PINAL COUNTY PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION
(PO NUMBER 233382)

Regular Meeting
9:00 a.m.
Thursday, August 20, 2015
EOC Room – Building F
31 N. Pinal St., Florence, Arizona

INDEX:

DISCUSSION OF ACTION ITEM REPORT:

- Action Item Report – pg. 1-2

REPORT ON BOARD OF SUPERVISORS ACTION ON P & Z CASES – p. 2

PLANNING MANAGER'S DISCUSSION ITEMS:

- Scott Bender, County Engineer – pp. 4-21
- Jim Petty, Public Works/Airport – pp. 21-26
- Presentation by Louis Andersen, Public Works Director on upcoming Public Works Projects and Economic Development Activity – pp. 27-28 and 34-38
- Himanshu Patel – pp.38-50
- Sun Zia power line siting project – pp. 50-60
- Notice requirements for Public Hearing Cases (presentation to after public hearing cases) – pp. 107-112

NEW CASES:

- PZ-001-15 & PZ-PD-001-15 – pp. 28-34

TENTATIVE PLATS:

- S-026-05 & S-033-06 – pp. 60-85

WORK SESSION:

- PZ-PA-001-15: pp. 87-88
- PZ-PA-002-15: pp. 89-98
- PZ-PA-003-15: None
- PZ-PA-004-15: pp. 98-107

CALL TO THE COMMISSION: 120-134

ADJOURNMENT – p. 134

TRANSCRIPTION PROVIDED BY

Julie A. Fish
Quick Response Transcription Services
829 East Windsor Avenue
Phoenix, Arizona 85006
602-296-5178

ORIGINAL PREPARED FOR:
PINAL COUNTY, ARIZONA

HARTMAN: If I can get your attention as Vice Chair. I will call this regular session of August 20th to order. I was kind of holding off to let our Chair come. Normally if you give him five minutes or so, he's here. But he's not here, so – and you are, and Commission Members, we have a quorum so we are here. So without any further delay, let's move into our regular August 20th hearing. We're in the EOC Room, Building F. Pinal County Planning and Zoning Commission. With that, there's agendas in the back. Commissioner Riggins – I mean Commissioner Salas.

SALAS: Yes sir.

HARTMAN: Do you have something?

SALAS: I was talking to the clerk here.

HARTMAN: I couldn't hear myself think.

SALAS: Something very (inaudible).

HARTMAN: Okay, with that, we'll call, call to order. Discussion items report is the first agenda. Steve Abraham, our Director, will initiate that.

ABRAHAM: Thank you, Mr. Chair. In your Action Item Report from last month, you looked at two cases, and the San Tan Heights Homeowners Association, and that case has not been heard by the Board yet, so there has been no resolution to that one as of yet. It will be heard at the end of the month, so we'll have an update for you at your next meeting for that. And then on the initiation of the RV parking amendment, code

amendment, staff is still diligently working on that one as well. So both cases are – haven't been finalized by the Board at this point. That was, that was it for your meeting last month.

HARTMAN: All right, with that, Steve thank you. And then let's go on to the report of the Board of Supervisors actions on P & Z cases.

ABRAHAM: Over the last two Board meetings, the only item that they looked at was the request for a cell tower out on Ocotillo Road and Kenworthy in San Tan Valley. That was by the SRP substation there. The Board ended up approving that one with no changes to your recommendation.

HARTMAN: All right. Steve I'm always saying the wrong name and everything, I, I want to kind of correct you if I can. Ocotillo, is that not right? Is it not Ocotillo?

ABRAHAM: What did I say? Did I say Ocotillo?

SALAS: Ocotillo.

ABRAHAM: Ocotillo.

HARTMAN: Yeah.

ABRAHAM: What did I say? Ocatiel.

HARTMAN: Octiel (inaudible).

ABRAHAM: Ocotillo. Okay.

SALAS: Ocotillo.

ABRAHAM: Ocotillo.

HARTMAN: Yeah. All right, the Commission's always

correcting me on names, so that's my time to get back.

SALAS: You're getting even, huh?

HARTMAN: Yeah, yeah. All right, thank you Steve.

ABRAHAM: Got it.

HARTMAN: Now we go onto number – item number 4, Planning Manager's Discussion Items.

ABRAHAM: Commissioners, per your request, I asked our Public Works Director Louis to come in and give you an update on some of the things that him and his team are working on. I also had Tim Kanavel scheduled, but Louis will be handling his part as well. Tim had some medical issues he had to take care of today, so Louis will be handling both Tim and his stuff. And without further ado, I'd like to turn it over to our Public Works Director, Louis.

ANDERSON: Thank you. Thanks Chair and Members of the Commission.

HARTMAN: Good morning, Mr. Anderson.

ANDERSON: Good morning. Hopefully I don't mispronounce anything, because I don't really want to (inaudible) notice. But I appreciate you having us back. We've got a lot of exciting things going on in our transportation area, and in the last year – I think it's been about a year since we were here. So I'm going to turn it over to our County Engineer, as well as our Airport Director, and they're going to talk about those particular projects. And

then I'll pick back up with Economic Development.

HARTMAN: Thank you.

BENDER: Okay, good morning Commissioner Members. My name's Scott Bender, I'm the County Engineer. I just wanted to give you a quick update on what's going on in Public Works. Wanted to start by highlighting some recently completed projects. There we go. One of the recently completed projects that we did, this was a flood control project out in Arizona City. We had purchased 40 acres and turned it into a detention basin. One of the problems in Arizona City is the flows are from southeast to northwest, and once they got to the Battaglia/Hennes intersection, they had nowhere to go. So this basin is on the west side of Hennes Road, south of Battaglia, 40 acres in size, so it allows that water to feed into there and get out of Arizona City. And along with that, we put a box culvert under Hennes Road because at the Hennes and Battaglia intersection, that was a - it would get flooded and people could not make use of that road, so they will be able to now. And then we also improved the channels on the south side of Battaglia Road to facilitate that water to move on west and continue to get out of the Arizona City area. The next one that was recently completed was - it was a low flow crossing on the Florence/-Kelvin Highway; it's called the Big Wash is where this wash is. It's basically the intersection of Barkerville Road. But during

big events, that wash – the water would wreak havoc on the roads, so what we did is we went in, we put a concrete – it's called a low water crossing, and we made use of the –they're called gabion baskets - basically it's wire baskets that you will up with rocks. We have those on either reside of the concrete structure, and that helps prevent erosion of the structure itself. Because otherwise some of these large events, if you don't have those in place, you will lose your road. So we're real happy with this and I know the residents in the area are real happy with it as well. And of course the number one priority for Pinal County Public Works is the Hunt Highway project. Phase I was completed last summer. It was 1.8 miles from Empire down to Thompson Road. Added – it's widening intersection improvements and along with drainage improvements as well. So it's four lanes with a two-way left-turn lane. Median in select locations to control access and improved safety. Right now Phase II is underway. It's almost complete. That picked up where we left off for Phase I, which was Thompson Road and it goes down to Gary Road. That's about 1.7 miles. Again, we did widening, intersection and drainage improvements. We also added a traffic signal at Village Lane, which was a highly-requested item. And it's, it's pretty much almost complete, but there is a September 30th completion date, and that's just to take care of punch list items and any other small things that may arise between now and then. And then

soon after Phase II is done, we'd like to roll into Phase III. You may be aware that recently we bonded $20 million for Hunt Highway to complete this project. We just weren't getting the adequate funding from our normal channels, so the Board of Supervisors did authorize a bond for this money. In Phase III we hope to start late 2015/early 2016 and will pick up at Gary Road and take it down to Bella Vista. And with - along with Phase III we're also going to do Gantzel Phase DI and there's a slide on that, and I'll show you that on a map. But the design is complete for that. We do have some State Land acquisition that's currently underway. We hope to wrap that up soon. So late this year/early next year, we hope to be under construction for that. And then Phase IV and V, well somehow some text for Phase V disappeared on the lower right there. But either way, Phase IV is Bella Vista down to Magma Road, and then Phase V is Magma down to Arizona Farms. And again, we'll just continue these same improvements. The designs are in various stages for Phases IV and V. Again, we have State Land acquisition to deal with, utility relocations. It's quite a bit to juggle, but Celeste Pemberton, our area 2 engineer is doing a bang-up job on that. Oh, there it is. So here's Gantzel D1, and this is the project that we're going to do along with Hunt Phase III. Gantzel from Bella Vista south to Omega is, is the road improvement section, and that's that green line south, south of Bella Vista. D2 is that orange

line that will connect into Hunt Highway, and that's at the Johnson Ranch Boulevard intersection. Along with this, the blue line going to the west, that's Bella Vista, and we're going to do pavement rehabilitation on that road. It's in pretty dire straits, so we're going to do that. We're also going to widen it up at the northwest corner so that we have a complete arterial section for Bella Vista. And then the green line going north is we're also going to do a ten foot multiuse pathway up to Poston Butte High School, so kids, you know, that walk or bike to Poston Butte High School, they have a safe place to travel to do that. So again, that's late 2015/early 2016 construction. And we'll do the Gantzel D1 portion first before we start working on Hunt Phase III. Reason being, is we think there may be some straggling issues on Hunt Phase III that we want to continue to wrap up, and if we do Gantzel D1, which everything is in place for that, that's going to take about four months, and hopefully in that four months we can get Phase III finalized and ready to do. And then after that, this is the connection from the end of D1 into Hunt Highway. Omega is the road there on the south end of D1. Design is about 60 percent complete. Sometime in 2016 we hope to start that. It'll probably be late 2016. This one here, we do have some State Land issues. We have to acquire it, but right now that, that area is being farmed. So we're going to have to deal with the farmer, compensate him. To

what extent that is, we don't know. As you know, there's a new State Land Commissioner, so we don't know the temperature of the State Land Department at this point, because we haven't had a chance to really deal with him a lot during this transition phase. So anyway, but we will get through it. And this will be a vital connection off of Hunt Highway that will get you over to Iron - to Gantzel, and eventually to Ironwood. So we're excited about this one as well. And another project we have underway is the Maricopa-Casa Grande Highway box culvert project. This is at the Santa Cruz Wash. It's near the Ak-Chin industrial area, if you know where that is. But what we're doing is, it's a 30 barrel box culvert project to get that water underneath the road. Those familiar with the area know that we have to close that road constantly whenever it rains because it is such a low flow crossing. So anyway, this will address those issues. We're also going to improve the access to that Ak-Chin industrial park via box culverts. We're widening one of the streets into there called Antone Street. So right now it is under construction. If you happen to be in the area, take a look at it.

