PINAL COUNTY
GROWTH PLANNING
INITIATIVE

Pinal County Board of Supervisors

Lionel D. Ruiz, District #1
Sandie Smith, District #2
David Snider, District #3

County Manager

Dr. Stanley D. Griffis, Ph.D

Deputy County Manager

Terry Doolittle

Assistant County Manager For Development Services

Ken Buchanan

Assistant County Manager For Health and Human Services

Donna Robb

Development Services Departments

Robert Davis, Public Works Director
Don Gabrielson, Air Quality Director
David Kuhl, Planning & Development Director
Steven Brown, Chief Building Safety Official
Raymond E. Glos, Environmental Health Director

GROWTH PLANNING INITIATIVE
TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

"A long standing rural county, Pinal County now has to deal with urban issues"……Valley Forward Report 2004

"Pinal County's biggest issue is in trying to manage rampant growth while maintaining Quality of Life"….Valley Forward Report 2004

"Pinal County's has significantly improved in some areas (air, land use), but is below average in Transportation and Open Space"……Valley Forward Report 2004

"Pinal County has become the Orange County of Arizona"……Rita Maguire, President of ThinkAZ, a public policy think tank in Phoenix.

"Pinal County does not have the resources, tools or capacity to provide adequate transportation systems. If the population projections for the Maricopa County East Valley are correct, Pinal County and its Communities will need to get very aggressive in the near future if it is to respond to the challenges ahead"……Valley Forward Association Report Card 2004.

"Pinal County will grow to nearly one million people by the year 2035, up dramatically from the 2003 estimate of 201,565. This represents an increase of more than 31,000 new people each year through 2035"….Central Arizona College Environmental Scanning Report, 2004.

"Pinal County offers no given indication that plans have been developed to address growth"……Valley Forward Association Report Card 2004.

"Pinal County has many open space opportunities available to its residents who have access to over 100 miles of trails and the newly designated Ironwood National Monument. The population is projected to grow significantly and there are little or no strategies to address growth and future recreational needs. Pinal County has an opportunity to protect and preserve valuable open space and must step up to the Challenge"……Valley Forward Report 2004.

As can be seen by the above comments, there is a great need to aggressively "step up" planning Pinal County's future. The following elements to the Growth Planning Initiative (GPI) take the initial steps to aggressively implement the necessary growth planning programs to make Pinal County's future the best it can be. Many of the elements recommended are a result of findings and recommendations from published reports such as the 2004 Pinal County Town Hall, the 2004 Valley Forward Report Card, and the Central Arizona College Environmental Scan Report.

Pinal County is currently experiencing phenomenal growth as evidenced by building permit totals. In 2004, Pinal County has issued nearly 10,000 single family building permits, which reflects a quadrupling of permits from three years ago. Despite the municipal incorporation and annexation, this growth in the unincorporated areas of Pinal County is anticipated to continue within the next 20 year planning horizon. Consequently, Pinal County needs to put itself in a position to anticipate the growth and prepare the necessary plans to put itself "ahead of the curve."

Staff has compiled an approach to develop the Growth Planning Initiative which involves preparing plans for the necessary transportation planning and capital infrastructure assessment, provide adequate open space, preserve our natural resources, provide environmental and sustainable communities as well as neighborhood quality features and provide the funding for growth to pay for itself.

The report is broken down into five general areas: Regional and Site-Specific Planning Standards; regional and Infrastructure Issues; Regulatory Protection of Public Health, Safety and Quality of Life; Technological Foundations; and Funding Strategies. Within these five areas are specific planning concepts, that if so directed, action plans developed and presented for implementation consideration by the Board of Supervisors and County Manager.

There are currently a number of planning programs already underway. This report simply reflects an organized approach to house all the planning efforts into one Growth Management Initiative.

The strategy of implementation of the Growth Management Initiative first hinges on adequate funding to support the various planning programs as well as support the operational needs to continue addressing the exponential growth occurring in Pinal County. The Planning Fee Schedule has not had significant increases, and does not reflect or support the current level of operation since 1984. It is necessary to seriously consider a Plan Fee (Attachment "B") increase to support the recommended planning programs and support operations. It is recommended as a result of an analysis and comparison of planning fees of "like cities and counties" that Pinal County increase its Plan Fee Schedule to 95% of Pima County's Plan Fee Schedule. Second, the strategy for implementation calls for "base planning" be initiated commissioning an Open Space Master Plan, Specific Area Plans, and sub-regional Small Area Transportation Plans. When these are completed, it would then be recommended to initiate a Pinal County Comprehensive Plan Update that would include the above mentioned plans. The other planning efforts will coincide at the same time with all other planning programs mentioned. Paralleling the planning efforts would be to initiate an Impact Fee Analysis to determine the cost of development, levels of current services, impact fee elements and maximum supportable fee levels to determine the final impact fee ending with developing the impact fee ordinances.

It must be said, without the invaluable assistance by the Directors of the Departments of Public Works, Planning & Development, Building Safety, Air Quality and Environmental Health much of the enclosed report would be incomplete. It must also be said that with out the support and guidance from the County Manager and Deputy County Manager, many of the current planning efforts would not be possible.

REGIONAL AND SITE SPECIFIC PLANNING

Specific Land Use Area Planning

It was recommended in the 2004 Pinal County Town Hall (Planning - #3) for Pinal County, in concert with cities/towns to develop plans; target areas for residential, commercial, and industrial; and to specifically plan the "growth corridors". It is intended to create six regional specific area plans that would eventually be added to the Comprehensive Plan update that will coordinate and be consistent with each area's specific needs and goals. This area plan approach would involve facilitating several joint meetings between Pinal County Planning & Zoning Commission and the cities/towns P & Z Commissions as well as general community meetings in each area to identify the needs and goals. The land use plan would combine the planning efforts with cities and towns in Pinal County and provide for joint-planning opportunities.

Comprehensive Plan

The current comprehensive plan is going on five (5) years old and showing signs of being outdated due to the rate of growth Pinal County is experiencing. The comprehensive plan should be updated after the "base planning" of the three small area transportation plans, open space and trails master plans completion and the recommended six specific area plans completed. New concepts should be explored and incorporated in the re-write and those discussed above included within the plan.

Zoning Code Update

In January 2004, a Planning Commission Subcommittee began a thorough review and analysis of the Zoning Ordinance for updating opportunities. Since the Ordinance was written in 1962, many of the concepts of zoning have changed and a complete re-write should be ready for public comment in mid 2005. The Planned Area Development Section, Sign Section, Use Permits and Outdoor Storage are all being updated. New language including Definitions and a Hillside Development Zone are also being explored. A consultant, David Williams & Associates has been facilitating meetings and assisting staff in writing proposed language during this time. The Pinal County Planning & Zoning Commission review and will consider the proposed changes to the Board of Supervisors for final adoption. Once the ordinance is complete and adopted, further modifications are anticipated over time.

