks can make the roadway safe without the intrusion of high poles and bright lights.

The standard Urban major highway solution proposed by ADOT is wrong and wasteful. Moreover, it will move Sedona's main artery toward being just another Scottsdale style strip than the special place to visit. The solutions in place seem to have met the ststed problem- safety of pedestrains. The addition of an interesection at Andante will complete the package. Limited sidewalk lighting in very dark areas may be appropriate for all. Don't waste taxpayer money on these huge lights. After all, that's really why they are propose- they're available and Federal (TAXPAYER) millions will blindly pay for them vs local or State funding.

People come from all over to Sedona because of its beauty. Installing continuous lighting as suggested by ADOT will not only deter from the beauty that brings people to this city, which I am told is the second most visited place in AZ behind the Grand Canyon, but it will do nothing to really address the problem. Accidents happen because people do as they please and do not obey the exisiting traffric controls. Putting continuous lights on 89A will only hurt the community, not help it. Putting a traffic signal at Airport and other stritgic areas is a good plan but the lights need to be sheilded and be like the ones in uptown. This is a small town that caters to many and we should not loose site of this and ADOT needs to be aware of this in all of its decisions. Lighting up our sky will not help.

I do not believe that adding lights at night will make any difference to road safety in Sedona. Most accidents have occurred during daylight hours; the night road deaths were from intoxication from bars that no longer exist. Reducing the speed limit has helped. Thank you.

Deal with the real safety problem at Andante; investigate medians, sidewalk lighting and sidewalk barriers,

and on demand crosswalk lighting. Do not install continuous roadway lighting.

The economy of Sedona runs on tourism, and access to the natural beauty of the area--both during the day and at night--are what drives tourism. I should know: I worked like a sled dog for 20 years to get here, with twice-a-year one-week visits to get a dose of sky and red rocks! This is also a quality-of-life issue for those of us who live here. If we had wanted blaring lights, we probably wouldn't have moved here. There are less drastic ways of improving safety than installing blaring lights along 89A. We've already reduced the speed limit, which is being very well respected from what I am seeing (there are a lot of police officers in this town relative to the size of it, and they do ticket people who don't comply). I would favor the use of low-impact lighting such as that in Uptown, along with pedestrian-crossing lighting embedded in the roadway. I would not oppose a light at Andante. Thanks for your attention to this matter.

If we look only at 2000-2006 for planning purposes - then we have a limited view of Hwy 89A needs. It is not possible to protect citizens from every condition, especially when they choose to put themselves in harms way, and we shouldn't try. Especially in light of the economy, ADOT should be focusing on critical transportation issues in the state, and I can't see this making that 'cut'. When you are a hammer, everything looks like a nail. ADOT is an engineering & construction dept, bless their hearts, and they need to realize that they are particularly susceptible to this old adage. Their job is to build roads not to find non-engineering & non-construction solutions to safety problems.

The village of oak creek does not have the protection that Sedona city has with respect to lighting, signs, etc. The village has no governmental entity for the whole area and the present voca is not good enough. Foolish to have two standards in the Red Rock area, don't you think. Suggest ADOT adopt the city of Sedona lighting, signs etc for the highway it controls in the areea. Please don't get fooled by these obnoxious buzy bodies who attend public meetings, these crackpots organize to dominate them. Get your input be surveys like this. Please do all you can to eliminate the endangered species act which is plain silly. There are not that many votes from these nuts to worry about. They are costing us millions. Please publicize how much the naming the cliff rose as endangered cost the highway to Cottonwood and 260. This act was just made for employment of botanists and the like who are making jobs for themselves and selfish politicians trying to attract a few votes.

We like Sedona as it is and has been. We want to keep the city as geographicy small as it is and keep its small town landscape.

The Andante traffic signal is okay as probably needed for safety what with all the current traffic, but nix all the big lights except those minimally needed. If medians and pedestrian barriers added, nothing else is required and the Andante traffic light would only help automobiles enter/leave 89A.