Another one that we have that's currently out to bid, this is a flood control project. This is in the Casa Grande area. The subdivision area's called Indian Hills. It's in Northern Casa Grande. But we bought an 18 acre parcel and we're going to turn that into a detention basin, and

analysis of that basin shows that we'll reduce the peak flows by about 25 percent, because what was happening is there on the lower right, at the very bottom, the dense subdivision, that's in the City of Casa Grande, and they do have a channel that goes through there. We think it was probably a little under designed, so when big storm events flow through there, it gets up into the streets It hasn't gotten into a house, but it has gotten close. So – and then north of that, that's, that's County subdivisions. Some of those homeowners have expressed concerns during large events, so this will reduce the flow by about 25 percent, and we'll, we'll see how it works out. But that's out to bid right now, and we'll have a bid opening on September 24th. Another one that recently we awarded – it's getting – actually it'll be awarded at the next Board meeting, and this is for the Guadalupe Road paving project, this is in the Apache Junction area, particularly the Houston Industrial Park. What we're gonna do, right now it's a dirt road, very wash boarded. So we're gonna go ahead and provide two lanes of paving, about a mile in length, along with associated drainage improvements and they should be starting that next month. And then I mentioned we had bonded for some funds, and part of this project was also part of that bond. It was $5 million for Ironwood Drive safety improvements. As you know, this is probably the most highly-used road in the County. But what we're gonna do – the limits

of the project are for – from Germann to Elliott. The survey is currently underway and we're looking at purchasing State Land. But what we're gonna do is add eight foot shoulders on each side, northbound and southbound, and then purchase additional right of ways so that we can reduce that slope. Those of you that have driven it, know there's – there is a fairly steep slope. It is – it does meet regulations, but it's at the very, very minimum. So we want to go ahead and reduce that slope so that, you know, people that unfortunately go off the road, it's not a – well, it's a more manageable event, should they happen to do that. So it's $5-plus million. $5 million for the improvements, and then we're trying to talk to State Land on acquiring additional right of way to, to provide those –reducing the slope improvements. And one other thing that we've got going on next month, you know, each year we have our transportation advisory committee. We receive project requests from the public. September is our kickoff meeting, kind of a Board orientation type thing. My area engineers will give updates on projects in the works from last year, and then they'll have two more meetings after this where we review those projects that were submitted, rank them. They came up – they come up with a recommendation that then goes to the Board for ultimate approval. So that will be kicking them off next month.

HARTMAN: All right.

??: (Inaudible – microphone was not on).

BENDER: I'll have to look it up. I've got it on my thing here. I'll pull it up in a minute. I think it's the 24th.

HARTMAN: Okay. What I'd like to do, if it's all right with you –

BENDER: Sure.

HARTMAN: And let the Commission go ahead and address questions to you. And I – maybe I'll start it out with a question. I – boy I certainly – I'm a native Arizonan, and Maricopian and I really appreciate you finally doing something with the crossing there at the Santa Cruz. I mean we've seen that for years disrupt flows and cost thousands of dollars. One of them they divert the traffic now, they send everything around Tortosa, the subdivision on Honeycutt Road, and one of the things I might mention; I've been on this Commission long enough to – we actually recommended to the Supervisors zoning of Tortosa and when they did, I had gone to Europe. And traffic has always been one of my things that I really concentrate on, the flow of traffic, because when you bring – when we bring subdivisions in, we need to have arterial transportation access, and safely. And anyway, I remember mentioning to the individual that he ought to have a roundabout, and I'll be darned if they didn't put two roundabouts in that Tortosa, which doesn't make it too

accessible as a detour for big semis that are coming from Casa Grande to Maricopa, back and forth. But it's not intended for that kind of traffic. So, box culvert hands up and big clap. I do want to know that – was that funded by Indian Fund – Federal Indian Funds, or did the County –

BENDER: No, that was County-funded.

HARTMAN: That's County, on the reservation?

BENDER: (Inaudible) project.

HARTMAN: All right. That's interesting, because as you come from Casa Grande towards Maricopa, everything else, all the water crossings are all box culverts, except to when you get to that Santa Cruz. So that was awful late in coming. Okay, my other comment is the industrial park, the Ak-Chin industrial park. They used to have a rail crossing there and they took that rail crossing out, that crossed the Maricopa Highway. They took that out, and now they're putting in, it looks like a paved vehicular access off of the Maricopa Highway. And I was on the Commission long enough that when (inaudible) Mini Mobile Storage first went in, as a Commission Member, I helped direct that they put a de- acceleration turn in/ turn out lanes on the Maricopa Highway, which are really a godsend. If you'll look at all the thousands of storage units there, that means a semi truck turned in and out of there every time, just to bring them in, not to bring them out too. So I'm, I'm questioning whether you're putting a de-

acceleration turn in/turn out lane there on that industrial park.

BENDER: No, we are not.

HARTMAN: Well –

BENDER: I think they use Anderson.

HARTMAN: Well they do currently, but they're not going to be. They're gonna – they're making a direct access to the Maricopa Highway. And then on the Anderson Road, as the Anderson Road goes north on Saddleback Farms there at the water tanks and everything, there's the little narrow crossing that we have several individuals in Saddleback Farms that – and staff's aware of this – that use that little narrow turnout to run their semis in. Coming off that Maricopa Highway is, is really dangerous, and there's skid marks there, and there's near accidents all the time. So maybe sometime you need to look at that. As we develop the infrastructure to that Maricopa area, that Maricopa crossing. All right, I thank you. And, and the way you say, your name is Anderson?

BENDER: No, my name's Scott Bender.

HARTMAN: Bender, Scott Bender. Oh, excuse me. Okay, I blew that one. All right, Scott, thank you.

BENDER: You're welcome.

AGUIRRE-VOGLER: I have a question.

HARTMAN: All right, Mary Aguirre-Vogler.

AGUIRRE-VOGLER: A few questions.

BENDER: Okay.

AGUIRRE-VOGLER: Okay, first you said something about funding from normal channels, would you explain that to us? And the reason I'm asking that is because I think a lot of people think that the infrastructure's from real estate taxes, and it's really from a gas tax, isn't it?

BENDER: Correct.

AGUIRRE-VOGLER: And why doesn't that get lifted? Why can't you get more gas tax for more funding? So what are the normal channels?

BENDER: Well the normal channels are, it's HUR funding, which is highway user revenue funds, which is the gas tax. And you're right, that hasn't been raised since 1972.

AGUIRRE-VOGLER: Why can't it be?

BENDER: That's a political thing that I don't think anybody wants to – you know, it's real easy for them to raise other taxes, but for this one, I don't –

SALAS: (Inaudible) right now.

BENDER: I don't know why they don't want to tackle it. But yeah, I mean it hasn't been raised since 1972. And then we also received money through our COGS, MAG and SCMPO, and those are called STP funds – Surface Transportation Funds. Those come down through the federal government, they get distributed to MAG, to SCMPO, and all the member agencies in MAG and SCMPO get to apply for those funds. So it's a –

AGUIRRE-VOGLER: And Maricopa gets a lot of them.

BENDER: They – actually the last go around it was pretty well even distribution, but in reference to your question, we don't get enough money from that to do what we needed to do on Ironwood. I think the distribution through MAG is $1.7 million a year, I think, which – not much to do what we needed to do out there. So – and then we also get our excise tax money, the half cent sales tax money. So that money comes in, we get our portion, and then each municipality in the County gets their portion as well.

AGUIRRE-VOGLER: So while you're talking to the State Land Department, you know, the dust storms are pretty bad and Red Rock Village is kind of a dead end, and there's no other access when there's accidents, and I know that there's a plan – I finally think I talked to another engineer that's probably not around anymore, that put it on a five year plan - the Pinal Airpark, from the Village to Pinal Airpark, and you need to talk to the State Land Department - sorry – and get that started. I don't know when you get those things started, but it would be nice, because we don't have that new red rock TI yet, and –

BENDER: Right. I think that one, though, was to provide access to the fire station.

AGUIRRE-VOGLER: Which one?

BENDER: Well – are we think – talking the same one,

do you know?

AGUIRRE-VOGLER: The fire station's there, but I mean it's still the same old Red Rock TI and Pulte keeps putting that off because –

BENDER: Right, and that's tied to the number of rooftops, and I don't think they –

AGUIRRE-VOGLER: Right. And they probably won't –

BENDER: They've reached that threshold.

AGUIRRE-VOGLER: No. But my point is, is that we need, you know, another road from the Village to Pinal Airpark. It was an old – it's supposed to on a five year plan, but I just wonder if it stayed there.

BENDER: We'd have to look.

AGUIRRE-VOGLER: It kind of would be nice to have another access, because there has been times when there's been accidents, and people come into the area and they just go around the loop there. Really bad. Okay, thanks.

BENDER: And September 22nd is the date (inaudible).

AGUIRRE-VOGLER: Oh, okay. Thank you.

HARTMAN: Commission Members?

GRUBB: Mr. Chair?

HARTMAN: Go ahead.

GRUBB: Oh, go ahead. You can go first.

PUTRICK: I have a quick question – actually two. One for my own edification. Why do you use box culverts

versus round?

BENDER: Versus what?

PUTRICK: Round culverts.

BENDER: Well box culverts, they're more efficient. They're stronger. The round ones are generally pipes, and they tend to deteriorate. But you, you get more bang for your buck, basically, with box culverts.

PUTRICK: Okay, so volume is a big factor.

BENDER: Volume is a big thing, and –

PUTRICK: And the other question I was going to ask you and you may not be able to answer it is what about the rest of Hunt Highway widening from Arizona Farms Road around the 79? What's the plan for that?

BENDER: That plan is in limbo. Florence recently had an annexation petition which would have tooken the Florence City Limits to Arizona Farms. If you've seen in the news, they recently rescinded that. I don't know if they're going to go through that exercise again to try and do that annexation, but our plans right now are just to, to Arizona Farms. That's all that the funding allows, so south of Arizona Farms, that will be a longer term project development.

PUTRICK: Okay, so then the follow-up question to that is, whatever part of that is in – whatever part of Hunt Highway that is in the Town of Florence is the responsibility of Town of Florence?

BENDER: That's correct.

PUTRICK: Okay. That's all. Thank you.

HARTMAN: Commissioner Grubb.

GRUBB: Thank you Mr. Chair. Thank you for being here, and I appreciate the work having been in and around the San Tan Valley for 15 years, the work that's going on there is about 16 years too late, but we do appreciate what's being done. I had a couple of questions about why are we only going to Elliott on the expansion of Ironwood?

BENDER: Because that's the Apache Junction City Limits.

GRUBB: Okay, and then –

BENDER: I think they have some plans in the works as well.

GRUBB: Okay. All right. The, the industrial park where you're going to pave the road on Guadalupe, is that going to go all the way to the County line, or are you stopping short of the County line?