Subdivision Standards Update

1. **Background.** The existing Pinal County Subdivision Regulations & Requirements and Minimum Standards for Subdivisions Street Paving was approved and adopted by the Board of Supervisors on March 25, 1963. Since then, a total of five amendments have been approved, with the last on October 19, 1981. Some of the subsequent amendments made changes (such as paving widths) without deleting previous requirements for paving widths.

The result caused confusion and arguments between developers and the County staff. Additionally, the regulation referred to Maricopa Association of Government (MAG) Standards, while the County staff strongly desires to have our own Pinal County Uniform Standard Details. County staff initiated an update to the ordinance in September 2002, contracting the services of Sunrise Engineering.

2. Summary of Proposed Changes.

a. Update general requirements incorporate existing statutory requirements.
b. Adds a more detailed definition section.
c. The existing ordinance allows a Tentative Plat to be submitted directly to the Planning and Zoning Commission. The new ordinance will formalize the process for submittal to the staff. It requires a Pre-Application Stage (Pre-Application sketch, Concept Review Meeting with County Staff), followed by a Preliminary Plat Stage (Pre-plat, environmental report, drainage report, traffic impact analysis, ALTA survey and filing fees) with revisions prior to submittal to the Commission.
d. The required public infrastructure improvements (streets, sidewalks, lighting, drainage, landscaping and utilities) in the existing ordinance are spread over various amendments, and are not consistent because subsequent changes did not delete or repeal previous provisions. The new ordinance will outline the process for submittal and approvals of plans, posting of financial security, and acceptance into the County maintenance system. It will incorporate design standards (street cross-sections, report requirements) by reference to Pinal County Design Standards and Uniform Standard Details.
e. The proposed ordinance contains a section on pavement cuts for utilities and inspection standards for right of way construction. These will be proposed as stand alone ordinances because they apply to more than subdivisions.

3. Current Status. The latest draft was received on November 23, 2004. Document is currently being reviewed. The Document will go before the Pinal Planning & Zoning for review and recommended adoption to the Board of Supervisors.

REGIONAL AND INFRASTRUCTURE ISSUES

Transportation

Current growth and development patterns have resulted in a need for better regional "surface roads" between communities and the need for funding sources for road improvements. Within each target area in the land use plan, small area transportation plan are being addressed to accomplish this. In addition, freeway corridor planning is underway.

Small Area Transportation Planning

1. **Background:** In 1985, the Transportation Planning Division (TPD) of Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT), with support from the United States Department of Transportation (USDOT) and the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), initiated a program to assist local communities in the preparation of transportation plans. The Small Area Transportation Study (SATS) program was set up as a model of agency cooperation between ADOT and non-metropolitan local communities throughout the state. It is designed so that each local community directly manages its study and is responsible for identification of local transportation goals, objectives and needs. ADOT's responsibility is to provide matching funding, technical guidance, and some data collection support.

2. **Study Goals & Objectives:** The current goal of the SATS program is "to develop a comprehensive transportation plan for a proposed local area or region to guide multi-modal transportation planning and programming for a 20-year timeframe." (ADOT SATS Program, December 2003). Some objectives within the overall goal of this program are:

a. Identification of current transportation issues for all travel modes.
b. Inventory of existing and projected land uses, travel characteristics and deficiencies.
c. Determination of future transportation system needs.
d. Analysis of alternative transportation solutions

Planning Study Process: The process to implement a SATS is divided into three phases: the initial scoping process; consultant selection; and performance of the transportation study. The study scoping process is a cooperative effort between ADOT and the local community. The community must contact ADOT's TPD or its regional council of governments to indicate its interest in conducting a SATS followed by a formal commitment letter reflecting the estimated study cost and acknowledgement of matching funds. An intergovernmental agreement (IGA) is generated by ADOT defining the responsibilities of ADOT and the community and establishing funding levels for the study. Currently, funding is provided on an 80/20 matching split between ADOT and the community. A technical advisory committee is selected to guide development of the study. ADOT and the community then cooperatively prepare a formal scope of work and the community prepares a request for proposal (RFP). Proposals are then solicited by the community and jointly evaluated by ADOT and the local community. If necessary, prospective consultants may be interviewed to obtain a better understanding of the consultant's qualifications and experience. Subsequently, a consultant selection is made by ADOT and the community.

The consultant performs the transportation study under the direct management of the community. ADOT and the community jointly serve on the TAC with other interested agencies such as the ADOT Engineering and Council of Governments. ADOT provides data to the consultant including traffic counts and accident data. The community provides local reports, data and other information.

The scope of work for each study is designed to meet the needs of the community and, therefore the studies may differ in content and detail. However, the major tasks of each study are similar to provide consistency among the various studies and may include the following tasks:

a. Identification of major study issues
b. Inventory of existing and projected land use and travel characteristics
c. Analysis of the existing transportation network to identify deficiencies
d. Identification of potential improvements and analysis of future transportation needs
e. Development of short and long-range implementation programs
f. Coordination with the TAC and local and state agencies
g. Implementation of a public participation process

The SATS Program has resulted in 25 completed transportation studies in Arizona between the years 1986 – 1992. Costs of the various studies range between $75,000 to $125,000 depending upon the size of the area, specific transportation issues, and complexity of the study.

3. **Pinal County Small Area Transportation Study (SATS):** Recognizing significant population growth and economic development has occurred in Pinal County within the last five years and acknowledging that a SATS would complement Pinal County's Transportation Plan, the Department of Public Works initiated its formal interest to participate in a SATS in June 2004. An IGA was executed in October 2004 and is pending final execution by ADOT. The RFP was developed and approved by both agencies and issued in December 2004.

Freeway Corridor Planning

1. **Background:** In 2002, The Southeast Maricopa/Northern Pinal County Transportation Study was initiated in an effort to evaluate transportation linkages between Maricopa and Pinal Counties. The study was a collaborative partnership involving Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT), Maricopa Association of Governments (MAG), Central Arizona Association of Governments (CAAG), Pinal County, City of Apache Junction and Town of Queen Creek. The study concluded with a *summary of needs* for the study area including:

a. Improvements to arterial roads.
b. Improvements to state highways.
c. Replacing/improving canal bridges, river crossings and railroad crossings.
d. Freeway improvements. Within Pinal County four (4) high capacity freeway corridors with controlled access vital to the transportation system were identified.

2. **Identified Freeway Corridors:**

US 60 Freeway Extension, would be approximately 7 miles long, solely located within Pinal County. This facility would provide 2 lanes in each direction.

Apache Junction/Coolidge Corridor would be approximately 36 miles solely located within Pinal County. The alignment includes a crossing of the Gila River and a crossing of the Union Pacific Railroad mainline tracks.

Williams Gateway Freeway would be a total of approximately 15 miles long, 9 miles located within Pinal County. This freeway would provide 3 lanes in each direction.

East Valley Corridor would be approximately 31 miles long, 12 miles located within Pinal County. This corridor would provide 6 lanes.