I was and still am outraged by the Sedona City Council's action in overturning and ignoring research and factual findings in favor of its prediliction to do things in a formulaic way. ADOT participated in the Safety Panel for a full year, and accepted the final recommendations of that Panel. The Sedona community felt betrayed and ignored when this ocured. While I understand the financial considerations, I also know funding can be found. The financial advantages of continuous lighting are ephemeral and short-lived. We need to move forward with the Panel's recommendations and increase safety while enhancing the beauty of our city. Creativity is what is needed, and honoring the wishes of Sedona's residents. Dark skies inform or lifestyle here. Additionally, tourists come to Sedona for dark skies, natural beauty and a sense of peace and calm we have here. Continuous lighting is incongrous with this and would leave Sedona poorer in many ways.

More lights willnot solve the problem. Use pedestrian lighting only.

thank you for all your work on behalf of Sedona and its people who care.

I travel this stretch of 89A, both during the day and at night, on almost a daily basis. The biggest hazard I repeatedly observe is people trying to cross 89A DURING THE DAY without bothering to walk a few steps to cross safely at signalized intersections. They step out onto 89A willy-nilly, dodging cars, making traffic come to a screeching halt,causing accidents, and very nearly getting hit themselves. I frequently observe this phenomenon DURING THE DAY at a popular restaurant located on 89A that apparently does not have adequate parking for its customers, so these customers park at a large lot on the other side of 89A and then risk their lives, and every one else's on 89A, by crossing 89A (not at a signal) to get to and from this business. No one at Sedona City Hall or at ADOT has been able to explain to me how continuous roadway lighting addresses this and other DAYTIME safety issues.

In my opinion, to sacrifice the dark skies and charming rural characteristics of this beautiful place, would forever mar it's natural, appealing ambience. For those of us who are fortunate enough to live here, it would be extremely sad. For those who love to visit this beautiful place, it would gradually cease it's appeal and go the way of so many other beautiful places, ruined by so called "progress". Surely we can be wiser than to treat it like some other place in some other area. We know and love Sedona. To un-necessarily

light it up and extinguish the starry skies would be very short sighted. We might as well re-do Sedona Schnebly's statue, dressing her in modern style with high heels on her feet and a cell phone in her hand. Now wouldn't that be silly? Remember what the 1-40 freeway did to many little Arizona towns on route 66? Do we have to repeat that with Sedona?

As I have stated I do not prefer the lights except possibly at Andante, and would then prefer LED street lights. This would give ADOT a chance to evaluate them in a real setting, and possibly a grant could be obtained to install them AND study life cycle costing on them including energy usage and maintenance.

All comments shared to this point.

I feel that a few people in power positions were allowed to override the will of the people. I believe that ADOT should recognize that 4 people in a city power position do not clearly represent what the majority of the people in Sedona really desire.

Please protect the precious dark skies of Sedona, Once undone it cannot be dark again. Without it we are just like all the cities people RUN AWAY from to get to Sedona.

If it must be then one light just on Andante, although we know we have prevented that problem by enforcing 35 mi driving and the accidents involved drinking, Under no circumstances do we need more lights on 89A. People come for the dark skies. Please get more input from the people that live here and not rush into this travesty. Please take your time on this. It is historically essential to take your time. Thank you for the opportunity to communicate my heartfelt feelings.

The lighting is overkill. It will destroy the character of Sedona. Put in another stop light with pedestrian crossing light and a crosswalk at the sit of the majority of the pedestrian accidents. Slow the traffic further on 89A if necessary.

Viable options for safety also include lighting crosswalks on demand in high-risk areas, why is this not being considered as a lower cost option to continuous roadway lighting?

The main safety problem for pedestrians now is lack of safe crossing areas along 89A. I would like to see pedestrian-activated stop lights at intervals to allow safe crossing. We also need bicycle lanes along 89A. We also need much better enforcement of laws regarding yielding to pedestrians, vehicles running red lights, yielding to bicycles, signaling by vehicles, and making safe turns.