BENDER: We're saying it goes to Meridian, but there's kind of a, a channel there. So it'll be just short of Meridian.

GRUBB: Is there a plan to connect that to Guadalupe on the other side of the wall?

BENDER: At this time, no.

GRUBB: Okay.

BENDER: I think long-term the idea is once Meridian ever gets built, you would have a tie at that point.

GRUBB: Well they're getting ready to open the interchange, so I think that that's probably not too far. But I would hope it's not too far behind because they did reopen Meridian Road over the bridge and the, and the off and on ramps are essentially done, they're just doing decorator work at this point. I'm just concerned about that, because we're going to spend money to pave something that I think is going to be annexed into the City of Apache Junction pretty quickly.

BENDER: Maybe.

GRUBB: Well I think with Meridian going through, they're going to close that gap. You know, the big challenge was that the property owners in there just weren't interested in being more regulated than they are now. Oh don't shake your head at me Mr., Mr. Supervisor. Don't shake your head Mr. Supervisor. Stranger things have happened. I didn't say into your district, but I think it's already in your district, isn't it?

??: It is (inaudible).

GRUBB: No it's not. I mean in his fire district. He has two districts.

BENDER: Right.

GRUBB: It's not in his fire district, so – but it's completely surrounded by the City. So that was just a

concern. I know it's not a lot of money in the transportation world, but it is. You know, that kind of money helps put traffic lights in and those kind of things, so – there was a third question. Oh, I know that in the past the discussion about moving that power line at Johnson Ranch Boulevard, that tower was pretty expensive, and in the past the discussion was not to widen Hunt Highway from Bella Vista to Johnson Ranch Highway south and reroute the traffic over Bella Vista and then down Ironwood, back onto Hunt Highway. Is that an abandoned plan, or?

BENDER: Yes. Yeah.

GRUBB: Okay. Because, because at the time that that discussion took place ten years ago, it was a million dollars just to move that tower.

BENDER: No, I think we have a, we have a fix where we don't have to move that tower.

GRUBB: Okay. Thank you. Appreciate it.

HARTMAN: Commission Members?

MORITZ: Mr. Chairman?

HARTMAN: Yes, Commissioner Moritz.

MORITZ: Hi Scott. Just a couple of questions. One is on the transportation advisory committee meeting, do you prefer not having outside people attend that?

BENDER: Public is more than (inaudible).

MORITZ: Welcome? Okay. And like Bill, I have

forgotten my second questions. Where is the meeting and what time?

BENDER: It will be in the Ironwood Room of the county courthouse.

MORITZ: What time?

BENDER: 1:30, I believe.

MORITZ: Okay. I know what the other one was. All I want to do is thank you for the presentation. We sometimes sit here in the dark. Unless we travel the particular area, we're not aware of where the funds are going and what you're doing, and to me it's very informative, and it looks like you're doing a great job. Thank you.

BENDER: We have a good team in Public Works. And with that, I'll turn it over to Jim Petty. He has a couple updates on our airport.

HARTMAN: Thank you, Scott.

PETTY: Vice Chair, Commissioner Members, I'm Jim Petty with Public Works and the airports. Good to see you all again. Since I was here last, we have made - I, I mean in my world I think it's pretty substantial progress in a lot of the stuff I was talking about last time. Starting with San Manuel Airport, the Board recently adopted the master plan that was completed, so that project is complete and the projects over the next 20 years have been identified and prioritized for implementation. We have a ramp reconstruction project going

on, and that project we have two construction projects, one at each airport, and of the two that one is the one that's not going good. There's a lot of unforeseen conditions with the subgrade and soil that we didn't anticipate and we have to deal with. But we're probably about 60 percent done, it's a very good product and the end will be - it'll be just great. We have an obstruction analysis pending, and what that is, they use software to visualize everything in close proximity to the runway, and it identifies any penetrations like ground, trees, power poles or anything that need to be addressed for safety sake, and that'll probably be starting in about three months or so. After those projects, San Manuel is pretty much kind of a mature airport where all the major infrastructure needs that have been identified in the previous master plan have been, you know, implemented and now we're adding some extras after that, and maintaining what we have. If the needs of based aircraft increase, we have plans to, you know, add more hangers and stuff. There's a casino, I believe, that's going in close there, that might influence us with -

SALAS: It's in Dudleyville.

PETTY: Dudleyville. That's it. If San Manuel itself grows in population or anything, that might, you know, add more based aircraft to the airport. But things there are really good. Pinal Airpark. This is one that for the past two years have - has kept me up at night because I was very

worried about if it would survive with the runway. Pleased to let you know that we have started the construction project to repair the runway. It's right now 50 percent done. What we did originally was do a three phase project, and after each of the first two phases, there was a day that the runway was going to be open to allow, like MAS to land and depart their aircraft they needed. The project went so well, the were able to do 50 percent of the runway in the first phase that would have been just one-third. It's spectacular. Tomorrow we start the second phase runway closure, and we'll be completed it's anticipated the 31st of this month. The master plan for the airpark. I called it 99 percent complete right now, and that's because we gave the FAA the draft, they made their comments, they're being implemented right now, and then we're pretty much done; we just have to have the Board adopt it. We had a taxiway overlay. So the taxiway, out of all the pavements it was probably the best condition, but the State has a program and they're going to treat it with an overlay to extend its life. That happens in September. And I'm also very happy to say one of my other nightmares was the amount of revenue that we have coming into the airport from leases and businesses. We're getting ready to put out an RFP for a lot of land for development that companies have expressed interest in. So I'm very confident that by October or November we'll have a signed lease and another business in there developing,

creating jobs, and providing more services for users of the airport. Hope I get this button right. Right. So, this is runway 1-2 at the airpark, and I know when you guys were there, I don't remember if we went out there and looked at it, got up close to it or anything, but you can see there's a ton of crack seal on it. There's cracks in there that are probably about one inch wide and loose aggregate. It's a real nightmare, especially for jet engines when they're taking off or landing, ingesting that, that debris. This is what it looks like now. This is the first half that's done. So we have new striping, we've got a three inch asphalt overlay, and I've never been as excited about pavement before in my life, but this is just - this is a dream come true.

HARTMAN: Quick question is it actually white?

PETTY: The paint. That's what - striping paint.

HARTMAN: Oh, okay.

PETTY: Yeah.

HARTMAN: That's unique.

PETTY: And so this, this is a picture on the northwest end of the runway looking to the southeast and about 3,000 feet, and this is the end of it. 3,000 feet it goes back to the bad pavement, and that's the stuff that we're going to be knocking out starting tomorrow. And if any of you would like to -

SALAS: Excuse me, you're not patching it, right?

You're digging it out and repaving?

PETTY: Yeah, what's happening is machines are milling off the two inches and putting on three inches.

??: Is it three inches (inaudible)?

PETTY: Yes. And again, if any of you would like to come out and see it again, let me know and I'd be happy to show you around. I'm just really excited about it. And that is my three slides.

HARTMAN: All right. Jim I'll start it out with questions. We really thank you for your presentation. When we went to Pinal Airpark, we really, all of us, really and thoroughly enjoyed it. One of the things I heard you mention, though, something about a tower, a control tower. Did you ever follow-up on that or has anything ever happened with that idea?

PETTY: There are - yes and no. There's a lot of jurisdictions. Right now Marana, they're probably the main party that's interested in it. They're doing a master plan and that's going to come up with that again. Our master plan says there's a possible need for it to come up. The Army helicopter folks want one. When we talked to the FAA about eight months ago, the FAA contract tower program is in the state of kind of upheaval, a bit, and the formulas used to compute the critical mass of land you can get on the list - and right now there's about nine airports on that list, and

it's a waiting list for it – they're being redone. So we're waiting until those equations are finalized for a cost benefit analysis. What it's going to take is a combined multiagency effort, and we all have to get on the same page and talk with a loud voice to get it done. So it's still happening, but it's just – it's a very unique situation and it's – there's no defined path to get it done.

HARTMAN: All right. Thank you.

PETTY: Kind of blazing a trail with it.

HARTMAN: Commission Members. No further questions?

PETTY: Thank you for your time.

HARTMAN: Thank you Jim. Appreciate it. Okay.

BENDER: Just to clarify that first (inaudible) meeting, September 22nd at 2:30, and that's in the Ironwood Conference Room 1891 courthouse.

HARTMAN: All right, thank you. Scott, I appreciate you taking – you and Jim taking the time to come and tell us about what's going on in Public Works, and we really appreciate – Public works is really important to us. I mean for this airport or whether it's vehicular travel, or maybe rail some day, whatever. Thank you very much for doing your job. Good job. Okay.

AGUIRRE-VOGLER: Is Louis coming back? Is Louis (inaudible).

HARTMAN: Okay, yeah, yeah.

ANDERSON: Thank you. Thank you very much. Is there – I could do the economic development presentation now, but you do have a lot of money sitting in the room. I didn't know if you wanted me to come back later and do that portion?

HARTMAN: No, go ahead, if you would.

ANDERSON: Okay.

HARTMAN: My Commission Members are asking me how long your, your presentation's going to be.

ANDERSON: Well, since I've never done it before, I read through it, there's about 16 slides and most of the projects on the economic development list, you guys have seen or approved or reviewed, so I'm not sure. It could take –

HARTMAN: All right, let me interrupt you. I – as acting Chair and we have a relatively short hearing today, and besides that we're gonna – if we go past lunch, we're going to boycott coming back this afternoon. So we're going to call lit quits at noon one way or another, so go ahead, if you will.

ANDERSON: If Steve finds it.

HARTMAN: Steve.

ABRAHAM: Oh, sorry.

ANDERSON: And Vice Chair, one point of correction, on your box culvert, on the Maricopa/Casa Grande Highway, the Ak-Chin did contribute to a portion of that project and it was – the reason it took so long to get that project done was that

we did – we were trespassing across the Ak-Chin, so we had to resolve that litigation.

HARTMAN: But, but did not the County give a certain amount of money to have the right-of-way?

ANDERSON: Yes, yes indeed we did. And it was negotiated over a number of years.

HARTMAN: Okay.

ANDERSON: Okay, so it looks like we've got our Pinal County Economic Development PowerPoint presentation up.

LANGLITZ: Mr. Vice Chair, we have – we have a request that we address just one agenda item, which is the new case – new cases, the Integrity Land and Cattle LLC rezoning request and PAD request. We're asking for a continuance. If we could please ask your indulgence to perhaps address that item first, and then folks can continue on with other business and as long as Louis doesn't mind, either, being interrupted. I don't want him getting mad at us at all.

HARTMAN: Well, but this, this is, this is on the agenda. I mean it's Planning Manager's Discussion Items and it is on the agenda. I think that – well it can go either way. I think that the audience that we have here today is interested in what's happening in Economic Development, so I don't want to bypass that until after lunch is what I'm trying to say, because I'm not too sure we'll be here.