On December 3, 2003 the Pinal County Board of Supervisors passed Resolution No. 120303-FC adopting the following priority for the freeway corridor in The Southeast Maricopa Northern Pinal Transportation Study as:

1. U.S. 60 Extension
2. Apache Junction/Coolidge Corridor
3. Williams Gateway Freeway
4. East Valley Corridor
5. Price Freeway Connection (identified in study as being wholly located within Maricopa County)

At the conclusion of the Southeast Maricopa Northern Pinal Transportation Study, ADOT acknowledged the need for corridor definition studies. Because of the impact the corridors have on two counties, ADOT will administer the studies. In June 2004 ADOT issued three (3) Request for Proposals (RFPs):

1. Pinal County Corridors Definition Study (combining the East Valley Corridor and the Apache Junction/Coolidge Corridor Definition).
2. Williams Gateway Corridor Definition
3. U.S. 60 Freeway Extension Definition

The studies have been awarded and are on a “fast-track” with a final report on each study to be presented to the State Transportation Board at the November 2005 meeting. Each study involves the formation/participation of a Technical Advisory Committee. Pinal County is represented on all three committees by the Assistant County Manager/Development Services.

Local government agencies located within study boundary areas recognize potential effects the significant population growth and economic development will have on Pinal County. In order to best serve the needs of all Pinal County residents and meet the future demands of the traveling public, representatives from local governments met in early November 2004 to discuss opportunities for sharing information, statistics, planning efforts and existing Planned Area Developments. This group will continue to meeting concurrent with the ADOT Corridor Definition Transportation Advisory Committee meetings.

Floodplain/Flood Control Planning

1. Background: Pinal County flood control and flood plain management have three (3) main organizational issues, funding, jurisdictional concerns and long range planning. There are also numerous drainage and flood control issues whose solution and treatment are affected by those organizational issues. In the past, low revenues have made meaningful flood control projects difficult. Typically flood control and large scale drainage projects were conceived and constructed by and for private development. A small flood control project, such as a drainage channel along the Ghost Ranch Road alignment in the Hopi Hills area, is estimated to cost between $1.7 million and $4.2 million depending on the level of protection desired. The Pinal County Flood Control District has managed to extend funding by the use of various grants, since 2001, 20% of the revenues have been in the form of grants.

Pinal County currently has 7 special taxing districts for flood control, 4 on the Santa Cruz – Santa Rosa river system, 2 in Supervisory District #2, and the Pinal County Flood Control District. There are also 3 cities that manage their own flood plains, as well as numerous irrigation and drainage districts. This hodge-podge approach creates difficulty in planning and construction of Flood Control works as well as Floodplain management. Due to the urbanization of the county the special districts along the Santa Cruz- Santa Rosa River system are quickly becoming obsolete. They were formed primarily to protect agricultural land and in the near future may be dissolved. However, the increased property value and subsequent revenues brought about by development should offset the cost of the increased maintenance required.

2. Current Status: Until 2003 the PCFC District did not have any long range planning, except for capital improvements through ADOT or CAAG. Flood Control was typically considered reactive and a maintenance issue, rather then a proactive engineering issue. Most drainage studies were limited in scope, due partly to funding, and usually conceived and implemented by private development. In 2003 work was started on the Pinal County Area Master Drainage Plan (PCAMDP). The first phase divided the county into 20 watersheds, prioritized them based on several criteria, and developed a scope of work and cost estimate for each watershed.

3. Milestones: The Maricopa Area Mater Drainage Plan will be ready for the Board of Supervisors review and approval by mid 2005. The entire PCAMDP should be completed by 2009. Current identified additional required drainage studies and cost estimates are enclosed (Attachment D). Additionally in 2004 the Pinal County Hazard Mitigation Plan was developed and is ready for board of supervisors review and approval. A summary of mitigation actions / projects are enclosed (Attachment E).

Regional Wastewater Planning

Introduction

Pinal County finds itself in the midst of a period of sustained growth that has seen a boom in construction and development as well as a steady increase in population. Annexations on the part of existing cities and towns and the formation of new municipalities out of what were formerly unincorporated areas of the county are changing the face of Pinal County at an ever accelerating pace. The continuing growth is driving a shift from what once was a county predominately rural in character to one with a more distinctively urban flavor. Planning for and guiding growth and development in Pinal County is a complicated, multifaceted undertaking that involves a great deal of collaboration, coordination, and cooperation across many functional areas of county and municipal government. The issues associated with growth pose new and difficult challenges for the county, including how to better control local development approval needs and processes and influence the same within the municipalities. Pinal County has little to no authority concerning policies to regulate wastewater facilities. Throw in the requirements and the ultimate authorities of the state agencies such as Department of Real Estate, Department of Water Resources, and Department of Environmental Quality along with the needs of the developers, builders, utilities, and one can see that there are many potential points along a given development approval path where the process can bog down, grind to a halt, or completely lose itself. This has never been truer than in the process for wastewater infrastructure planning, approval and construction in Pinal County.

Background

Wastewater planning is one area of basic infrastructure planning that has, in large part, been left to the developers, the local COG and ADEQ to figure out. While Pinal County has been in the business of approving new development throughout the county, the lack of a clear vision for how the location and development of wastewater infrastructure should occur in the county has resulted in what may appear to some to be a haphazard collection of treatment facilities and providers, operating under a variety of regulatory schemes and authorities and providing service to geographical areas whose boundaries are subject to change with the next development through the door. The determining factors in the creation of new wastewater infrastructure within the county has not been a result of any kind of regional wastewater planning, but rather a result of whose project is approved and when.

Prior to 1992, much of the development occurring in the county consisted of larger lot subdivisions that utilized onsite septic tank systems for their wastewater treatment and disposal needs. A collection of poorly operated package treatment plants provided the primary means of sewage disposal in other unincorporated areas of the county that had wastewater treatment and disposal needs that could not be met through septic tank systems. The municipalities, of course, built and operated their own wastewater treatment facilities to serve their citizenry. In the unincorporated areas, the demand for more high-density types of development created the need for wastewater collection, treatment and disposal by means other than septic tank systems and small package plants. Pinal County witnessed a proliferation of wastewater facilities to serve the new development. Along the way, everything from small package treatment plants operated by homeowner's associations to Arizona Corporation Commission regulated wastewater utilities to special wastewater improvement districts were approved to accommodate the increasing need for wastewater collection, treatment and disposal services.

The timing on the approval and completion of wastewater infrastructure has not always been perfect. Bad timing and a dysfunctional wastewater approval process have resulted in everything from nuisance and odor problems associated with facilities operating beyond capacity to inappropriate siting of facilities to the inability of homebuyers to close on their new homes due to a lack of approved treatment and disposal facilities to serve their new homes. In order to eliminate the kinds of problems that have occurred in the recent past, it is imperative that Pinal County takes a more active role in wastewater planning and approval issues to ensure that wastewater infrastructure will be available when and where needed. Basic infrastructure planning, including planning for wastewater, must occur at an appropriate point in the overall development approval process, ideally at the front end, in order to be effective. Wastewater planning should certainly not be an afterthought and it cannot at this point be done in a vacuum. Rather, it must include all the stakeholders in a given geographical area slated for development. This has not always been the case in the past.

Authority for Wastewater Planning and Approval

Section 208 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act was enacted for the purpose of encouraging and facilitating the development and implementation of area wide waste treatment management plans for those areas in each state which, as a result of urban-industrial concentrations or other factors, had substantial water quality control problems. Section 208(a) of the Act required the Governor of Arizona to identify each area within the State that had water quality control problems, designate the boundaries of each of those areas, and designate a single representative organization capable of developing an effective area wide waste treatment management plan for the area. Central Arizona Association of Governments (CAAG) was named the Designated Planning Agency (DPA) for the Pinal – Gila planning area. Section 208(b) of the Act required the DPA to have in operation an ongoing and continuing area wide waste treatment management planning process and develop an area wide water quality management plan (WQMP) that is to be updated annually. The CAAG WQMP was to include, among other things, the identification of treatment works necessary to meet the overall waste treatment needs of the planning area, including the anticipated municipal and industrial waste treatment needs, over a twenty-year period as well as the identification of Designated Management Agencies (DMA), entities designated in the WQMP to manage sewage treatment facilities and sewage collection systems in their respective areas. It appears that the current CAAG WQMP failed to anticipate Pinal County's wastewater treatment needs over the twenty-year period that began with the last plan update in 1994. In other words, as a planning document and a process intended to guide the development of wastewater infrastructure in Pinal County, the CAAG WQMP has not served its purpose well.

With respect to authority to approve the construction and operation of wastewater treatment and disposal systems, A.R.S. § 49-202 designates the Arizona Department of Environmental Quality (ADEQ) as the agency for the State of Arizona for all purposes of the clean water act, the resource and recovery act, and the safe drinking water act. Prior to the creation of ADEQ this authority was vested with Arizona Department of Health Services (ADHS). ADEQ acts as the clearinghouse for WQMPs in Arizona and on behalf of the Governor certifies that area wide WQMPs including plan amendments are incorporated into and consistent with the state water quality management plan and submits the plans or plan amendments to the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) for approval.

ADEQ's rules preclude the agency from approving any sewage treatment facility, including expansions of existing facilities until it has been determined that the proposed facility will conform to the area-wide WQMP and the state management plan. ADEQ functions primarily in a technical and engineering capacity with respect to the approval of wastewater infrastructure. The planning elements are generally left to the county and CAAG to work out. Pinal County Planning & Development and the BOS as part of the county's overall development review process approve the location and zoning for proposed new wastewater facilities. CAAG reviews WQMP amendments once the county has determined location and zoning are acceptable. ADEQ reviews and approves plans and permits for facilities, but is generally removed from the planning process other than performing it's role as liaison between the Governor's office, CAAG and the EPA with respect to the area wide WQMP and amendments to that plan.

A.R.S. § 49-107 provides for the delegation of ADEQ's water quality authorities to a local environmental agency, county health department, public health services district or municipality where the ADEQ director believes those delegated authorities can be competently, efficiently and properly performed by the local agency. ADEQ has in the past delegated the individual on-site sewage disposal (conventional septic tank and alternative type systems) portion of their wastewater authority to Pinal County. Pinal County is presently seeking an expansion of its delegated authorities from ADEQ to include delegation for review and approval of sewer collection systems. Delegation to Pinal County for authority to review and approve sewage collection systems and sewer line extensions is currently on hold on the part of ADEQ and will likely be delayed until revisions to ADEQ's Aquifer Protection Rules have been completed sometime in the spring of 2005.

Pinal County through its Title 11 authorities and its various departments, commissions and Board of Supervisors has the responsibility for land utilization and land development matters within the county. This responsibility includes the development of a comprehensive land use plan, specific actions associated with changes in land use, and the approval of residential and commercial development plans such as master planned communities, subdivision plats, manufactured home and RV parks all of which include some form of wastewater treatment and disposal consideration as part of the approval process.

Discussion

The question that has to be asked with respect to any discussion concerning regional wastewater planning within the county is what is the county's vision for wastewater treatment and disposal over the next 20 years? This question should have been asked 10 or 15 years ago, well in advance of the growth and development onslaught. If the question was asked and the vision developed, it has not been shared or articulated to the extent it needed to be to provide meaningful direction with respect to the regional planning of wastewater infrastructure in the county. Rather, wastewater planning in Pinal County has seemingly become a de facto byproduct of the overall development approval process as it occurs in Pinal County. Wastewater treatment and disposal issues and concerns have in many cases been viewed as someone else's problem and relegated to ADEQ and CAAG after the fact. The result has been the creation of many so-called regional wastewater facilities, whose existence is largely determined by the location and timing of the development that necessitated the facility's presence in the first place. This is not to say there is anything inherently wrong with having numerous regional facilities as opposed to a few larger ones.

It is just the way Pinal County has approached wastewater treatment in an ongoing effort to balanced rapid and continuing growth and development with the concept of regionalization of wastewater. What we see is what we got as a result of our unique circumstances and approach. Unlike Maricopa and Pima Counties who have had the luxury of driving new development toward the existing infrastructure, we lack the urban core that generally contains that existing wastewater infrastructure. Instead, our approach has been to create wastewater infrastructure, including wastewater treatment and disposal facilities, at the time of and concurrent with the particular development at hand. The planning concept that we have embodied seems to be that the first developer in an area of the county devoid of wastewater facilities is destined to become the regional provider for that particular geographical area. The facility providing wastewater treatment today will presumably provide wastewater treatment tomorrow for other development that might follow. One obvious flaw to this approach is the developer who may not be interested in becoming a regional wastewater utility or the developer whose project follows and decides not to buy into the existing facilities and instead elects to start another regional facility of his own. An overriding consideration to this approach to the regionalization of wastewater appears to be the desire and need to keep the development approval engine cranking in order to fuel economic growth and financial stability within the county.

CAAG, ADEQ and Pinal County are all involved in wastewater planning and approval on some level. Up until recently, the management of wastewater treatment and disposal in the county seemed relatively uncomplicated. But, the rapid growth the county has been experiencing over the past several years has brought to light just how dysfunctional wastewater planning in Pinal County has become. The three entities most involved have been seemingly operating independently of each other. On one separate track Pinal County approves new development that will have to be served by new wastewater treatment and disposal facilities, the approval of which is left to ADEQ. ADEQ, on a second track, approves the wastewater treatment and disposal facilities, but only after it has been determined that the proposed wastewater treatment and disposal is in conformance with the certified area wide water quality management plan which is the responsibility of CAAG. CAAG, on another track, reviews new wastewater treatment facility proposals and changes to existing facilities and approves these as amendments to the existing WQMP. There has been a notable lack of integration with respect to the review and approval functions of these three entities. In many cases, the development has been approved and the lots platted long before the wastewater treatment and disposal questions ever come before CAAG as a WQMP amendment. This has had the effect of stifling any meaningful discussion about whether or not this is where the county wanted to go with regional wastewater planning. It seems that somehow the wastewater infrastructure component associated with new development needs to be identified and emphasized early on in the overall development approval process as it occurs in Pinal County today.

