



San Tan Valley
Special Area Plan

SAN TAN VALLEY – SPECIAL AREA PLAN

TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING #2

MEETING SUMMARY

MEETING INFORMATION:

San Tan Valley – Special Area Plan

TAC Meeting #2

Tuesday, July 25, 2017

10:00AM – 12:00PM

Mountain Vista Middle School

MEETING ATTENDEES:

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

Steve Abraham, Pinal County

Evan Balmer, Pinal County

Kent Taylor, Pinal County

Rachel Zenuk, Pinal County

Kevin Kugler, Michael Baker International

Matt Klyszeiko, Michael Baker International

Michelle Orton, Town of Florence

Steve Johnson, San Tan Valley Chamber of Commerce

Brad Mecham, CAG

Gayle Blanchard, J.O. Combs Unified School District

Brett Burningham, Town of Queen Creek

Daren Schnepf, District 2 Advisory Committee

Charles Hofer, Arizona Game and Fish Department

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 TAC 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 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

TECHNICAL 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*):

Clarify, only 32,000 San Tan residents are in the workforce? *Yes, US Census data provided this information. It is important to keep in mind that San Tan has a larger family size, resulting in a smaller workforce on average.*



San Tan Valley
Special Area Plan

SAN TAN VALLEY – SPECIAL AREA PLAN

TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING #2

MEETING SUMMARY

Clarify, the percent of higher education attainment is based on workforce or entire population?
This figure is based on the entire population.

We need to tweak our approach to land use planning. The current comp plan provides little guidance to decisions makers on good planning practices and forces them to make decisions on their own.

The Arizona State Land Department does not want to reduce flexibility on Trust Lands, but recognizes the need to balance land use and infrastructure planning. Balance would provide flexibility to respond to market and certainty for STV in the future.

Agree coordinated planning will help to better plan elements like bike lanes, but will they be used? It's good to address, like to address, but believe that level of detail should be in later phases of the development process.

Who approves this plan when completed? *The Board of Supervisors will ultimately approve this plan as a major Comprehensive Plan Amendment.*

We need developers and utility companies at the table. This is a joint effort, STV is an exploding community with little oversight and now infrastructure is trying to catch up. This plan will help avoid this problem in the future.

Think this has been a great process, but ASLD needs to review the scenarios and more detail. Ultimately would like to utilize a zoning bank concept.

We need to work with ASLD and cooperate on all sides. *To frame the current land ownership composition in the study area, 35% of the study area is greenfield or has no development/PAD, and 85% of that greenfield land is Trust Land managed by ASLD.*

Scenario C seems to reflect what the community wants in terms of providing a central gathering place. *Yes, it was developed to respond to specific community feedback on that issue, but it has other tradeoffs that may conflict with other community comment like traffic. The scale of this development was also tempered and is intended to be realistic in terms of scale/demand.*

What type of typical development would occur in the community center place type? Is that similar to a Tempe Marketplace? *Yes, Tempe Marketplace is one example of the type of development that could occur in the Community Center place type, however the planning area could not support that type of development in every Community Center location, so some would have a lower level of intensity.*

Would this land use approach still utilize the land uses found in the Pinal County Comprehensive Plan? *No this plan would utilize the new place types.*



San Tan Valley
Special Area Plan

SAN TAN VALLEY – SPECIAL AREA PLAN

TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING #2

MEETING SUMMARY

Likes the flexibility the place type approach provides to mix and match uses. Believes Scenario B is most feasible. Scenario A is not sustainable, but is reason some moved to STV. Concerns with Scenario C and employment and Urban Center located along railroad, makes access difficult. *Yes, does complicate access and may require grade separation, but was also trying to take advantage of the future plans for a commuter rail station.*

Is workforce housing required in all scenarios. *No, at this stage of the process policies such as this have not been discussed. The current economic environment in STV does not trigger this issue, but as land is developed in the long-term this may become an issue that would need to be addressed.*

Suggest better identifying what lands are greenfield and ASLD.

Place type approach is becoming more common and developers seems to like it. Notice that should appears often under the compatibility measures, you may want to consider shalls to avoid issues in the future. *Yes, at this stage I the process we utilized should to define the condition. As the process moves forward and the preferred plan is identified some of those shoulds are expected to change to shalls.*

Will this approach include a health matrix as part of the next open house? *Yes, to help residents evaluate how these plans impact health we will develop a health matrix with the assistance of the health impact assessment advisory committee.*

Seems like you could put Scenario B & C together. *Yes, ultimately the final preferred plan will most likely be a combination or hybrid of these three scenarios.*



San Tan Valley
Special Area Plan

SAN TAN VALLEY – SPECIAL AREA PLAN

TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING #2

MEETING SUMMARY

Appendix A:
TAC Meeting #2
Sign-In Sheet