LANGLITZ: No, I think no, what I mean is just if

the Commission can just address items 5 and 6, which is the – staff is going to request a continuance, and then if the Commission approves, it'll be continued, and then Mr. Anderson will continue giving his economic development report. It just allows some folks who have a time-sensitive issue to get this matter addressed. That's why we're asking for that.

HARTMAN: All right. With that, let's go ahead. New cases, and we'll open the public hearing portion. The first case is number 5, is PZ-001-015. Let's see, who's taking that? I see – who on staff's –

ABRAHAM: Mr. Chairman, staff did not prepare a presentation because we're asking for a continuance on both cases, number 5 and number 6. So we were going to ask you if you could basically look at that continuance, continue it to October, and –

??: No, in September.

ABRAHAM: I'm sorry, September, the September meeting, and then go ahead and open up the public hearing and take comments if anybody's here for that case.

HARTMAN: Let's go ahead and ask Ms. Rose to come up. Now I see why you're asking for immediate action on this case. Jordan, because of your cost. I know, and your job obligations.

ROSE: Vice Chair, thank you Mark and I appreciate that. Yes, we're in full agreement with staff on the

continuance to September 17th. So we would ask for that. And thank you for working with us.

HARTMAN: All right, I'll call to the – with that, any questions Commission Members? Yeah. On that we need to call to the public, don't we? This is a case – yes, it's a public hearing. Commission Members do you want me to shorten it down that much more? No, I'll call to the public. Is there anyone that is for or against this case that would like to – yes ma'am. If you would. Come forward and address – give us your name and address, if you would, please.

MCCATLIN: I'm Barbara Jean McCatlin. My address is 10593 East American Pride Drive, San Tan Valley, 85143.

HARTMAN: Thank you.

MCCATLIN: I am entirely against this copper concentrate transfer facility being built within probably two football fields of our homes. Not only would this affect our entire neighborhood, which has one way in and one way out, it would affect our property values, it would affect our health, it would affect the health of our animals, our way of life, everything. I have written an email to, I believe it was Mr. Grubb and Mr. Putrick, Putrick. See, everybody has to do that, right? There is, there's a lot of reasons why this should not go forward from this point at all. And most of it is that this is a dangerous facility to be built so closely to at least 125 residences. We don't have the drainage out

there, we have water issues. Skyline Road is the only in and out of that neighborhood. If anything were to happen, we'd be trapped. The County sign was posted in a place where it's beyond the road closed sign at Skyline and Lane, so the general public could not see it. The only reason it was seen was because my husband walked the dog out there. We just - we really are imploring you to just table this for good. That's all I have.

HARTMAN: All right, I, I thank you for coming forward. Commission Members, any questions? Frank? Commissioner Salas.

SALAS: Can you be a little bit more specific on where all these dangers are? You know, just not like a lot of reasons or whatever.

MCCATLIN: The copper process includes things like arsenic, and my husband actually works in copper, and there's the environmental impact, the health impact from airborne heavy metals. It could literally turn our homes orange having this facility built so close to us. So if it's turning our homes orange, what's it doing to our lungs?

SALAS: Do you have any - how should I say - record or - on this as to the (inaudible) of all this?

MCCATLIN: I can certainly come up with some. I was under the impression that this was going to be continued today, so we, we were just made aware of this County sign a

few days ago.

SALAS: Well I would request that for the next time - and I'm not saying that we're going to continue, as far as I'm concerned – that you bring the information.

MCCATLIN: I will definitely bring it.

SALAS: You know, because I'm not satisfied with saying there's many reasons and a lot of stuff that goes on, so we are not informed that a lot of reasons, or a lot of stuff goes on, is sufficient enough to make the decision on.

MCCATLIN: Yeah, we just didn't have time to prepare, because this sign was so hidden. It was very hidden.

HARTMAN: All right, and then what that will do is when we continue, and we will continue this case, it'll give you some time to gather some support.

MCCATLIN: Absolutely.

HARTMAN: I really thank you for coming before us. Commission Members, any questions? If none, thank you.

MCCATLIN: Thank you.

HARTMAN: Is there anyone else in the audience that would like to come before us and talk on this case, PZ-001-15? If not, we'll turn it back to the Commission for further discussion and a motion. A motion. Frank Salas – Commissioner Salas.

SALAS: Mr. Chair, I move that we forward PZ-001-15, and honor their request for a continuance.

HARTMAN: Do I have a second?

GRUBB: Second.

HARTMAN: Commissioner Grubb. What was the date to the next –

ABRAHAM: September 17th.

HARTMAN: September? All right. September 17th is the proposed hearing date. If there still – we have a second, Commissioner Grubb second the motion, if we have no further discussion, I'll call for a voice vote. All in favor say aye.

COLLECTIVE: Aye.

HARTMAN: Opposed? Hearing none, motion carried. Continuance of PZ-001-15 to September 17th. All right, with that we go onto Item PZ-PD-001-15. Applicant?

ABRAHAM: Mr. Chair, I think we covered the – both cases under that one public hearing.

HARTMAN: All right. So Commission, I'll actually call to the public on that case too. That's a PD, Planning and Development portion, which is basically per the guidelines. Is there anyone that wants to come and speak to us on that? If not, we'll close it to the public on that portion.

ABRAHAM: No, leave it open, sir.

HARTMAN: Leave it open. With that, I turn back to the Commission for public comments, and if none, I'll accept a motion.

SALAS: Mr. Chair.

HARTMAN: Commissioner Moritz. No, excuse me, Grubb? Commissioner Grubb –

SALAS: That's really a mistake.

HARTMAN: Yeah. (Inaudible) lady first.

GRUBB: Chair, I move that we continue PZ-PD-001-15 to our September 7th meeting – 17th meeting.

SALAS: Second.

HARTMAN: All right. Commissioner Salas seconds it. If there's no further discussion, I'll call for a voice vote. All those in favor say aye.

COLLECTIVE: Aye.

HARTMAN: Opposed? Hearing none, motion carried. September 17th is the date on both of those. All right, does my legal advise me to go back now to our economic development?

LANGLITZ: Yes, Mr. Vice Chair, and thank you very much for taking that item out of order and we're back to Mr. Anderson.

HARTMAN: All right. Thank you.

ANDERSON: Thank you. A lot of things also happening in Economic Development. As you saw, Public Works has a lot of items going on at the same time and we're really proud of our Public Works staff for all of the efforts that they're making to get those things on the, on the book, as well as our Board of Supervisors for allowing us to bond some

money to get those critical projects going. We're getting there. There we go. Okay, Pinal County, 2015. The philosophy we have for our San Tan Region, as well as the County to live, work and play. Current estimated population 402,000. We're the third most populated county in Arizona, as you know. Current workforce, 154,000. Unemployment rate is pretty low at six percent, and the unemployment rate in the nation - or here, in '09 was 13.2, so we're really going in the right direction. We have major assets that we talk about, as well as provide information to potential clients, and that is aggressive and proactive economic development can-do attitude. Tim Kanavel, County Manager and our Board of Supervisors. Interstate: I-10, Interstate 8, Union Pacific Railroad, the main southern U.S. line. Eight rails served industrial parks along the I-8 and I-10. Pinal Airpark. As Mr. Petty pointed out, we are really moving forward with the Pinal Airpark and he mentioned the 65 acres that we're going to be going RFP for, and we're looking for some - another industry provider for the airpark. Close proximity to Tucson and Sky Harbor, and we have the DOD Military Parachute School at Pinal Airpark, the Apache Helicopters, and the Arizona National Guard. Pinal County, skilled available regional workforce. We're adjacent to Pima and Maricopa County in the middle. We're the, the good between the two. Located in the heart of the Sun Corridor. Available and affordable land.

Robust electrical power grid and a robust natural gas infrastructure. So we do – each of your departments have a County strategic plan and a business plan, which we tie to the Board of Supervisors strategies, which one is creating jobs and increasing our economic development. We do target business and job sector in the aerospace and defense manufacturing, transportation and logistics. County departmental changes, and this is more of a philosophy change, I think, between Community Development, Public Works and all of the other departments under Greg's leadership, in that we work more collaboratively together, keeping each other informed and working more cohesively. In the past we were in somewhat of silos and with the collaboration, you're seeing more synergy. Oops. We're also a member of the Sun Corridor and MAG. The Sun Corridor's a newly created economic development group, previously Trio. We're also members of MAG. We just became members of the Arizona-Mexico Commission, when we were down there a couple weeks ago; partnership with the City of Phoenix on the FTZ75. Don't ask me what that is, but I'm sure someone in the room has answers to that - Mr. Patel probably. Thank you. And that's County-wide, right?

PATEL: Correct.

??: It's foreign trade zones.

ANDERSON: Foreign trade zones. So if you do business outside of the country, you get a rebate on, on

taxes. Working on various Sun Corridor issues with Pima County. We meet quarterly with Pima County and Mr. Huckleberry's staff and Mr. Stanley, to talk about joint issues. I-11 in particular, and that I-11 corridor. We've also been working with UP and State Land on the classification yard, helping to facilitate our parts of that and Pinal Airpark workforce development.

Proposed and Development Business Programs. We've got an expedited permitting process in Community Development. We have the business assistance program, tourism, grants program, veterans business assistance program. Our leadership, many asset studies, new business assistant program. With the external and internal relationships changes, all enhances the County's ability to track many significant projects located throughout the County. We have several valued partners. We talked about Pima County, Maricopa County, MAG, ADOT and there's a list of others that we have worked closely with in the last couple of years. And I'm going to turn it over to Mr. Patel. He's going to take on the project-specific details, and as you've many seen a lot of this. But I'll stick around if you have any questions specific for me.

??: Morning sir.

AGUIRRE-VOGLER: Say more about the union yard. Where is that? You've just kind of brought up stuff, but you

haven't really given us any meat on them.

ANDERSON: What kind of meat would you like on the rail yard? It's the switching yard, it's the –

AGUIRRE-VOGLER: Where's it at. I mean I know it's at, I mean like where is it at?

ANDERSON: There's a slide specific (inaudible).

AGUIRRE-VOGLER: Okay, thanks.

PATEL: Good morning, Members of the Commission, Himanshu Patel.

HARTMAN: Good morning, Mr. Patel.

