



San Tan Valley
Special Area Plan

SAN TAN VALLEY – SPECIAL AREA PLAN

TRANSPORTATION & INFRASTRUCTURE ADVISORY

COMMITTEE MEETING #2

MEETING SUMMARY

MEETING INFORMATION:

San Tan Valley – Special Area Plan

TIAC Meeting #2

Tuesday, July 25, 2017

1:30PM – 3:30PM

Mountain Vista Middle School

MEETING ATTENDEES:

Ashley Heinrich, Assistant to Mike Goodman
Pinal County Board of Supervisor, District #2
Steve Abraham, Pinal County
Evan Balmer, Pinal County
Lester Chow, Pinal County
Tara Harman, Pinal County
Lt. E. Pile, Pinal County Sheriff's Office
Kevin Kugler, Michael Baker International
Matt Klyszeiko, Michael Baker International

Mohamed Youssef, Town of Queen Creek
Jess Knudson, Town of Florence
Tony Bianchi, Phoenix-Mesa Gateway Airport
Brad Cole, Johnson Utilities
Jason Bottjen, ADOT
Travis Ashbaugh, CAG
Brad Hinton, El Dorado Holdings
Giao Tran, City of Mesa Natural Gas
Daren Schnepf, District 2 Advisory Committee

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 TIAC 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.



San Tan Valley
Special Area Plan

SAN TAN VALLEY – SPECIAL AREA PLAN

TRANSPORTATION & INFRASTRUCTURE ADVISORY

COMMITTEE MEETING #2

MEETING SUMMARY

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 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):

The planned North/South Corridor is missing on the plan; this corridor will drive future development in STV. *We do agree that, if/when developed, the North/south Corridor will have an impact on the growth pattern of STV. However, ADOT is currently going through the EIS process to*



San Tan Valley
Special Area Plan

SAN TAN VALLEY – SPECIAL AREA PLAN

TRANSPORTATION & INFRASTRUCTURE ADVISORY

COMMITTEE MEETING #2

MEETING SUMMARY

identify a preferred route, that effort is not scheduled to be completed until 2019. Further, dedicated funding for this corridor is unknown until the pending public vote in November. Even if funding is approved, we understand that the freeway is many years out. Consequently, we need to balance how we will respond to growth today and recognize that the plan is a living document and may need to be revised as infrastructure plans change in the future.

From a political standpoint, it may be a good idea to show the preferred route on the plan. *We are not aware of a specific preferred route for the North/South corridor through STV.*

Regardless of alignment, it may be beneficial to acknowledge on the plan in some way, because it will impact growth in the future.

Currently show rural residential near canal, may want to look at scenario that changes this area to jobs.

32,000 employees are leaving the area, where do they go? *Majority of workers are commuting to jobs in Phoenix, Mesa and Chandler.*

So, N/S arterials, Ironwood, Rittenhouse, Ellsworth, are key to SR 24. North/South Freeway won't help much because people won't travel east to go west.

Only one third of land is available, so Scenario B makes sense to disperse trips and make more walkable, but vehicle miles traveled is higher than Scenario C why? *Under Scenario B, there is limited MF in the Commercial Center nodes, however, under Scenario C MF is incorporated into the Commercial Center nodes and Urban Center placing a higher number of housing units within walkable areas.*

With a 300,000 population base you need 600 cops, where is tax base to pay for that. A residential focused tax base can't support that. *We did not complete an economic analysis of each scenario, however we will complete one for the preferred plan to help better understand what those impacts will be.*

Overall, I like the place type concept and think Scenario B is the most realistic in terms of likely growth that developers will actually construct. Curious why community college is shown within Community Center place type? *We looked at all the zoning districts and their permitted uses and matched them to the closest place type. The zoning designated on the college site happened to fall within the commercial center place type.*

Northern portion of commercial center node on Gantzel, south of hospital, is developing as residential now.

What about trails? *Trail corridors will be further defined once the preferred plan is determined.*



San Tan Valley
Special Area Plan

SAN TAN VALLEY – SPECIAL AREA PLAN
TRANSPORTATION & INFRASTRUCTURE ADVISORY
COMMITTEE MEETING #2
MEETING SUMMARY

Appendix A:
TIAC Meeting #2
Sign-In Sheet



San Tan Valley
Special Area Plan

| | |
|--|---|
| San Tan Valley – Special Area Plan | |
| Transportation & Infrastructure Sub-Committee Meeting #2 | |
| Mountain Vista Middle School 33622 N Mountain Vista Blvd, Queen Creek, AZ 85142 | Tuesday, July 25, 2017 1:30 PM – 3:30 PM |
| Sign In Sheet | |

| Name | Agency | E-mail |
|-----------------|--------------------|--------------------------------|
| Travis Ashbaugh | CAG | tashbaugh@cagaz.org |
| Tony Bianchi | PMGAA | tbianchi@gatewayairport.com |
| Brad Cole | Johnson Utilities | bcole@azvisions.net |
| LESTEL CHOW | PC | lestel.chow@pinalcountyaz.gov |
| Mohamed Youssef | TOQC | mohamed.youssef@queencreek.org |
| Jason Bottjen | ADOT | j.bottjen@azdot.gov |
| Jess Knudsen | Florence | jess.knudsen@florenceaz.gov |
| Giao Tran | City of Mesa | giao.tran@mesaaz.gov |
| Tara Harman | Pinal County | tara.harman@pinalcountyaz.gov |
| Daren Schnepf | | daren.schnepf@gmail.com |
| LT. E. Pile | Pinal County S.O. | eli.pile@pinalcountyaz.gov |
| Brad Hinton | El Dorado Holdings | bhinton@eldoradoholdings.net |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |