

MEETING SUMMARY NOTES

Pinal County Comprehensive Plan Development Forum

Date: November 13, 2008
1:00 p.m. – 3:00 p.m.
Location: Central Arizona College
Signal Peak Campus; Coolidge
Purpose: Revised Draft Plan Presentation

Handouts: None

Participants

Janet Apkaw-Williams, Ak-Chin Indian Community; Benjamin Belkin, Walton International Group; Curtis Brown; Maxine Brown, Central Arizona Association of Governments; C. Alton Bruce, City of Coolidge; Evelyn Casuga, Arizona Public Service; George Chasse, Centerpoint of the Southwest; Linda Cheney, El Dorado Holdings, Inc.; Rich Court, Rose Law Group; Jeff Creeden, Arizona Public Service; Michael Cronin, El Dorado Holdings, Inc.; Ronnie Cabbage, Robson Communities; Leila DeMaree, City of Casa Grande; Jeffrey Dilts, The WLB Group; Jason Dudley, SRP; Curt Dunham, Partners for Strategic Action, Inc.; Gary Eide, Town of Kearny; Robert Flatley, City of Coolidge; Baird Fullerton, Brooks Strand Associates, Inc.; Jack Gilmore, Gilmore Parsons Land Design Group; Michelle Green, Arizona State Land Department; Jackie Guthrie, Jackie Guthrie & Associates; Kazi Haque, City of Maricopa; Mike Hutchinson, Superstition Vistas; Judee Jackson, Arizona Public Service; Aggie Kirschmann, Langley Properties; R.S. Matt, Coalition of Arizona Bicyclists; Shannon McLaughlin, Nathan and Associates, Inc.; Rick Miller, City of Casa Grande; Jeff Morrison, The WLB Group; Katherine Moser, Invenergy; Melanie Oliver, Town of Superior; Jim Poulos, Robson Communities; Roger Pryor, The Wolff Company; Francis Reilly, CMX; Court Rich, Rose Law Group; Caryn Sanchez, Salt River Project; Susan Shaw, Central Arizona College; Anthony Smith, City of Maricopa; Audra Koester Thomas, Partners for Strategic Action, Inc.; John Thomas; Gary Timmerman, Dibble Engineering; Magill Weber, The Nature Conservancy; Martin Weber, TNC; Darrell Wilson, CMX, LLC; and Paul Winslow, Orcutt/Winslow Partnership

Staff Present

Terry Doolittle, Pinal County Manager
Ken Buchanan, Pinal County Assistant Manager
Jerry Stabley, Pinal County Community Development Director
Peggy Fiandaca, Project Consultant, Partners for Strategic Action, Inc.

Meeting was called to order at approximately 1:10 p.m.

MEETING SUMMARY NOTES

Welcome and Project Overview

Terry Doolittle welcomed all attendees of the second Development Forum and thanked them for participating in the Pinal County Comprehensive Plan process. He provided an overview of the planning process, the second 60-Day Review Plan, and the schedule moving forward.

Second 60 Day Review Draft Plan Presentation

Jerry Stabley, Pinal County Project Manager, delivered a PowerPoint presentation highlighting the key changes in the second 60 Day Review Draft Comprehensive Plan. After completion of the presentation, participants asked questions and made comments on the plan for Pinal County to consider.

Discussion Points

City of Maricopa – Mayor spoke and said the City appreciates the extended review and comment period. He said that the document provides a good basis for the county and cities. It is one of our tools in the toolbox. Regarding the LAND USE ELEMENT, Maricopa requested additional activity centers to be placed on the map and they were. The City appreciates this effort. The GROWTH AREA ELEMENT, the Town feels that our concerns were addressed. The MULTIMODAL ELEMENT still has the most challenges; particularly the goals, objectives and policies. The City appreciates the reference to the various cities' transportation plans. The ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ELEMENT well represents and compliments the cities' economic development activities. The City of Maricopa truly appreciates the due diligence that the County has made to address comments.

City of Casa Grande – Is there going to be an Executive Summary?
Yes once the plan is complete.