PATEL: Pinal County Community Development. Thanks for having us again. I wanted to share with you what's happening – not just in unincorporated Pinal County, but you know, overall County, including cities and towns, because regardless of where projects are located, as long as they're located in Pinal County, we all have greater opportunities for job employments, as well as the whole philosophy of live, work and play. So let me touch on some of the things Mr. Anderson talked about, but also specific projects. Some big projects, you know. We're going to stay away from kind of the retail side, because that's not the emphasis of Tim's office. His is focused on, as Mr. Anderson indicated, the cluster of transportation, aerospace, manufacturing, logistics, things like that. One of the projects you've obviously have known about for years is this possibility of a casino along the

Mammoth and San Manuel and Dudleyville area, and so the – along 77, yeah, Route 77. So helping the eastern portion of our County, and opportunities for employment there. The San Carlos-Apache Sky Casino, which is a project that they have planned. It's on about 75 acre piece of property. Currently, I know they're interest has been focused on the main casino and a lot of renovation and construction going on there. And then shortly going through the engineering and environmental is where they're at right now to start this project, hopefully by the end of this year, early part of next year. So that will help, at least with job creations and amenities, recreation amenities or other types of entertainment that people want to enjoy there. The inland port Arizona project, this is the former water farm of City of Mesa property along 87, south of Coolidge, on the eastern side between the UP rail and State Route 87, and currently it's in planning stages, but it's got a – it recently went through annexation into the City of Coolidge, but we still play a partner with the City of Coolidge, as well as the property owner to help plan it, and so this is going to be a very important project for industrial, manufacturing, to logistics, to help generate opportunities of employment in the central part of Pinal County. So the current status of that project is it's in the currently in the planning stages. There's still some preliminary planning that the, that the property owner and the

City of Coolidge are working through. They recently, as I mentioned, went through the annexation. So the entitlement process associated with zoning and site planning itself, will predominantly be handled by the City of Coolidge.

Resolution Copper, you're well aware of this project. Recently, you know, the land exchange was part of the federal budget, and that passed in December of 2014. So they're going through, you know, the environmental components of it. And a portion of this project was the item that you took action on recently. It is one of five different type of facilities that are, that are in connection with the processing of, and extracting, as well as production of copper. So this is a substantial project for long-term economic benefits to Pinal County, and a tremendous amount of creation in our northeastern part of our County. It will have a, certainly a ripple effect throughout the region, you know, from housing opportunities, retail opportunities and other sectors of our, of our economy.

Phoenix Mart. This project you're well aware of also. It has started. It's Phase I construction. You know, we saw last year the signage and stuff went up, and the grading started, and now they're in the construction stage. This is - this is a project directly in the City of Casa Grande, and they're - they've gone through a tremendous amount of infrastructure improvements, water/wastewater to help serve

this particular property which is on their eastern part of their city limits, and so this is certainly underway. Not as fast as some people may want it, but it is – it does have a great affect on how the economy is for it to, to be successful. And so we're hoping that this will continue on and see incredible opportunities for that part of our County.

The logistic projects right here, this is a distribution center. This is a tractor supply. And this is their southwestern distribution center that they located in the City of Casa Grande, but along the UP – just directly by the UP line there. And so this is – if you – you probably saw in the recent probably year or so the – this industry, this particular retailer has started building tractor supply stores, the retail side of it. Well the distribution for the southwestern part of the U.S. got located here in Pinal County in the City of Casa Grande. So a great amount of investment has been put into this project. The UP Red Rock, this has been a long discussed project. It's a classification yard. You know where the location is on the eastern side of I-10, directly across Picacho Peak and the Rooster Cogburn – Rooster Cogburn something, I don't know. It's an entertainment venue there, right? So this is contingent upon getting the State Trust Land, because the majority of the land on the – on that part of the I-10 corridor is owned by State Trust, and with the transition of new governor, as well as many department

heads through the - at the State agency, he, he appointed earlier this year a new State Land Commissioner, who's been tasked to, you know, help figure out, do State Land reform, and opportunities to get - develop lands that they own back into the private sector and start getting opportunities to generate dollars for the trustees, primarily school districts, but also for job creation. And so very good dialogues have been going on with State Trust Land on this project in the recent month or so, and we'll be part of those dialogues, as well as UP, and hopefully we can see this property, this lands, be put up for auction and get it into UP's hands so they can plan out their timing of the construction of this particular project. So our County Manager has had very healthy discussion with State Trust Land, and so we're making a lot of progress, and we're looking at engineering the, you know, flooding, drainage, because that's a huge issue there, sound, lighting, things like that that are going to have a, you know, impact on the surrounding areas. So, we're even getting into those kind of discussions, so that's good progress we're making.

Case New Holland, it's an R&D Facility. You're familiar with this one. This came through the - came through you to review and to provide your recommendation, and so they're in construction and should be done here shortly. And this is primarily an R&D facility to do exploratory research

and development on their technology, and their use of a variety of different equipment that they are in the business of, so – primarily agricultural, but the technology requires tremendous – innovation is always the key when you're getting into the technology, so. Some – in terms of healthcare, we're seeing a real good interest in the San Tan area to, to locate what's now – the industry is evolving, you know, the traditional hospitals are, are evolving from the large facilities to, you know, quick in and out facilities, and they're wanting to locate smaller footprints, but in multiple areas. And so we're seeing urgent cares, as well as emergency hospitals that are being discussed and going through – in different stages. They're either going through at the staff review stages, or going to be proceeding with design because the site already has particular zoning to allow it. And then other manufacturing facilities, is Sheffield that is located in the, in the City of Casa Grande. This is a – I don't have a lot of information on this one, but that's something Tim would have more detail. Because he – his office deals directly with every city and town's economic development offices, and so – but good to see an investment of $9 million in capitalization there. There's Tim's contact. Feel free to call him or email him, but we are here to answer any questions you may have based on what we've mentioned. That concludes our presentation. Thank you.

HARTMAN: Great. All right, stay with us for a second, because I'm sure the Commission Members will have some comments. I – as I – on the west side of Casa Grande, as I go over towards I-8 by Wal-Mart, that warehouse that they have, that, that warehouse, Wal-Mart warehouse, has just turned out to be extremely used. I mean I see lines of trucks there waiting to get through the gates at 5:00 on, on Friday evening, and I don't know whether they work –I assume they work total around the clock, but that, that Wal-Mart facility. And then this tractor supply thing, this tractor supply, they just built a retail outlet on Cottonwood and yeah, I mean it went up in like a couple months, it was totally done. And it's already open. And these, these are tax bases that you guys have helped get us – get into Pinal County that, that are way higher, the tax rate's way higher than residential, and they're also job providing. Great – I give you cheers for doing your job, that that's great. Okay, Commission Members, questions? Yes, Putrick. Go ahead Putrick.

PUTRICK: How's Tim doing?

PATEL: I don't know his status, but I assume he's doing well, but I'll be happy to pass on any regards that you may have.

PUTRICK: I missed on the tractor supply on 287 there in Casa Grande, what manufacturer is that?

PATEL: It's a distribution center.

PUTRICK: Distribution center. What – which manufacturer is doing that, or did I misunderstand that?

PATEL: Well – yeah, the tractor supply is a retail store and retail store – they put one up in Coolidge six months ago or so.

PUTRICK: They just finished (inaudible).

SALAS: Just put one in in Catalina.

PATEL: Yeah, so it’s a retail store.

PUTRICK: So it’s independent of a manufacturer then.

PATEL: Correct.

PUTRICK: Okay.

PATEL: But in order for them to have a southwestern – I think they’re headquartered out of Tennessee, but they expanded into the west in the last few years, and in order for them to have a distribution center for the distribution of their retail goods, that’s what they located in Casa Grande. Similar to the Wal-Mart distribution center.

HARTMAN: Similar to the Wal-Mart. It’s big.

PUTRICK: Gotcha. Okay. Yeah, it’s interesting, I noticed commercials for – talking about tractors and farm implements, Mahindra’s now in the U.S., and I see their commercials here and so that’s another manufacturer that’s come to, come to the U.S. and I’m – I don’t know much about farming or any of that, but, but I remember going by the John

Deere factory in Chicago on the train one time, and it took about a half hour to go past the factory with all the tractors out there, so I know it's a big business and it's good for the County and it's jobs and all that kind of stuff, and I like the tax base, and like you say, and so I'm looking forward to that. Then one last question, you may not have the answer to it. I recall that that property, vacant property across the east side of, of Ellsworth Loop from the Queen Creek Mall, is supposed to be kind of a retail and entertainment center? Is that what that is? Do you know what it is?

PATEL: At the Hunt Curve there? By where it turns into Ellsworth?

PUTRICK: No, no, no, at, at the Ellsworth Loop, right, right across the street from the Queen Creek Mall. The construction fence is up and it looks like they're going forward, so –

PATEL: Yeah, Commissioner Putrick, I believe that's in the Town of Queen Creek, so I don't know the details, but I imagine it's a collaborative approach to a mixed use project that's consistent to retail and other types of –

PUTRICK: I just – I didn't expect, you know, I thought if you had an answer. But anyway, so I was curious.

PATEL: You said Sprouts is there? Yeah.

PUTRICK: Okay, and there's a, I think a home, a home store is supposed to go in there somewhere and different

things, so it'll be nice. And that's all.

PATEL: Yeah, make sure we don't spend our dollars there, spend it here in Pinal County.

PUTRICK: Yep.

HARTMAN: Commissioner Salas.

SALAS: I'm interested, how close is this resolution concentrator or exchange or transfer to the railroad?

PATEL: It's directly located next to the railroad.

SALAS: Directly.

PATEL: And we'll get – yeah, we'll be happy to – once you get closer to the September, you'll get the materials and the packets and the maps and be able to get a chance to analyze that case. It's located directly next to the Mag – what it was known, and I think it's still known as the Magma Rail Line. That is currently an inactive rail line.

SALAS: I kind of figured that.

HARTMAN: In active/inactive status if I'm not mistaken. They keep it in repairs and everything. It – you could actually run a train on it.

??: They do run a train.

HARTMAN: They do?

??: Yes.

HARTMAN: Okay, thank you.

SALAS: There used to be the connection out of Magma to the main rail area. The other question was how close is

the tractor supply to the railroad here in Casa Grande? I'm assuming that'll be pretty close to that, as well, right?

PATEL: It's not directly adjacent to the railroad, but it's in close proximity.

SALAS: Because I'm assuming that there's a great potential now that we're negotiating with Mexico on trade, that that would be one heck of an opportunity for our area in here to trade with Mexico, especially agricultural stuff right now. So that's all I have in comments. Oh, one more, excuse me. What's the approximate amount of employment that this Resolution Mine is going to project?

PATEL: Are we referring to total, total projects of resolution, or this particular case that (inaudible)?

SALAS: No, I'm referring to the mine area itself. I know it's going to project jobs outside of state, and you know, other suppliers and stuff that come with development, but in-house, I mean how many miners is this going to project? Do you have that information?

PATEL: Yeah, I think it's – we'll be happy to give you a copy of this PowerPoint. There it is.

HARTMAN: All right, moving along. Any other Commissioners? Mary Aguirre-Vogler.

