



**San Tan Valley**  
Special Area Plan

# **SAN TAN VALLEY – SPECIAL AREA PLAN**

## **BUSINESS & ECONOMY ADVISORY**

### **COMMITTEE MEETING #2**

#### **MEETING SUMMARY**

#### **MEETING INFORMATION:**

**San Tan Valley – Special Area Plan**

BEAC Meeting #2

Thursday, July 27, 2017

2:00PM – 4:00PM

Mountain Vista Middle School

#### **MEETING ATTENDEES:**

Michael Goodman, Pinal County Board of Supervisor,  
District #2

Steve Abraham, Pinal County

Evan Balmer, Pinal County

Kevin Kugler, Michael Baker International

Matt Klyszeiko, Michael Baker International

Judie Scalise, ESI Corp

Chris Webb, Rose Law Group (Representing Fulton  
Homes & Property Reserve LLC)

Bryan McCoy, San Tan Valley Chamber of Commerce

Tisha Castillo, SanTanValley.com

Seth Keeler, W Holdings

Vickigene Howard, Incorporation Committee – Geni's

Book Keeping Services

#### **PRESENTATION SUMMARY:**

*Note: To allow for the collection of universal feedback, identical presentation material was provided to each advisory group. Consequently, the presentation summary for each advisory group does not vary. However, the subsequent group discussion summary does reflect the unique observations and comments expressed by members of the BEAC committee.*

Matt Klyszeiko, with Michael Baker International (MBI), opened the meeting by thanking committee members for their attendance. Mr. Klyszeiko then gave a general update on the status of the project and the specific activities that have been completed since the last committee meeting. He shared that these activities included the completion of the first round of Community Open House Meetings, which drew more than 500 attendees over the two scheduled meeting dates. He also confirmed that the San Tan Valley (STV) Special Area Plan - Existing Conditions Report was now complete and would be placed on the project website for public review.

Following his opening remarks, Mr. Klyszeiko transitioned into the formal presentation by reviewing the planned agenda for the meeting. Agenda topics included reviewing Findings & Trends, Focused Themes, Scenario Development and facilitating a Group Discussion on the presented material.

Under Findings & Trends, Mr. Klyszeiko presented a high level summary of the key findings of the STV Existing Conditions Report, specifically noting STV is expected to continue to grow, is young and family oriented, almost exclusively consists of single-family homes, has a strong workforce but few jobs, is lagging in higher education attainment, is experiencing retail trade leakage, and is auto dominated.

Mr. Klyszeiko also shared the results of feedback received from the attendees of the community open house meetings. This included sharing community member's thoughts on STV's benefits to



**San Tan Valley**  
Special Area Plan

# **SAN TAN VALLEY – SPECIAL AREA PLAN**

## **BUSINESS & ECONOMY ADVISORY**

### **COMMITTEE MEETING #2**

#### **MEETING SUMMARY**

build on and challenges to work on; perceived barriers to job growth, underserved areas, and transportation challenges; as well as importance of alternative modes of transportation, level of physical activity, and opinion of safety.

To help further inform the planned group discussion, Mr. Klyszeiko also provided a brief outline of some national trends that are occurring, which may impact growth and the built environment within STV in the future.

After completing the summary of the Findings and Trends, Mr. Klyszeiko then presented five Focused Themes; Balanced Community, Broaden Economic Opportunity, Improve Transportation Systems, and Live Healthy that were derived from the findings of the Existing Conditions Report and public feedback from the Community Open House meetings. He explained, these Themes were established to help guide the generation of the future growth scenarios for the STV area.

Before reviewing the future growth scenarios developed for the study area, Mr. Klyszeiko reminded the committee members about the land use challenges that exist with the current Comprehensive Plan and outlined an alternative “Place Type” approach to guide development in the STV area in the future. These Place Types included; rural living, suburban neighborhood, urban transitional, community center, urban center, suburban office, and employment center.

Following the description of the Place Type planning concept, Mr. Klyszeiko walked the committee members through three different land use scenarios that were developed to address, via different planning approaches, the Focused Themes previously identified. The three scenarios centered on; Business as Usual, Community Nodes, and Community Center. Along with each scenario, Mr. Klyszeiko outlined outcomes, relative to population, housing, jobs, vehicle miles traveled, walkability, and transportation options, to assist committee members in visualizing the projected impacts of each approach.