On the other hand, it may be that wastewater treatment and disposal in Pinal County could not have evolved any differently than it has given the patterns of growth and development that have occurred over the past several years. Pinal County is not Maricopa County and it is not Pima County. The models for wastewater planning utilized by our brethren to the north and to the south may not be so well suited to the shotgun pattern of development that has occurred here. While the CAAG WQMP encourages the regionalization of wastewater treatment, regionalization is in the eye of the beholder.

Regardless of what the regionalization of wastewater looks like or should look like in Pinal County, it is not too late to step back, assess the current wastewater planning and approval process in Pinal County and then try to create the vision of future wastewater infrastructure for the county over the next twenty years. How do we define regional facilities? Where do we want to see regional facilities located? Where do we not? Do we want to engage the municipalities in the wastewater planning process? How do we deal with development that requires smaller package facilities? How do decentralized wastewater systems, septic tank systems and the like, fit into the overall wastewater treatment and disposal scheme? We can elect to do active wastewater planning in Pinal County as part of our overall planning process or we can let it evolve on its own as an addendum to that same planning process, much like what has already occurred. Without the vision there can be no real wastewater planning.

Recommendations

The following are some recommendations that we may want to explore as part of an attempt to create a more meaningful and functional wastewater planning process that will better serve all parties involved.

- Pinal County should first develop a vision for what we want our wastewater infrastructure to look like over the next twenty plus years. This vision should include the future of regional, package and onsite wastewater and treatment facilities. This vision should not reside in the mind of one person, but be articulated to all so that the vision can provide the foundation for the development of policy that can then be incorporated into our overall development planning and approval processes. Some possible areas where there may be a need to develop policy might include:

- Policy regarding minimum lot size for onsite sewage disposal systems
  - Policy regarding the maximum number of lots that can be served by onsite systems
  - Policy regarding sewer hook up and when it is required
  - Policy regarding the regionalization of wastewater treatment in areas where there are wastewater needs adjacent to but outside of the boundaries of incorporated municipalities or sanitary districts
  - Policy defining package treatment plants and when and where are their use is appropriate
  - Policy regarding the best ways for Pinal County, ADEQ, CAAG, and municipal officials to effect optimum coordination and information exchange on wastewater topics and issues to ensure needed wastewater planning occurs
  - Policy regarding occupancy of new dwellings where construction of approved sanitary facilities has not been completed

- Within the context of a defined plan for the establishment of future wastewater infrastructure, Pinal County should continue to work toward acquiring a greater portion of the ADEQ water quality functions and duties. This will require legislative changes for more authorities to counties. The more we are able to do at the county level, the greater our ability to influence, guide and control the water and wastewater aspects associated with the development that is occurring. The incorporation of ADEQ's water quality management functions and duties into the county's overall development and approval process will benefit Pinal County, ADEQ, and the developers, in at least two ways.

First, it will provide Pinal County with a significant opportunity to streamline and simplify the development approval process. Second, it will afford Pinal County the means to apply a more holistic approach to the development process by allowing the county to coordinate and exercise more control over a greater portion of the process at the local level. Obtaining delegation for sewer collection systems and line extensions will allow us to integrate the technical engineering and review portion of the overall wastewater planning and approval process with the planning aspects thereby giving us more control over the entire process.

Summary Comment

The die may have already been cast with respect to how wastewater infrastructure in Pinal County will develop, now and in the future. There are, however, vast tracts of land in the county still waiting to be developed. Despite the limitations and constraints imposed upon us by an ineffective and dysfunctional wastewater planning and approval process at the State of Arizona, Department of Environmental Quality, it will require considerable legislative changes in order to take the steps necessary to create the vision today for how wastewater treatment and disposal in Pinal County will be accomplished tomorrow. By doing so, we begin to perform meaningful wastewater planning that can be integrated into an effective, overall development approval process.

Open Space Master Planning

In the above mentioned statements from the Valley Forward Report Card 2004 indicated that Pinal County has no formal plan for open space planning and was rated very low as compared to our counterparts in Maricopa County. Open Space planning was also mentioned as a priority in the 2004 Pinal County Town Hall to “inventory potential open space areas”.

It is an important planning effort to create a Pinal County Open Space Master Plan. Equally important to the open space/park plan should be regional (Maricopa County as an example) in philosophy leaving the more comprehensive community and neighborhood parks and open spaces to city/town and homeowner association planning efforts.

This planning effort will add to the work currently being done by the Pinal County Trails Association to develop a trails plan for the County. This plan will identify open space, destination sites and conservation resources that are available to the County. This planning effort, if approved and directed so, can begin as early as mid 2005 with completion in late 2005. This master plan will coincide with consideration for an impact fee for growth to pay for the acquisition and development of the regional park system. It is intended to work with the Bureau of Land Management and the Arizona State Land Department to acquire strategically located land for regional parks. These parks would be connected through a linear park/trail and open space system. Further, the trails could be connected to cities/towns trails and park systems throughout the County where feasible. A completed Pinal County open space plan would include regional parks similar to Maricopa County approach and philosophy connecting to Pima County’s regional park systems.

Trails Plan

The current plan regarding linear park/trails is to develop an immediate plan that will protect the Arizona Trail in eastern Pinal County, the Anza Trail in western Pinal County and a third major trail along 53 miles of the CAP. These "Spine Trails" will set the frame work to connect the various communities, special natural resources and special features in the County. This work is currently being conducted in concert with the Pinal County Trails Association and should be ready for consideration for a major amendment in the Comprehensive Plan update in 2005.

Economic Development

In keeping with the priorities of the 2004 Pinal County Town Hall, consideration should be given to add an economic development element to the comprehensive plan. This plan could be a tool linked to the land use plan to ensure that appropriate areas are designated industrial, manufacturing, planned and zoned for future economic development opportunities that are conducive to the planned transportation corridors. Examples of economic centers include the Pinal Air Park(I-10), Williams Gateway Airport (Pinal County side), Arizona Public Service's Saguaro Electrical Generation Facility (I-10) to name a few. A concept of the economic development plan would involve utilizing the Maricopa Association of Governments to analyze population, housing and industrial components to project appropriate areas for economic development.

Capital Improvement Planning

During the completion of the impact fee analysis, a schedule of development of capital infrastructure needs should be completed. A CIP can provide identification of costs associated with the planning of the regional roads, open space and safety facilities as demand warrants. This process could help to ensure the needed public facilities are currently available before development.

Regulatory Protection of Public Health, Safety and Quality of Life

Air Quality and Growth in Pinal County

Pinal County is faced with the challenge of protecting the quality of life as well as protecting public health. How this challenge is met will depend on how Pinal County acts on dust issues.

1. Abstract

In a word, DUST constitutes the air quality issue in Pinal County.

"Sources" produce the emissions that constitute air pollution. Air pollution produces impacts on people, or "receptors."

Pinal County already has a dust problem. Due to dust, we face an imminent "nonattainment" designation from the Environmental Protection Agency.

Growth may displace some existing dust sources, such as some agricultural activity and some dirt road traffic. But growth also threatens increased dust emissions from an expanded network of dirt roads, increased on-road traffic, continuing construction and expansion of disturbed open areas.