SALAS: I just have another question.

PATEL: 2,000 direct, and 1500 indirect.

SALAS: Is there an opportunity to negotiate a visit

on the mine site, for the Commission to visit the mine site.

PATEL: Oh, I'm sure they'll be happy to – if they have an opportunity to on their – we can get in touch with their like public relations and get an opportunity to learn more about the overall project, as well as the location and where they're like the main office in Superior and stuff is.

SALAS: I think that it would be a very good trip for our Commission to go to the mine, directly to the mine site so some of us can get familiarized with the system, you know?

PATEL: Right.

AGUIRRE-VOGLER: At least –

HARTMAN: Steve, can you comment on that?

ABRAHAM: We'll get in touch with their folks and see if – what the availability of something like that would be.

AGUIRRE-VOGLER: Well maybe at least just an aerial, at least a presentation by them, because with this recent mine problem that released a lot of contaminants in the Animas River, there's going to be a lot of controversy on this issue.

SALAS: Well you're talking about a 7,000 foot mine, Mary, and our trip would involve more or less to learn what the system is, and that kind of stuff.

HARTMAN: All right, Commission Members, we'll get into that part of the hearing when we have a hearing on that.

SALAS: Well I'm just saying let's get a trip down there.

HARTMAN: I know. Okay.

PATEL: Well, we'll get back to you, Mr. Chair, and the Commission on an opportunity to tour.

HARTMAN: Okay. Any more?

PATEL: I just want to thank you for the opportunity. Thank our staff, and reiterate what Mr. Anderson indicated, the collaborative approach between our departments and the County Manager's vision, and the Board of Supervisor's vision. That's what makes this stuff successful; it's not just one individual or two individuals, so thank you very much.

HARTMAN: Thank you, thank you very much. Okay, then the next part of the planning manager's discussion items, SanZia? SunZia power lines.

ABRAHAM: All right, Thank you Mr. Chair. Commission Members, I wanted to put this in your packet, because this is another long project that we've been working on for many years. However, it appears that the rubber is starting to meet the road on this – the siting of these power lines. Now, SunZia is a power line transmission projects that it's going to actually occur in New Mexico and in Arizona, and the lines will be sited in Pinal County somewhere, so we're directly affected by the power project. Now the project - and

I'm reading directly from their news release here, is a - involves the development of two new 500 kilovolt electrical transmission lines and associated facilities originating at the new substation in Lincoln City, New Mexico, and terminating at the existing Pinal Central Substation, which is by the fair grounds, actually. Now the Arizona portion of the transmission line is approximately 200 miles in length and would cross Arizona State Trust Land, BLM, BOR and private lands located within Greenlee County, Graham County, Cochise County, Pinal, Pima and the City of Coolidge. SunZia project will be brought before the siting committee to request approval of their proposed route, and the way the County is involved is that this is the time that we basically say hey we want to be involved and become a party of interest under Arizona Administrative Code. We can talk about that later. But we're basically going to throw our name out there and say hey, we want to be part of the siting committee and be a person and a community of interest. So we met with them about a month ago, now, and the thing in your packet is what they gave to us as part of their information materials. So you get an idea of some of the proposed routes that run through the County, the State and then the neighboring state, with the idea of basically being able to generate renewable energy and transmit that to users in Arizona. So it's an interesting project. It's kind of - it's develop - in the process of

developing right now. As you can see, most of the land in Pinal County is really owned by the State. It does border against some existing development in San Manuel and then the Robson Ranch Community down there by Oracle Junction. So not sure how it would really affect the planning and zoning type case, but just to give you an update on what's happening in our County. And Mr. Chair, I'll just bump ahead right to our last - if there are any questions on that I'm available if you have any -

SALAS: Have those sites been approved already, Steve?

ANDERSON: No they haven't. Actually it's going to the siting committee in a little bit here, and the - that process takes about 18 months, I think. Maybe a little longer than that nowadays, but there's a, a proposed map alignment in your packet there of some of the routes that they're looking at.

SALAS: My concern is the destruction of the (inaudible), though. Because one of those proposals was to cut straight down through that canyon over there in Knutson. That would be a sin to do that. I would be totally against it. We've already got a gas line that comes off of I-10 all the way through. There would be no need to destroy our desert and especially that particular area, when they can follow the same route adjacent to the gas line. It would be cheaper for

them, and it would save a lot our beautiful land over there in that area. That's –

GRUBB: Mr. Chair? Mr. Chair.

HARTMAN: Yes, Commissioner Grubb. Steve, is this an above-ground or a below ground?

ABRAHAM: Above ground. Yeah, it would be a dual line above ground. So 500 kV look a lot like the (inaudible) lines going up Gantzel, just for a, for a comparison.

GRUBB: And they're ugly.

HARTMAN: Steve, I – I – are we going to have a formal presentation on this?

ABRAHAM: No, I was just showing you what they showed us.

HARTMAN: Is the Chair to, allowed to allow two expert witnesses to talk about this, SunZia?

ANDERSON: Like, you're an expert witness?

HARTMAN: No, is the Chair allowed to call to the public to have two expert witnesses come one at a time, of course.

ABRAHAM: Well, this was a – this planning manager's discussion item. I guess it'd be the purview of the vice chair if you wanted to take public comment on it.

HARTMAN: I would like to take a public comment on it. I have two individuals that have come down from the San Pedro area. Both of them are (inaudible) conversation chairs,

of the (inaudible) Conservation District and have – and are concerned about the impact. I would welcome anybody else that is for it to come up and speak, but could I ask maybe Bill Dunn to come, or Andy, either one.

LANGLITZ: Mr. Chair.

HARTMAN: Yes.

LANGLITZ: Mr. Vice Chair, it's – I guess it's okay to what these people discuss. There's nothing the Planning & Zoning Commission has no jurisdiction – or is this regard to the SunZia line? Yeah, there's absolutely nothing that the P and Z has any involvement whatsoever in this line, and will have no involvement at any time in the future. This is huge project. Basically the main jurisdiction is with the federal government, however the Arizona Corporation Commission, their citing committee will take a look at it. Any public comment needs to be addressed to the citing committee at the Arizona Corporation Commission. There is no zoning issue, there – really, Pinal County is not going to be able to do anything at all about this. We will intervene in the proceeding and we will be given information and we can comment on it, but this is a, this is a huge project that's been going on for at least ten years now, and the idea is they're not bringing – temporarily they'll be stopping in Arizona. The whole project is to bring wind power to Southern California. That's where this thing is going, but you gotta go through Arizona to get

from New Mexico to Southern California, so that's why it, it's coming through. I didn't, I didn't mean to say it's not - certainly these gentlemen can, can speak their mind in that, but I wanted, I wanted to make sure that you didn't have the impression that really you have any control whatsoever over this. That's all I, you know, in fairness, that's the only point I was trying to make. I'll stop blabbing now.

HARTMAN: Mark, I appreciate your comments, because I think the residents of the area that this line is proposed to go through, have really not had any impact with the siting committee. Bill Dunn, if you would come forward. The Commission needs to know what, what's going on in things like this when the federal powers take on a project. Bill Dunn from Winkleman, the chair of the Winkleman NRCD, National Resource Conservation District. Bill. He's a rancher also.

DUNN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The first problem is, it's not renewable energy. It's packaged as such, but ten years ago it was regular energy until it called it renewable energy, because that got the environmental community to be for it. And after a year and a half or two years of exposing it, well finally the environmental community is against it, along with some other problems with it. And our, our main, our main problem with it is they're - you know, they're supposed to go down existing corridors, and they do along I-10 until it's inconvenient, and then they leave it. So our position is it

should stay along the existing corridor, which is I-10, where it's – there's already lines everywhere. You can't mess up the environment anymore with, with some more power lines along I-10. And it's, it's been sold not honestly. So I don't know – there's a lot more that, that big problems, but I don't, I don't know since you don't have a say in it, I don't know what else except to expose it for what it really is. It's going to cause – we've pointed out to them lots of environmental problems with it, erosion problems, and in the record of decision they didn't say how they were going to mitigate those. Anyway.

HARTMAN: Does it go through the Aravaipa area?

DUNN: On some maps. The BLM record of decision it doesn't, it goes down I-10 to just before it gets to Benson, and then goes through the Salt – I'm sorry –

AGUIRRE-VOGLER: San Pedro.

DUNN: San Pedro, down the San Pedro above, kind of it turns and goes above south of San Manuel, north of Oracle, straight – and then goes straight west to almost the substation over there between – this side of Marana, then heads east – or south excuse – or north, north until it gets directly west, or east of 11 mile corner, and then heads west again, along (inaudible) Highway.

HARTMAN: All right. Commission Members, any questions of Bill?

SALAS: I have a comment Mr. Chairman.

HARTMAN: Okay, Commissioner Salas.

SALAS: Maybe we cannot do anything about it, but some of us that area opposed to it, could at least create some public interest in the whole thing.

DUNN: Good, I hope so.

SALAS: You know, I hope that they can make a decision to come to the least, you know, destructible area and then some of that area lends itself to that. They don't have to destroy some of the beautiful pristine land that we have out there.

DUNN: Yeah, there's already a corridor for these types of infrastructure.

HARTMAN: Utilities.

DUNN: Utility infrastructure that they – but it's cheaper this way. They don't have – you know, they don't have to buy the, the – as much right-of-way. One other thing, early on they came to Pinal County Board of Supervisors and asked for their blessing and got it, and that's before anybody knew about, you know, anything about it. So if you want to talk to the Board – to the Supervisors, maybe that'd be a good thing to do.

HARTMAN: All right, Putrick.

PUTRICK: Just a couple of comments, and I – since we don't have any say in this, I think it's probably a form

that maybe we can arouse some, some people to do something about it. First of all, I'm not and never will be a big fan of wind energy, and if you want a good example of the fallacy of wind energy, look at the country of Denmark. Look at their wind energy farm that they built, spent hundreds of thousands of dollars because somebody said hey they wind blows here all the time, and it turns out it doesn't blow there all the time, so they have this huge ugly wind farm and they can't - they were not able to shut down any of their regular power generating plants because the wind doesn't blow all the time, so they have excess energy, which they sell to eastern Europe. The things are a blight on the landscape. All you got to do is drive Interstate 10 and go through the pass over here in Palm Springs and look at how ugly that is. They've started it on the island of Maui on the west Maui mountains on the south side. It's a blight on - and I hate windmills. I hate wind farms. And I could care less. And finally, if California wants some more energy, let them build them over there. They've already screwed up the environment in Southern California, let them build them over there. Quit putting it off on New Mexico and on the State of Arizona to get them more power. Let them do their own thing. They're so busy telling everybody else what to do, let's tell them do your own thing. Thank you. That's my -

SALAS: What do we get out of it?