Rose Law Group – We suggest that the North/South Freeway alignment be shifted; thought it should be moved over near Eloy. We made these comments previously. It seems like the revised draft shows the north/south corridor along highway 87 at Eloy instead of Wheeler. Isn't it in everyone's interest to show where the County would like the north/south freeway to be instead of where ADOT is currently showing it?

Jerry explained that the Draft Plan indicates the current ADOT locations for state transportation facilities. The County recognizes that the state must go through considerable planning studies before the alignments will be set.

Rose Law Group – Regarding the moderate low density category, the top dwelling unit per acre went down in this draft, why? There should be some flexibility. Some of the flexibility that is put into the plan about other land uses that are allowed seems not to make sense. I am not sure the relationship of how the uses were identified. I am not certain of how the uses were identified.

Jerry explained the criteria – based on the size of the project. We also examined the looked at the distance to existing platting or homes to protect existing residents, etc.

MEETING SUMMARY NOTES

Rose Law Group – Regarding the WATER ELEMENT, is there a problem the County is trying to be solved that might not exist? I am not certain why we are doing this particularly in these economic times. You can't have homes without water. This just increases the cost of homes. Are we trying to solve a problem that does not exist? The developer at the end of the day is at risk if the water is not here. This is an issue that we feel strongly about. You may have people tying up zoning.

Jerry explained why this policy was put into the document. It is intended to ensure that water is available.

Rose Law Group – Regarding the HIGH DENSITY RESIDENTIAL classification – Consider increasing the high end of the range?

Peggy mentioned that the high end of range was increased in this draft already.

Rose Law Group – Regarding the MIXED USE ACTIVITY CENTERS, please provide more clarity of the uses that are allowed. Page 69 needs to be clarified.

Jerry explained that some inconsistency were caught on that page and will be changed.

Rose Law Group – Regarding the IMPLEMENTATION SECTION, will Pinal County consider allowing zoning and plan amendments simultaneously? This would be helpful to allow that to occur. It would allow the Commission to see the project at the time of the amendment and zoning.

Jerry said that the County will consider this change.

Need to clarify the major or minor amendments. Who make the decision if a project is compliant? How do you figure this out?

City of Maricopa – It would be helpful to have a matrix describing the requirements of major or minor amendments.

Could you expand on how the Plan addresses approved master plans? If we make one change to a portion of the approved master plan does it open the whole plan to be compliant with the new comprehensive plan? If we come in for a revision to 50 acres out of an entire approved PAD does this request open up the entire PAD?

Jerry explained that it will be clarified in the text on how approved master plans will be viewed.

Please clarify if a parkway that runs through our adopted PAD that does not include the parkway, when we come into platting do we need to then show the parkway?

Parkways in the western portion of the County – what is the basis for the parkways in this area? What was used to justify this level of parkways?

Peggy explained that the current Hidden Valley Study process is updating the travel demand modeling effort that may result in some changes.



MEETING SUMMARY NOTES

City of Maricopa – Changes in zoning that is inconsistent with the Comprehensive Plan; would that require a major or minor amendment. Please clarify in the text.

City of Casa Grande – Regarding GROWTH AREAS, it seems that the Plan is extremely specific for the Superstition Vistas area and not so specific for the other growth areas. It would be helpful to provide more specificity for the other growth areas.

Peggy explained that the intent of doing specific growth area plans in collaboration with the cities and Native American Communities within the growth area will be part of the implementation process. However, because the Superstition Vistas planning process is well underway, more detail was provided.

Rose Law Group – Page 301 – Please clarify the last sentence.

Please add the roadway names on some of the maps to ease in their readability.

Please clarify page 300 - IMPLEMENTATION (3E) traffic impact analysis.

Next Steps

Jerry thanked everyone for attending. Everyone was encouraged to review and submit their specific comments on the Revised Draft Comprehensive Plan by December 20th using a comment matrix online. At that time all comments received will be documented and recommendations on how to move forward with the comments will be made. It is anticipated that the plan will be approved in early 2009.

Meeting adjourned at 2:35 p.m.

These meeting summary notes reflect the notes taken by Partners for Strategic Action, Inc. during the meeting. If corrections are needed, please provide those recommendations as soon as possible by contacting PSA, Inc. at 480.816.1811 or psainc@cox.net.