The community, including both existing sources and the growth industry, needs to recognize the issue, achieve emission reductions from existing sources, and still assure that growth does not make the situation worse.

2. Background - Perspectives on air quality

A. Standards

" Health standards

Under the Clean Air Act, Congress required the EPA to develop uniform air quality standards to protect public health across the nation. For dust, or PM_{10}, the EPA adopted both 24-hour and annual standards. The EPA has a history of forcing state and local governments to act to bring air quality into compliance with those standards.

" Quality of life standards

Under the Clean Air Act, Congress also required the EPA to develop nationwide standards to limit degradation in areas with clean air.

For dust, or PM_{10}, the EPA adopted maximum degradation limits for both 24-hour and annual time frames. Unfortunately, for the most part, the EPA has never forced anyone to actually respect those standards.

B. Understanding air pollution impacts

Air quality impacts are difficult and expensive to monitor.

Even narrowing the discussion to just dust, monitoring air pollution levels constitutes a substantial undertaking. All monitors require a secure site with power. Filter-based monitors typically run on a one-day-in-six cycle. As a result, it takes years of data to develop a detailed understanding of local conditions. Newer electronic-based monitors provide continuous and instantaneous data, but are very expensive to buy and to maintain.

People reside all over. Many areas lack workable monitoring sites. As a result, monitoring data reflects only the "tip of the iceberg," and that data reasonably predicts the impacts on many individuals beyond those who live next to the monitor.

C. Understanding air pollution sources

Many air pollution sources are difficult and expensive to define.

Dust sources include stack emissions, other industrial and commercial activity, vehicles, and fugitive emissions. Fugitive emissions include wind-generated emissions.

On one end of the spectrum, stack emissions can be directly measured with instruments, so emission quantification relies on sound science and very little guesswork.

At the other end of the spectrum, wind-generated emissions cannot be directly measured, so emission quantification involves more estimation and less exacting science.

Other types of sources fall somewhere in-between, relying on both estimation and science in varying degrees.

3. Who contributes and how much to which problem?

There is no "smoking gun," so proving responsibility is difficult and expensive.

Our receptor modeling network, designed to assess human impacts, looks like only a few isolated dots on a map. Still, those monitors indicate we have a problem.

For the stationary source "stack" emissions that we regulate by permit, we have closely defined the expected PM_{10} emissions. However, those emissions account for a mere fraction of the elevated PM_{10} concentrations observed at our monitors.

For a number of sources of PM_{10} emissions, such as dirt roads and fugitive emissions from industrial and mining operations, we have never had the resources to define detailed emissions estimates.

For many other sources of PM_{10} emissions, notably large-area sources and wind-generated emissions, current technical tools simply don't produce credible estimates of emissions at the source.

As a result, we do not have a convenient set of scientific tools to develop a "proof" of which sources contribute to objectionable dust levels.

Nonetheless, the elevated PM_{10} levels on our monitors indicate that the citizens of Pinal County are exposed to unacceptable levels of dust. A danger to public health calls on us to act. A nonattainment designation by the EPA would force us to act.

If we must reduce dust emissions, and we lack precise science to structure a plan, we are going to have to rely on common sense as our guide.

4. Where do we have an issue in Pinal County, and who is responsible?

- Our monitoring network indicates that elevated dust levels exceed health-based standards at the Pinal County Housing Complex; in Stanfield; and at Cowtown.
- Those monitors must be viewed as representative of a broader problem, which most likely involves the agricultural basin of Pinal County.
- Available technology does not provide a ready means to pin responsibility for elevated dust levels:

The wind?	The desert?
Agricultural operations?	Disturbed earth?
Industrial sources?	Feedlots?
Dairies?	Dirt roads?
Transport from other areas?	

5. Growth-related impacts on air quality in Pinal County

- o Growth brings people to existing elevated dust levels, so development is turning the existing situation into a real public health issue and not a mere academic question.
- " Land splits compound dirt road traffic and dust emissions.
- " Growth produces more traffic, which causes more re-entrained dust on paved roads.
- " Construction generates dust from jobsite emissions, track-out of soil onto highways, and emissions from over-the-road haul trucks.
- " Construction-related mining generates dust, track-out and haul-road emissions.
- " Growth increases recreational activity in desert areas, which causes more wind-generated dust.

6. What can we do? Where should we focus?

- " We need to accept that in some areas of the County, existing activity and land use produces too much dust.
  - $ To address the existing situation, we need to honestly recognize where we generate dust, and what level of emission reduction we need to protect public health.
  - $ To address the existing situation, we need to decide which dust sources can be controlled in a fair and cost effective manner.
- " To avoid compounding the existing dust problem, we must not allow new sources and activities to make the problem even worse.
- " We need to decide whether we should also strive to assure quality of life, or just settle for protecting public health.
- " A nonattainment designation will only allow roughly a year-and-a-half to two years to formulate and adopt an enforceable control strategy to reduce monitored PM_{10} values.
- " We need to open a stakeholder process to make sure the citizens of Pinal County understand the situation, and begin identifying ways to reduce PM_{10} emissions.

7. Conclusion

Pinal County needs to first get a grip on, and then act on dust issues that threaten public health. And we need to decide whether we will settle for protecting public health, or whether we want to protect quality of life.

Noise Ordinance

There is enforcement power under the criminal code in A.R.S. § 13-2904, which provides a person commits disorderly conduct if, with intent to disturb the peace or quiet of a neighborhood, family or person, or with knowledge of doing so, such person makes unreasonable noise. Legal staff is doing further research to determine whether noise, in general and connected with construction, can be regulated under the zoning or public health authority.

Landscape Ordinance

There is no explicit statutory authority for the county to regulate landscaping and require landscape plans for permitted uses. Staff is currently working with our consultant and the Planning and Zoning Commission Subcommittee to identify situations, such, as planned area developments, special uses, perhaps others, in which a site plan, including landscape plans can be required.

Sign Code

Staff is currently working with a designated consultant and the Planning Commission Subcommittee to develop a new sign code. This work should be complete as part of the overall Zoning Ordinance update scheduled for mid-2005.

Density and Diversity Standards

Staff is currently revising the PAD requirements to include various density and diversity standards. We are planning to either add these standards or similar standards to either the cluster portion of the Zoning Ordinance or create a separate design guideline manual that could be applied to many different types of projects. This has a high priority and should be addressed in 2005.

Code Compliance

Staff has implemented a new case tracking system in the AS400 computer system to track all complaints from start to finish. Data is available on all cases electronically, allowing the supervisors, county manager and department personnel to find current, updated information for all of 2003 and 2004. This speeds response time and provides a management tool to allocate staff resources. Since we currently staff three satellite offices with field personnel, the need to pull staff from the Florence office has been reduced. However, these field offices are experiencing very high traffic two mornings per

week and one additional Code Compliance Officer is anticipated to allow the field staff time to more aggressively pursue code violations and serve neighborhoods.