The real safety problem on 89A is the area of the Andante intersection. Therefore a signalized light with the usual circle of four supplementary lights will do the most for nighttime safety and not destroy the dark skies and not create light trespass for the surrounding neighborhoods; lights will do nothing for daytime safety. Low wattage low height pedestrian light like Up town would be ok if the merchants really feel they want night lighting.

Money can be beter spent elsewhere

As a resident of west Sedona, I feel that "urban" style lighting is totally out of character and therefore is very undesirable.

Don't act upon City Council vote as they do not listen to their local voting populace. They city voting residents are not the only people affected by these safety measures and by the river of lights. VOC residents and residents outside the actual city limits must also suffer the consequences of the measures taken and especially the street lights. We see the already existing light pollution more than 10 miles away already, and have no star visibility when looking toward the Sedona city. An addition of the proposed lights will remove an even larger portion of the starry sky in that direction from where we live, not to mention the obliteration of the sky views closer to the city and in close proximity of the proposed street lights. More lights only blind the driver not improve visibility. We don't want any street lights except at the Andante traffic signal, and those should be the low-wattage sidewalk type lighting.

While ADOT's solution might fit Phoenix, it certainly has NO place in Sedona.

Sedona is not Phoenix. It is a unique town with special characteristics that must be preserved. Safety is certainly an issue, but there are alternatives to lighting up the town with a row of high intensity street lights. Let's conviene some study groups to explore alternatives.

The current roadway is an ugly blight on the chararcter of Sedona, unfriendly to pedestrians and uninviting to tourists. The ADOT lighting plan only makes that worse! The road does move traffic quite quickly through town.....but should quick drive-throughs be the primary issue of importance to this kind of community? I strongly recommend "stepping back" and consider a long range plan that will truly enhance the chararcter of this town for the next 50+ years. ADOT has access to some creative architects/engineers who might integrate the multiple issues of aesthetics,pedestrian safety and pleasure, access to businesses, reasonable traffic flow. Big project, but there is plenty of time...and costs could be budgeted over many years.

We have good examples of acceptable lighting all around Sedona. There is also ample data to show that the West 89A corridor does not require highway lighting. Let's take the common sense, lower cost approach and install lighting and crosswalk signals that improve public safety while preserving the character of Sedona. I cannot imagine why ADOT would want to do otherwise.

Please consider 89a in West Sedona as this community's Main St. In this regard, enhancement of this stretch of road should mimic the treatment given to 179 in VOC. The Main St. treatment will encourage and enhance pedestrian safety and use of both sides of the street while public transportation, biking and car traffic are supported with traffic calming techniques and enforcement of lighting codes and speed limits. The Main St. designation assures respect for the quality of life that citizens seek in moving to our town: dark night skies, clean air, low traffic noise, a destination rather than a pass-through sensibility. West Sedona is a community of itself with library, Adult Community Center, restaurants, book stores, shops, cafes, theater, etc. that can be accessed by its active population in a number of ways. Pedestrian and bike access as well as public transportation should play a large role in ADOT's plan for enhancing public safe

The DOT is trying to impose standards on Sedona that are like all other urban communities. Sedona is unique, not like other urban communities! The minimum lighting preserves the natural night beauty of our area. Anyway, the statistics of bright roadway lighting do not support added safety for anyone! We do not want another bureaucratic government organization imposing unnecessary requirements on our community. They may need bright lights in Washington D.C. to reduce crime, but we don't want or need them in Sedona.