DUNN: Well, the problem is they don't have any – they don't have a wind farm that they're going to connect to right now. They've – when we spoke with the people there, they said well we're aware of – we're aware of some possible wind energy being generated in that area. But you know, ten years ago it was just to connect the east and the west power grids, and that's what it's for.

HARTMAN: All right, Commissioner Members, any other – want to make a comment? Bill, thank you.

DUNN: Thank you.

HARTMAN: Steve and Mark, I thank you for letting us kind of go into an open forum on this. We're not making any decision, it's just an information, and your planning manager discussion items, that – I could cover in that – you know I mean really, I'd loved to have the opportunity to have a discussion about something that is brought on us that doesn't really include us, Pinal County, or probably our Supervisors. It will include the State Land Department in right-of-ways and things like that, but I don't know whether Pinal County is getting any monies up or going to receive any monies from a project like this in economic development. I don't see a lot to it. Especially when it goes through pristine areas, when it could go other areas. But anyway, that's all part of the siting committee that's already been done and everything. Okay, with that, we still have like another hour and some

before we end our meeting, so I think what we'll do is let me, let me get anybody else in the audience that wanted to speak on that SunZia. No one? Okay. Thank you. With that, let's go into Tentative Plats. And the first Tentative Plat is S-026-05. Steve, don't get up and leave.

ABRAHAM: You first.

HARTMAN: Dedrick. All right.

DENTON: Mr. Chair and Members of the Commission, staff would like to request that if we can hear items number 7 and number 8 at the same time, but just give a different motion. If that's acceptable?

HARTMAN: Yes, that is, because they're adjoining properties.

DENTON: That's correct. And with that, this next case is Santa Cruz Ranch and the Commission did give a continuance back in July of 2013 so they can speak with the City of Maricopa in regards to annexation. From what I've been told, that annexation discussion kind of fell apart, so now they're looking at talking with Casa Grande, as well. And with that, the applicant is requesting a continuance, again, but staff is recommending a denial of that request. But after the packets went out, the City of Casa Grande did issue out a letter requesting time for them to do a cost benefit analysis. If the Commission do decide to continue it, staff would support a three months continuance to allow the cost benefit

analysis, but we still recommend to deny it and move on from there. And with that, the applicant is present and I'm available for any questions that the Commission may have.

HARTMAN: All right, will the applicant come forward.

KEELER: Good morning, Vice Chairman, Members of the Commission. My name is Seth Keeler.

HARTMAN: Pardon me on the name?

KEELER: Seth Keeler.

HARTMAN: Seth.

KEELER: And I'm with W Holdings and my address is 1121 West Warner Road, Suite 109, Tempe, Arizona 85284. Appreciate the opportunity to be before you today. What I'd like to do really quick is kind of just explain briefly - I heard you want to get out of here quick, so I hear that - explain briefly what has happened since –

HARTMAN: You have until noon.

KEELER: Okay. I'll do (inaudible.).

SALAS: Or less.

KEELER: So we came here two years ago and asked for a continuance on our tentative plats. Our goal at the time was to get annexed into the City of Maricopa. And prior to that, we had already started on the annexation attempt and we were successful with the first annexation. That happened in August of 2012. At the time, the City of Maricopa had been

approached by the Ak-Chin Community and the Ak-Chin were trying to work on a FITA trust application. Had that happened before this annexation, City of Maricopa would have been cut off. The FITA trust application takes a property and puts it into the classification of a sovereign nation. We were successful in that first annexation, we called that the foothold. After that, we ran into some technical issues. One of the technical issues that we encountered was the law for annexation requires that there be a minimum 200 foot swath. Our most narrow area was 193 feet. So we were faced with a technicality of a seven foot shortfall with our minimum width. So with the City of Maricopa, we worked on processing an amendment for legislation that would have allowed a little more flexibility in that language. It passed the house, it passed the senate, everything was great and literally last minute. Because that bill was packaged with some other controversial bills, the governor through it out. So we were back to ground zero on our effort to get something going. We had met several times with staff at Pinal County and there was a recommendation to look at the language again and we discovered that that minimum of 200 foot applies, unless it’s within a roadway, or a right of way. So what we did is we created a road and were able to continue the annexation. So we successfully annexed the second part into the City of Maricopa, and that happened in December of 2013. The reason

our property was not a part of the second annexation was, we were still working on the negotiations of our pre-annexation development agreement. Some of the hurdles that we've encountered with the City of Maricopa is we would make headway in our negotiations and then key people would go to another city. And when a key decision-maker leaves the city, you can't get anything done. In that process of waiting for the new person to arrive, we were approached by the city with some additional items that they wanted on the negotiation table. One of them was they wanted us to account for the east/west corridor, which is a 200 foot swath roadway. It's a limited access parkway. We had two major issues with that proposal. Issue number one, 95 percent of our property is within the floodplain. It is a curable issue with extensive drainage solution. That parkway goes right – it's proposed to go right on top of our drainage solution. So we see that as a no-go. You can't rob us of our opportunity to cure our issue. There's also a regional wastewater treatment plant that would be impacted with this swath. That's issue number one. Issue number two. As it stands today, we have active entitlements here in Pinal County. We have a PAD and we have a development agreement. The development agreement is for a roadway, and it dictates that Anderson Road is 110 foot right-of-way, and Teel, which is our east/west, is a neighborhood collector. Our position to Maricopa was as it stands today, we already

defined what our roadways are and we feel that we're protected with our entitlements. So that was an impassable issue for us. When the new city manager was hired and we had, again, another round of discussions, he added more things onto the negotiation of the demands from the city. In addition to what we've already talked about, he said we want to have you guys pay for a fire station, 15 firemen, a fire truck, the facilities for communications and staff to support it, and we want you to pay for a police station with 20 officers, supporting staff, vehicles, and grounds for the communication facilities. We are already faced with a very expensive property to develop. When the city added these more demands, it was another hurdle that was impassible. In addition to that, like I said, we have active entitlements with our PAD, our land plan. They came and they said well we want you guys to kind of switch some things around and we want a Kierland Commons in here. We think Kierland Commons is a great project, it works in Scottsdale; we just didn't think that it would work here. After we had this difficult issue, we went back to Pinal County and I had a good meeting with Greg Stanley and Himanshu and also Louis was there, and we simply said we, we recognize that the best case scenario was for us not to be entitled and developed in Pinal County. We want to get to a city. Their recommendation was to try Casa Grande and see if that was a viable option. This, you know, Greg

basically said yeah you can develop here, but it would be better for us not to have a satellite community in between two cities. So if you can figure this out with Casa Grande, go for it. So we did. We met with Casa Grande, talked to them about our goal to be annexed into a city, and Casa Grande sent the letter that I believe was - you can see it up there, it was in the presentation. In the cover letter that came from the City of Casa Grande, they requested 9 to 12 months to work through the cost benefit analysis and look into the possibility of us being annexed. Staff supports three months. I'll just say that when, when you're coming into a city to be annexed, the more entitlements that you have, the stronger your position is. And we've been continuing the tentative plat here with Pinal County with the intent to be annexed into the City of Maricopa. Now we're looking at the City of Casa Grande, and having the tentative plats active is very valuable to us. The denial came from - in my opinion - a discussion that we had with staff, because we thought well what if we just did annex, or what if we just did develop in Pinal County? Our property, as it stands today, the tentative plats have been continued because of a drainage concern. We have made a proposal to alter that drainage to put the - to put basically it underground, below grade, instead of using it's - the original plan which was there's an above-grade canal. So our proposal would alter our plats, and so we asked staff what

would happen, can we just do administrative approval because we're really only changing a couple pages of the plat, and they recommended well it'd probably be better off if you guys came back through the process with a new plat. So, what we discovered when we talked to the City of Casa Grande, some of the benefits that actually apply to Pinal County, is they are their own floodplain administrator and that would alleviate burden from Pinal County, and from – you know, from my perspective, having the continuance for the nine to 12 months is very valuable and I'm struggling to even understand why Planning Commission would have a, have an issue with extending us a longer timeframe. It alleviates us coming back and wasting staff's time, and gives us the opportunity to go at this with City of Casa Grande. Those are the major points I wanted to cover with you today, and I'm happy to answer any questions if you have any.

HARTMAN: This property is south of the newly annexed property?

KEELER: It is.

HARTMAN: And did, did the city annex on down to the Santa Cruz?

KEELER: We are, we are essentially adjacent to the City of Maricopa property, annexable property line. Is that what your question is?

HARTMAN: Yeah, the Santa Cruz channel separates

your property from the city, is that not right, on Anderson Road?

KEELER: Yeah, we are – so basically it's essentially right next to it, because it goes right up our northern border, is where the Santa Cruz channel goes.

HARTMAN: And there's still, there's still a problem with that Santa Cruz channel, and I – you got to realize that, we realize that the Board of Supervisors don't want the responsibility of flood and they – that's why they're trying to say pass it onto cities.

KEELER: Correct, we understand that.

HARTMAN: All right, there's still – but there's still a problem on that Anderson – they're building those nice box culverts on the, on the Maricopa Highway, but the restriction on Anderson Road is about half the size of one of those – of the two big box culverts that they're building, so, so that's going to dam up the water and cause flooding on your properties, whether it's residential or agricultural. Which it's agricultural now. So I, I see that as another infrastructure challenge that's got to come about, one way or another. Your – I'm senior member on this Commission and member from District 3, which this – you are in District 3, and one time a developer in Maricopa, when this Commission used to be zoning Maricopa, Maricopa is an alluvial fill area. That whole area is alluvial fill, and it either means it came

in with water or wind. It stunk there. And so the whole area's really flood prone. And the City of Maricopa, there's the Santa Rosa runs right through the City of Maricopa, and this Commission was challenged with a developer that was south of 340 - excuse me, west of 347, west of 347, which the flows of the Santa Rosa tended to go that way and flood the school and all the other places that it's flooded. And we told that developer that, that they had to work with Union Pacific and build a bigger trestle, and they had to work with the County or whoever, and build a bigger bridge before they could develop down there, and they almost didn't go through with that. But they did it. So this Commission has a lot of strength to help with the infrastructure that builds towards progress and, and I just want to say I really appreciate you guys staying in there. Anyway, there's, there's still some challenges. I mean this - whether you can switch it from Maricopa, and I'm disappointed in Maricopa because they went as far as they went. They were actually going to be landlocked at one time when Ak-Chin purchased that Saddleback Airstrip in that portion and you guys helped them jump the tracks and jump south, and then they decided well that's enough. Which they didn't do on the west side of Maricopa when Ak-Chin bought the dunes, which this Commission, it's, it's a golf course, it started as an all male golf course, but it ended up being a really a nice golf course. Well it took

like less than a month for them to convert that land into trust land. This is the dunes on the west side, which basically blocked Maricopa from ever going west. Now they can still go south, but they – but anyway, south along west of 347. But on this particular property, they applied on that land that they purchased, they applied for trust land and to this day that's still not trust land, and which they still have to pay taxes on it and do everything like the rest of us do when we buy land, and, and the roads. I'm concerned with that, because it – Anderson Road leads straight to my house, and if it had turned into trust land, it – I would have had to cross the reservation to get to my property. So this, this whole – this is all part of District 3 and it's all part – I know it's a long, ongoing thing, and I know Commission Members say look we've given them tentative plats, and we've given them tentative plats, but you're headed the right direction, because the future is development. We're not going to stay in agriculture forever, and – but it's got to be sound, safe development. Seth, I'll turn it to the other Commission Members, let them –

MORITZ: Mr. Vice Chair.