Hearing Office

Staff has added an assistant to process the large number of cases we have and to more aggressively collect outstanding fines and penalties. This should result in faster turn around times for violations and improve response time to neighborhoods. Staff has increased the number of Hearing Officers to three and has doubled the hearing dates to twice per month. The Hearing Office and the new Prosecutor position will respond to zoning code compliance, building safety, environmental health (where applicable), air quality (where applicable), environmental investigations (where applicable).

Technological Foundations

Building Safety

Due the ever increasing activity in the Building Safety Department it is taking twice as long to issue permits, from 15 to 25 days, as it did before this extreme increase in growth occurred. Many of the building safety inspectors are doing twice the amount of inspection per day as they should. Their schedule has gone from 25 to 50 a day. We are experiencing a growth rate of greater than 70% over last year. In addition to evaluating our staffing levels, the department is currently in the process of implementing new technology to initiate a computerized central permit system. When fully in place, the **ACCELA** technology will give us the following capabilities:

ACCELA CENTRAL PERMITTING

- **Processing time** will be cut significantly by eliminating the process of routing applications through numerous development service departments electronically rather than the current paper manual system. For building permits issued in subdivisions, all the information from the departments will automatically be fed into the building safety department, cutting our turn-around times to 5 to 10 days.
- **Costly errors** will be cut significantly by taking the human error factor out of the equation of the current manual paper routing system.
- **Staffing** is being reorganized by taking three of the five permit technicians assigned to processing permits and reassigning them to cover other critical duties of the “One Stop Shop” process.
- **Statistical information and other research** will be compiled much quicker and more accurately, and not require the resources previously used to extract it. We’ll be able to plan more effectively and cover ourselves better in legal matters.

INTERACTIVE VOICE RESPONSE System (IVR)

- **Inspection Requests** from the builders will be received and processed much more effectively with the IVR. We will eliminate a tremendous amount of time being spent by the permit techs manually downloading inspection requests off the telephones, typing them in to their computers, printing and making copies for the inspectors.
- **Disseminating Schedules** will be done more effectively. We are currently faxing daily, inspection requests (over 400 a day) to all the inspectors in our outlying districts.
- **Enhanced Customer Service** will be immediately realized by allowing the builders to call their inspections in and receive the results of their inspection, on the IVR instead of trying to get through on busy phone and fax lines. We should have an adequate number of ports to handle the volume of calls.

HANDHELD COMPUTERS or PDAs

- **Daily Assignments** will be downloaded by each inspector with their own personal PDA and the results of their inspections offloaded at the end of the day in a matter of minutes. This will eliminate 16 to 20 inspectors on the phone with 5 permit techs recording inspections.
- **Record keeping** will be more complete and accurate, cutting time and expense and also our susceptibility to litigation.
- **GIS** will eventually be available on the PDAs for mapping and planning their routes.

Once the system is fully implemented it is expected to provide more efficient and effective service to Pinal County's citizens and growth stakeholders.

Integrated Geographic Information System

Currently, there is a project to develop an adequate Land Management Integration Program utilizing and developing an integrated GIS system to assist the Pinal County Recorders Office, the Development Services Departments and the Sheriff's Office. Components include a GIS Base map anticipated to be completed by mid 2005 with Phase "D" currently under negotiation for consultant services.

The addressing Geo Code/Centerline mapping is currently under review for a scope of services needed utilizing the Arizona's 911 program as possible contractors to assist the project.

An Imaging System is being reviewed to assist in the electronic transfer of information to replace the manual/paper system currently in use. Staffing and organizational systems analysis is being analyzed for the integration of an imaging system's use within the various services provided by Pinal County.

GROWTH PLANNING INITIATIVE
FUNDING RECOMENDATIONS

Introduction

In order not burden the general fund to initiate the GPI, adequate funding to begin to offset the capital, planning and operational costs incurred for the stepped up planning and implementation to address growth,

Plan Review Fees

To aggressively address growth through the Growth Planning Initiative adequate funding is needed for the numerous planning efforts as well as funding an adequate staff and operational costs. The planning fees schedule has not had significant change since 1984. The enclosed attachment "B" reflects an analysis and comparison of planning fee schedules of the cities of Mesa, Gilbert, Casa Grande and Apache Junction. The comparison was also done with Pima, Maricopa, Coconino and Yavapai Counties.

Methodology:

A comparison was done in the areas of tentative plat, final plats, zone changes/planned area developments, special use permits, industrial use permits, concept review and advertising. The comparison was done by multiply the fees charged in each community listed above by 95%. A comparison was done by using the number of cases processed in the county and multiplying these cases numbers by the percentages shown in the attachment. These figures represent what the total revenue would be for Pinal County if the same number of cases were processed in future years using new fees.

Findings:

The tentative plat stage of development incurs the most fees in any stage of the development process in all communities studied. Some communities charge a base fee plus a cost per lot. Other communities charge a base fee plus a cost per acre. Pinal County charges a base fee plus a cost per lot. Therefore, the communities studied that charge fees per lot provided the best comparison. These communities are Pima, Maricopa and Yavapai Counties and the cities of Mesa and Casa Grande. Some of the counties and cities charge for certain services while others do not. Some county and city fees were not available, so a complete comparison was not possible. Maricopa County reflected this to some extent.

Results:

Pima County has the fee structure that most reflects Pinal County in terms of type of services and categories. If Pinal County were to adopt fees where a 95% multiplier was used, the total income would be $4,462,310 (est.).

Impact Fees

Definition. Development Impact Fees (DIFs) are defined as those fees charged directly to developers to offset the government's costs associated with providing public services and facilities due to the impacts from new development. They have also been defined as scheduled charges applied to new development to generate revenue for the construction and expansion of capital facilities located outside the boundaries of the new development (off-site) that benefit the contributing development. Impact Fees, although it can be argued the term "exaction," is more descriptive of the improvements or monetary contributions resulting from negotiations between a developer and a government, usually through a development agreement.

Legal Foundations. Impact Fees are not new but have been enacted by local governments across the country for more than 30 years. In Arizona, counties are expressly authorized by statute to charge impact fees but are only permitted to implement impact fees on water, wastewater, parks, transportation and public safety facilities. Impact Fees have been well litigated over the years in both the federal and state courts. Two fairly recent federal cases of note are *Nollan v. California Costal Commission* and *Dolan v. City of Tigard.* These cases essentially deal with exaction issues but certainly contain implications for impact fees. The *Nollan* ruling creates a standard of logical connection between the stated purposed for the exaction and the nature of the exaction itself. The *Dolan* ruling added the standard that an exaction be "roughly proportionally" to the impact of the development.

In Arizona, *Home Builders Ass'n of Central Arizona v. City of Scottsdale*, a case involving a water resource impact fee, saw the courts upholding impact fees. The case was first decided prior to the *Dolan* case, but was remanded to the court of appeals by the Arizona Supreme Courts for reconsideration in light of *Dolan*. The appellate court again upheld the impact fees and ruled *Dolan* does not apply to impact fees (and again, the Arizona Supreme Court concurred).