#### **GROUP DISCUSSION:**

At the conclusion of the presentation, Mr. Klyszeiko led the committee in a discussion based on two key questions; Do you have any concerns with the Place Type land use approach and What do you like or dislike about the three scenarios presented? The following comments and suggestions were made by committee members

*(Note, italicized text reflects responses provided by project team members):*

Want to confirm the Hash Knife Rd alignment west of Kentworthy does not go through to Gantzel, no right of way easement was preserved. The roadway configuration for the property between combs and Hash Knife east of Kentworthy is incorrect, will provide correct alignment.

There is MF land use proposed within the approved Bella Vista PAD, but it does not appear to be shown on the scenarios or is identified as Community Commercial. *The Community Commercial*



**San Tan Valley**  
Special Area Plan

## **SAN TAN VALLEY – SPECIAL AREA PLAN**

### **BUSINESS & ECONOMY ADVISORY**

### **COMMITTEE MEETING #2**

### **MEETING SUMMARY**

*place type allows MF uses, consequently the MF zoning shown in the Bella Vista Farms PAD was grouped within the Community Commercial place type. However, it does appear Scenario B is not consistent with that condition and will need to be corrected.*

I believe Scenario C needs strong roadway access, locating the employment off of Skyline will require crossing the railroad tracks. *Yes, the employment was placed in this location to account for the future, preferred commuter rail alignment. However, you are correct, the trade-off for this location is long-term it may trigger the need for grade separation.*

Overall, I like the place type approach. It functions better than past comp plan land use plans that functioned more like zoning districts. However, I have a concern on Scenario C. The community center is placed on Trust Land, which is difficult to control, may sit there for decades. Prefer Scenario B, it's a more realistic way to achieve objectives. Citizens don't want Scenario A.

Under Scenario C, where did the size come from? *We did give consideration to this and looked at case studies/development to try and define something that is realistic. The current size of the Urban Center is comparable to Kierland Commons or roughly 50 acres in size. However, the Urban Transition place type allows for a greater variety of development types, so the size of that area is much larger to allow it to function as a transition area.*

The public feedback expressed they lacked representation, it appears these options lack a government facility. *Generally speaking the place type approach allows for government facilities to be located in multiple place types. However, if STV were to incorporate in the future, Scenario C would probably function most closely to a traditional City with a downtown.*

San Tan will have an expanded government complex for courts, public works, and sheriff within the next 2-3 years. Most likely, if STV incorporated they would contract back to the County for these services. Need to put pressure on ASLD to open up STV to planning and development.

I like Scenario C, ASLD did not extend lease, current farmer has 2 more years on lease and then it is up.

Do we need to meet with the advisory group before the next open house meeting? *We are sensitive to everyone's time, currently we have not received comments that would require significant changes to the Scenarios as presented. Consequently, we suggest coordinating through email to address any minor modifications moving forward.*

I think it is healthy to look at other Cities land uses/plans. *We agree, for example, when examining employment we looked at existing employment centers like the Price Road corridor and Gateway airport industrial area to understand what the feasibility of employment uses in San Tan could support given its current lack of freeway access.*

We need to keep in mind that SR 24 will be extended to Ironwood by 2020.



**San Tan Valley**  
Special Area Plan

# **SAN TAN VALLEY – SPECIAL AREA PLAN**

## **BUSINESS & ECONOMY ADVISORY**

### **COMMITTEE MEETING #2**

#### **MEETING SUMMARY**

You need to have a market and incentives to attract employment, this requires government involvement.

CAC is looking at education system and what employers need. For example looked at Lucid motors and created new program to develop skills for that industry. High Schools are also changing their methods of education to meet these future needs.



**San Tan Valley**  
Special Area Plan

**SAN TAN VALLEY – SPECIAL AREA PLAN**  
BUSINESS & ECONOMY ADVISORY  
COMMITTEE MEETING #2  
MEETING SUMMARY

Appendix A:  
BEAC Meeting #2  
Sign-In Sheet