We would like to see "two tier" speed limit signs, like they have in other Arizona cities like Yuma. The sign has two speeds, a daytime speed and a night time speed limit. I suggest the daytime speed limit be 35 mph and the night time limit be 25 mph. Also, since the Sedona community has such strong support for a "preserve the night sky" ordinance all lighting already installed along the highway should be re-evaluated and changed if necessary to preserve the beauty of our wonderful night sky. Thank you

Accidents will occur with lights or not. One of the reasons we bought a home in Sedona is so we could enjoy the night skies and we certainly do. Our home is near 89A so the lights that have been suggested would certainly effect us. Please don't take the beauty of Sedona away.

The lighting decision that currently exists seems to me and my wife to be incredible overkill that flies in the face of the FACTS. These facts are not simply those related to the actual past local incidents or those related to the change in "danger" since non-invasive measures were taken (eg, lower speed limit, higher police vigilance), but also the experiences of other small towns (in Colorado?) that have seen that high-impact lighting does not produce a solution, much less an optimal solution. This Sedona issue presents ADOT a chance to make a progressive, thoughtful and non-invasive solution that does not do permanent damage to the Sedona character, and I hope that it and Council act accordingly and consider the other non-lighting options that can be undertaken. We have a priceless natural wonder here in central Arizona - let's not have an unnatural decision spoil it. Thank you.

I think it is sick that the Sedona council would use the few accidents that have happened as an excuse to receive monies from the state.

It is clear that the real problem is the intersection at Andante and 89A that should be addressed by installing an intersection light.....leaving the dark sky policy intact for the rest of Sedona.

From KSB's own investigation it is clear that at least 2 councilors (Scagnelli & Surber) were not forthcoming as to their real reason for wanting and voting for lights. In plain English, they lied. They said it was about safety when really they were scamming the state for free infrastructure and admitted in emails the lights could be removed or changed later. Keep Sedona Sedona. There is no reason for ANY changes to 89A. We do not need lights, medians, pedestrian barricades - nothing.

With the US, and in particular Arizona facing a budget crises, why are politicians willing to cut education and other vital services? Why is ADOT pushing a costly solution on Sedona...that Sedona does not want?? It is irresponsible to cater to developers 1) against the will of the people of Sedona, a2) because it is not the safest solution, 3) it will be costly at a time when expenses should be limited to more essential needs like education. ADOT should quit building tradition roads lit up like Vegas, and put in more bike routes, and a lane for slower smaller alternative vehicles. Do the Andante street light and be done with it.

The installation of street lights designed for a large city in Sedona would be a disaster! It would destroy the beauty of our small-town. ADOT's proposed installation of Street lights is akin to using a body cast to heal a broken elbow - NOT APPROPRIATE. Please target the remedy appropriately with a traffic signal at Andante, which is the broken elbow! Thanks.

Dark skies are a critical component to Sedona's lure and character.

Yavapai county also has strict lighting ordinances and Sedona should also be compliant with them.

Sedona is NOT an urban place but a rural town and should remain that way. Again, that is part of the lure

for tourists as well as a desirable characteristic that attracts residents. Don't force urban solutions, especially ones that don't even work well in urban areas, into rural towns. Street lighting creates glare which actually make intersections less safe (objects are harder to see than when illuminated by headlights only).

Please revisit your plan to place the street lights continuously along 89-A. The facts show that street lights are not the answer to human foibles. We cannot ignore the environmental impact of the proposed pole lighting for 89-A. The statistics show that quick transitions from dark areas to highly lit areas cause problems with vision. Our eyes cannot transition that rapidly. We need a traffic control signal at Andante. We need sidewalk lighting - be it pedestrian activated or dusk to dawn lighting. Thanks to ADOT for lowering the speed limit along 89-A and to the Sedona Police Department for enforcing the limit. Thank you for this opportunity to comment.

The night sky and the darkness in this area at night are positive attributes of Sedona. If I'd wanted the bright lights I would not have moved so far from Broadway! Please do not ruin the ambience of our small town, this isn't Phoenix.

Safety is a two way street between pedestrian and driver. Minimal lighting should be used to help drivers. Pedestrians can see headlights of cars.