Impact Fees Must Meet Standards. The law which authorizes counties to charge impact fees in Arizona requires several things in order for an impact fee to be considered legitimate. Impact fees…

….are generally paid when building permits are obtained.
….must be based on actual anticipated costs for new development.
….cannot be used to fund existing infrastructure deficiencies.
….must be assessed in a consistent, "non-discriminatory" manner.
….must be roughly proportional to the region where is it being assessed.

In addition, a county must be able to prove the new development paying the impact fee gets appropriate benefit from the things funded by the impact fee.

Impact Fees…How Much? It has already been pointed out that development impact fees can be assessed in a variety of areas. The question of how much any given impact fee element should be and what process should be used to arrive at a number must be addressed. First, an impact fee must have a proportionate relationship to the cost of providing the public facilities for which the impact fee is being charged to serve the new development.

Impact fee formulas for commercial and industrial development will differ from residential development (a high traffic count for commercial development could be charged a proportionately higher fee than a parks impact fee). Individuals in like situations must be treated alike.

In developing a formula for impact fees, solid technical data and analysis must be used to establish cost figures that are legitimate and defensible. The basis for charging the impact fee and the calculation is normally included in the enabling ordinance. Though the process of developing impact fee formulas can be time consuming, once the cost of service analysis is complete, it becomes a matter of crunching the numbers.

Developer Credits/Offsets. Every impact fee calculation must include consideration of potential credits and offsets. It is common for a county to require a developer to do certain things in conjunction with a development such as dedication of rights-of-way or setting aside land for a park. These exactions have value and that value must be credited toward any impact fee being levied for an improvement. A county must also give credits for payments by the developer to other funding sources being used to fund an improvement. A county must ensure that the total contributions to all sources of funds being paid by a developer and being used to fund a public facility do not exceed the development's appropriate proportionate share of the cost of the facility.

Process to Implement Impact Fees. The American Planning Association (APA) suggests any impact fee program be carefully designed and documented and suggests using the Planning & Zoning Commission or appoint an ad-hoc Impact Fee Committee or simply keep in with the Board of Supervisors to assist in developing an impact fee program. Some sort of public hearing process or other method of securing public input would seem to be essential. The APA says seven issues need to be considered in developing an impact fee program.

1. Linking the comprehensive plan – Impact Fees should support the plan.
2. Defining facility service areas – draw service area boundaries to assign impacts.
3. Assessing impact on existing facilities – analyze real impact by development.
4. Measuring unit impact – quantify impacts and make them specific.
5. Pricing unit impact – avoid overcharging for cost of impacts.
6. Administering revenue – set policy and procedures for fee collection.
7. Administering expenditures – track and monitor expenditure of fees.

Statutory procedures and accounting requirements must be followed in the adoption and administration of an ordinance implementing development impact fees. A 120-day notice of intent requirement is contained in the law, as is a requirement for the release of a public report supporting the proposed impact fee along with a 90-day delay in the effective date for any new or increase in impact fees. Impact fee dollars must retain their identity in the county's budget and accounting system and can only be used for the purposes identified upon the adoption of the impact fee.

The anticipated first step would be to secure the Board of Supervisors direction on using impact fees. If the BOS directs staff to move forward, a consultant would be necessary to assist staff in the appropriate foundational work for an ordinance.

Once a draft ordinance is developed, it would make sense to approach the "stakeholders" (developers, homebuilders) for input to work with the ordinance prior to presentation to the Board of Supervisors. Once a consultant is hired, it anticipated work could start in 90 days and Staff would need another 365 days for its work, grace periods and public forum involvement.

Staffing and Organization

Current staffing level analysis is being addressed in all of the departments within Development Services. An on-going staffing plan as well as organizational review of adequacy is currently underway to meet the future demands of growth in Pinal County. The following are examples of recent staffing initiatives reviewed and approved by the County Manager.

Planning & Development. *T*wo planning positions were added in the last couple of years to assist in processing the current planning function. These new positions will also help in long range planning functions. Consulting will probably perform the majority of the studies and planning needed to complete the GMI. An additional Project Administrator position under direct supervision by the Assistant County Manager for Development Services should be added to manage the various consultant contracts and assisting the Department Heads with the assigned special projects.

Building Safety. Six positions have been added in the last six months to respond to 188% growth in annual building permits/inspections from five years ago. Three new building inspector positions and three new permit technician positions have been added to respond to more efficient customer service levels. Further, the new permit system (ACCELA) was initiated in January of 2005.

Public Works. Five positions were created and brought "in-house" to staff a development review section for all new planned area developments resulting in final plats. The section is responsible for reviewing and identifying transportation and flood control requirements.

Drafting/GIS/Addressing. Improvements to the County Geographic Information System (GIS) are underway with a "base GIS map" expected to be unveiled in early 2005. The right-of-ways and parcel portion of the GIS project is nearing completion. Current phase development is addressing. Current staff provides customer service, drafting and addressing that is a priority for the Planning & Development and Public Works departments. Creation of a geo-coded addressing map, zoning and floodplain information, and additional GIS personnel are identified and are a function of the budgeting process. Further, the new building permit system (ACCELA) will require a substantial commitment of planning and development GIS/addressing personnel. Two additional GIS positions have been created.

Administration. *C*omputers, vehicles, digital cameras, printers have been purchased in all phases of the department. Additional emphasis on training is planned. Staffing is adequate, although some reclassification is anticipated as increasing demands have changed some jobs functions and responsibilities.

Facilities. Current facilities within the Development Services Division are adequate at this time. As population increases in growth rates will require additional personnel, equipment and additional facilities. A Comprehensive Pinal County Master Facilities Plan is need of consideration.

Conclusions and Recommendations

As can be seen by the above report, it is being recommended to begin aggressively managing the necessary planning responsibilities to ensure that responsible growth in Pinal County. That it is being carried out in an efficient as well as an effective manner. The Growth Management Initiative and its components, if implemented, will address many of the overriding concerns for the rapid growth and its consequences for Pinal County. The following are recommendations for implementation of the GMI.

1. Implement the Plan Review Fee Schedule update.
2. Implement Impact Fee Study.
3. Commission an Open Space Master Plan.
4. Update the Pinal County Zoning Code.
5. Update the Pinal County Subdivision Standards & Regulations.
6. Continue with implementation of the Small Area Transportation Planning.
7. Update the Pinal County Comprehensive Plan.
8. Continue implementation of the Pinal County Master Flood Control Study.
9. Address an adequate policy for Regional Wastewater Planning.
10. Address Air Quality Modeling preparing for Pm10 Non-Attainment.
11. Implement Noise Ordinance.
12. Implement Landscape Ordinance.
13. Implement an updated Sign Code.
14. Implement Density & Diversity standards within subdivisions.
15. Continue stepped-up efforts of Code Compliance.
16. Continue increased efforts for an efficient and effective Hearing Office.
17. Continue with implementation of new technologies tools to assist with more efficient response to the citizenry and stakeholders.
18. Continue to address adequate staffing, organizational structure and adequate facilities to ensure adequate levels of service.

Attachment A

Attachment B