When seeking the best solution to the safety of route 89A in Sedona, please keep in mind that Sedona has a unique responsibility to plan its future to always complement the incredible red rock panorama. Both the red rocks and some sort of community will no doubt be here "for ever". We have truly world class scenery to consider, and a city surrounded by national forest. Future generations will flock to this place, and we now are deciding what this place will be in the distant future. We will be built out in a few years, and there is a tendency to scramble around for more housing, more vacation accommodations etc. Sedona is entitled to a different approach. WE have a responsibility to plan this city as a unique place for the benefit of future generations.

Sedona is not an urban area and should not be addressed as such. There are low level lighting and other lighter impact solutions that can alleviate the challenge. The night skies must be preserved.

ADOT is misleading the public by using fear as a tactic to get support for the lights. The corridor from Dry Creek to Airport is not listed in the 5% report -- only the Andante mile. The signalized intersection at Andante should have been installed 3 years ago. That's the area of 3 of the pedestrian fatalities; the 4th was outside the corridor area. 84% of accidents are daytime...lights do nothing for daytime accidents. Pedestrians need safe crossing day AND night. ADOT's May 6 report says the safest way to cross is at a signalized intersection. Why have they not installed one at Andante? In addition, unnecessary lighting has unnecessary impact on the environment- CO2 released into the atmosphere, effects on humans and wildlife, health issues, and deterioration of night time skies and daytime vistas. Sedona deserves better from ADOT and from the City Council.

Please, follow the will of the people who live in this town. The traffic safety statistics support the towns reasonable solution regarding improved safety for motorists and pedestrians alike. We have chosen to live in Sedona because it allows for intelligent resourceful community living in harmony with nature. Please provide support, not interference.

I thought that deliberations regarding SR 89A safety issues were supposed to address both day-time and night-time safety, especially since the vast majority of accidents and injuries occur during the day and continuous roadway lighting on this stretch of SR 89A will do nothing to improve day-time safety. The majority of the Sedona City Council has ignored the will and input of the residents of Sedona. It is time for ADOT to put the interests of Sedona residents above the narrow political agendas of some City Councilors. ADOT knows that the best solutions focus on day-time remedies like medians, as well as addressing the Andante intersection. ADOT, please don't destroy our rural community with big-city lights.

Every effort should be made to maintain the small town aesthetics while addressing safety. Sedona should not have to settle for brightly lit roadways that resemble busy city lights and a glow in our night skies. The few accidents that occur due to impaired or negligent drivers is no reason to penalize the residents of Sedona with changes to the landscape that take away from the beauty that has attracted most of the residents who moved here because of the small town country atmosphere. Lights similar to those in uptown and on hwy 179 should be adequate to improve the darkness that exists in the areas referenced in this survey.

Sedona is unique, and the dark starry skies are one of the things that always amaze and dazzle my visitors from other areas. Anyone who believes that the proposed lights would not affect the dark skies should stand in a lighted parking lot and look up. Even the light reflected off the pavement will change the way our beautiful town looks as you arrive here from the west at night and will cast an unnatural glow on nearby neighborhoods, mine included. I do not think anyone would consider installing lighting or guardrails or

billboards on the rock formations or hiking trails, but the beauty and majesty of Sedona's night sky is just as much a part of the magic of this area as those things that are seen and enjoyed by residents and visitors in the daylight. Please look at the facts, consider the improvement in the accident and injury rates, and allow the precious gem that is Sedona to remain brilliant and sparkling - a uniquely valuable asset for Arizona, the nation, and the world.

As far as real estate values, I would not buy a home in the area where there is light pollution. One of my most important reasons for moving to Sedona was the dark skies and beautiful stars. I am considering buying a larger home, but will limit my choices to Uptown or the village. I will not consider the area close to the proposed street lights.

I moved to Sedona because of the little town charm. Careful drivers and pedestrians should keep traffic incidents low. Lighting will not necessarily solve the problem and the money could be better spent preserving parks and land.

I believe the report done by the special committee set up last year should be followed. It was a comprehensive study on the issue and brought out the following: Continuous lighting, as proposed by ADOT, would NOT have any significant impact on the safety of 89A. What would:

Lowering the speed limit. I would like to see it lowered to 30 mph

Cross walk and lights at Andante

Medians and barriers

It would also be useful to have some sidewalk lighting (low wattage) at certain places along 89A. Some places just do not warrant this, since there is enough light. I do not think continuous lighting is necessary. The lighting as proposed would have a deleterious effect on our community here, it would encourage a strip like development of this area. Why is West Sedona treated differently from Uptown? Are we not good enough to have a customized solution? I realize money is a huge issue. I do not support the idea that, because ADOT has the money for the lights, we should build them.

Please do not ruin the enjoyment of experiencing the magnificent Sedona skies at night. If it is absolutely necessary to install safety lighting please make it as unintrusive as possible. Sedona is a small town surrounded by glorious red rocks under beautiful star-filled skies. Do not lump us together with large metropolitan areas.

Any and ALL decisions should not be made without generous notice to the public and several public forums held day and evening to gather input from all interested parties. Let's not do the typical ADOT procedure of, "gee, we put a 1x1 ad buried in the paper announcing one meeting in a building you can't find easily - and 5 people showed up so we're done with public input". Then, once the public has had a chance to speak up, ADOT needs to listen

The dark skies are one of the most charming features of Sedona after the red rocks. Degradation of this resource diminishes our quality of life and the attractiveness of our community to low impact tourists.

The current solution to the safety problem is an example of overkill. The tourism based economy depends on the natural beauty of the area, its small town atmosphere, and the wonderful outdoor activities provided by our forest. There are insufficient evening activities to warrant the expense of installation and maintenance of scores of Cobra-style lights and poles up to fifty feet high that illuminate the entire roadway and cause a community to glow in the dark. Our beautiful night skies would dim. The move would be a step backward in the national effort toward greening America. Do not allow the negligence of a few self serving individuals with little regard for personal safety to turn Sedona into a Las Vegas look alike! Let us not "pave paradise and put up a parking lot"!

We believe input by all residents of the greater Sedona area should be permitted on this important issue. It has been denied at Sedona City Council meetings. 89A is a state road which our tax dollars help maintain, and what Sedona proper decides to do with its lighting affects all of us living in this area! We, in the Village, treasure our dark starry nights as we sit on the patio facing the City to the north...its one reason we moved here. We are stunned that such a vast number of tall bright lights is even being considered, when there is much evidence that less lighting would prove safer with less glare. Substantially less energy and cost would be expended, as well! My husband and I understand that such lighting as is being proposed by ADOT is now being removed in areas of California because of its inefficiency. Please, please rethink this terrible decision and prevent our beautiful Sedona from looking like a used car lot! Thank you.

Use the results of the city appointed public committee as the basis for a new plan.

Sedona needs a context sensitive solution to pedestrian and driver safety. We deserve in West Sedona nothing less than the solutions that Uptown and RT179 received. We need this from our City Council and from ADOT. This area has residential within a block of 89A. We are the environmentalists in town. We can and do walk everywhere. Many have telescopes. Please don't spoil our side of town.

76 street lights is OVERKILL!! Sedona can be BOTH safe and beautiful. There are better, less intrusive

measures including traffic signals, crosswalks, sidewalk lighting, medians, and pedestrian barriers which can protect people without destroying the natural beauty which makes Sedona great. People also need to be accountable for their own safety as well. The irresponsible behavior of a few does not justify this over-reaction of ADOT and a few short sighted members of the City Council. Please remember that is our natural beauty and spiritual qualities which attract people to our area. If Sedona is stripped of it's peaceful, small town flavor, which include it's gorgeous night skies, it becomes nothing more than another gas stop between Phoenix and Flagstaff.