HARTMAN: Yes. Commissioner Moritz.

MORITZ: It does sound like you've had quite a series of events that prevent you from accomplishing what you want to accomplish. As you know, staff has recommended a

denial and 12 years is a long time, and we've been looking at those recently and saying how many more – what's the word?

??: Extensions.

MORITZ: Extensions, thank you, extensions can we do. Could I – Dedrick, could I just get some feedback from you on why staff is recommending a denial?

DENTON: Staff is recommending a denial because the flood mitigation does impact the tentative plats, so they would need to come back through us – or through you guys to get that approved. Our Community Development Director doesn't have any authority to make those changes through a minor amendment, so we have to go back through the Planning and Zoning Commission.

MORITZ: Right.

DENTON: So if the City of Casa Grande doesn't want to annex them, they'll be back in the same position.

MORITZ: Mm hm. Thank you, yes.

KEELER: Vice Chairman, Commissioner Moritz, may I – from my perspective, there's a difference between asking for a tentative plat extension, and asking for a tentative plat continuance. If we were to stay in Pinal County and develop, we would want an extension to our tentative plats to get to final plat and develop the property. Right now what we're looking for is a continuance on our tentative plat which gives us time to go to Casa Grande and work through a pre-annexation

development agreement. Dedrick's correct, if that fails, then we have no other option to come back here and say okay, we tried for years to get somewhere, but no one will take us, so we're going to develop here. We would be going back through the tentative plat process, fixing what staff has said we need to fix, and that would be the appropriate time to do that. So just so it's clear, what we're asking for today is a continuance, not an extension, to give us time to try to get annexed with the City of Casa Grande.

MORITZ: Mr. Vice Chair?

HARTMAN: Yes, Commissioner Moritz.

MORITZ: So, Dedrick is there a way to do a continuance of these two cases, or –

DENTON: Yeah.

MORITZ: To a meeting of Planning and Zoning in August of 2016?

DENTON: That would be up to the Commission.

MORITZ: Okay.

GRUBB: Mr. Vice Chair?

HARTMAN: Yes, Commissioner Grubb.

GRUBB: Seth, how close is the Casa Grande border to you?

KEELER: That's a great question. There's a couple parcels that we would have to have annexed with us from the – from the property line which is the western-most – essentially

the northern western-most property boundary that's annexed into Casa Grande. There's a couple more parcels that we would have to join with us so that we would be in the connectivity range. We have already been through that same role. For example, the two successful annexations we've had to date, have been properties that were not our property. So we've already learned how to work with other property owners and make this annexable pathway possible.

GRUBB: So this would require you to get across the railroad tracks.

KEELER: We're actually south of the railroad tracks.

GRUBB: But the boundary of Casa Grande is north of the railroad tracks.

KEELER: And south of the railroad.

GRUBB: Oh, they have?

HARTMAN: And like just to the - back to the east of this property.

GRUBB: Oh, it just doesn't show on this.

HARTMAN: I know, it doesn't.

GRUBB: The map that I have. Okay.

HARTMAN: Seth, one of the things that you ought to bring up is it seems like a natural to me that Casa Grande, if they ever want to expand, would expand towards you because it can't go towards Coolidge. Coolidge is already very

aggressive in their city boundaries. They can't go to Eloy, because they've been aggressive, and they're on the east side of Casa Grande. They can't go north because of the reservation. They can a little bit, there's a little bit of room in there for the city to go. We had an airport deal there that they can take in. But they're also, in your property and your area, they take the kids to school. You're in the school districts of Stanfield, so what I'm saying is they could expand eventually to Stanfield where Maricopa's going to be boxed in by the properties that Ak-Chin bought, except for what you leap frogged over their property, which you went through it because it hadn't been State Trust Land yet - not state trust - sovereign nation land, excuse me for mis - sovereign nation yet. So it really seemed like a natural. I don't know. That would be one of the things that you would have to explore and work out is whether Casa Grande wants to fight the Santa Cruz. I do have an article here that I don't know whether - I don't know whether any of you got to see this or not, but this is in the Casa Grande Dispatch - Casa Grande Dispatch. The Board of Supervisors just don't - gave some money to Corps of Army Engineers to study the Santa Cruz, the lower - the Santa Cruz, and this is the big problem about the whole thing, is it - it's the Santa Cruz and nobody wants to take on the liabilities of the flooding, and it - and it says in that article that they're looking for funding to

help promote the development of the flood control on the Santa Cruz, which is part of Pinal County, big part. And I don't know, that's almost overwhelming too.

KEELER: Vice Chair.

HARTMAN: Okay, Seth.

KEELER: There's a Santa Cruz alliance that we're involved with, and that's an effort to provide a regional solution for what you're talking about. The reality check comes into play when you look at the estimated timeframes of projects like that. They're a 20 year window. So what we're doing is we're taking our property and creating a solution that will merge perfectly with the regional solution when that time comes. So yes, Chairman you're correct. I mean this is – it's a big issue, and we've known that from the very beginning, and that's why our drainage solution is imperative.

HARTMAN: Commissioner Salas.

SALAS: If we're to follow the recommendation of our staff, what is the, what is the damage that it will do to your proposal or what you're working on, your project?

KEELER: Vice Chairman, Commissioner Salas. Good question. When, when we go to the City of Casa Grande, we want to have as much entitlement as placed as possible. That adds to our value. That's like why does the city want us? Well here's why you want us, because we have all these benefits. We have all this in place. If you follow the

recommendation of staff and deny our request for a continuance, it takes one level of the profitability margin in a development case down. We are, we are just a zoning case. We are not an entitled zoning case with a tentative plat. So a simple continuance on your part affords us the opportunity to look more attractive to the City of Casa Grande, which we are pleading for.

SALAS: But what benefit does the County have out of that?

KEELER: That's a good question. The benefit from my perspective is it frees up the County from having to worry about us developing in the County, it frees up staff's time. The City of Casa Grande is their own flood plain administrator, so the city would handle that component of the development process. We wouldn't be relying on Pinal County being the floodplain administrator. I think there's some benefits - if you look at the long (inaudible) of the project, like we mentioned, when we talked with Greg, Greg does not want to have a satellite development property in between two cities. If we develop in Casa Grande, it's a benefit to Pinal County, not having to worry about a satellite community in the middle of two cities.

SALAS: My concern is jobs. What does this project, this development, offer our County as far as jobs? You know, and this is my own personal opinion as a Commission, as a

County, you know, we're approving a lot of development into our area, and jobs are very critical, and these developments are not bringing anything in. They're bringing in minimum wage jobs. After you develop, what do you have? A little minute market over here, you've got some landscapers over there, and people cleaning homes and stuff like that. That isn't an advantage to the County. That's my perspective from it. So I don't see why we should be so urgent in thinking that oh boy, we're going to lose something big here if you have to go back to square one.

KEELER: Commissioner Salas, I can share with you a little bit about my perspective on development. When you look at Pinal County or you look at a city like the City of Casa Grande, they have a general plan and they, they identify corridors where they want to have specific things. For example, corridor of neighborhoods, or corridor of retail, or corridor of employment. If you want to talk about how to lure an employer to an area, the first thing they're going to look for who lives here? Who can work at my facility when I bring it, and that's why there's a sequence of development. Roof tops usually are the first thing to show up. Then you can attract the employers, because there's people to actually be employed in what you're presenting.

SALAS: Well on the flip side is that we create a lot of development, and there are no lucrative jobs in the

area. You know, we're building a bunch of – the way I look at it to be another crash – you're going to create plight in these developments, that's what's going to happen, because we don't have any base from a job perspective. I think that as a Commission and as a staff are working on this, we need to look at that, and too much of it has been going on already without us having any real benefit from these developments. And that's, that's the way I look at it.

KEELER: I appreciate your perspective. I think that like what we just heard from Himanshu, he presented that there is economic activity, there are favorable things happening in Pinal County and subsections of the cities, and I agree with you that we do need good employment corridors. And there are already identified employment corridors within the cities of Casa Grande, cities of Maricopa and Pinal County. Our particular property happens just not to be on one of the employment corridors.

SALAS: Well, personally I'm not interested in creating a bedroom county, when we have the potential of attracting industry in the area because of the open space that we have, and we're bringing development - again, I'm repeating myself – in to build a bunch of homes where people can't even go to work at. You know, we're attracting homes for possibly people coming out of Phoenix, Tucson or wherever it is, if they want to live here, and commute wherever they're gonna

work. But you know, there's no jobs in the area for them.

KEELER: Commissioner Salas, if I may add, there's, in our opinion, one of the greatest elements that we have here, in this corridor particularly, the City of Maricopa and this region, is its proximity to stuff like the Intel corridor. We think that there's some great employment areas that are close to this, so people can drive and get to work.

MORITZ: Mr. Vice Chair?

HARTMAN: Yes, Commissioner Moritz.

MORITZ: I look at this as a - and yes, I think Commissioner Salas has a point, but this is has been in the works for 12 years and from what I can see, a lot of it is certainly not the fault of the applicant. There are a lot of conditions that have come up that have caused them to be delayed, and the letter from Casa Grande, the City of Casa Grande, I didn't see in our packets.

KEELER: It just came in.

MORITZ: So could you just repeat what they're requesting again?

KEELER: Certainly. Vice Chair, Commissioner Moritz. There is a letter from the City of Casa Grande. Want me to read the letter, would that -

MORITZ: Is it short?

KEELER: Yeah, two paragraphs.

MORITZ: Please.

KEELER: Okay. It says we've been approached by the owners of Santa Cruz Ranch Development regarding annexation –

SALAS: Excuse me, can you amplify a little bit?

KEELER: Certainly, Apologize. We have been approached by the owners of Santa Cruz Ranch Development regarding annexation into the City of Casa Grande. We have initiated preliminary annexation discussions. We understand that Santa Cruz Ranch preliminary plats are the subject of renewal or continuance at the August 20th planning commission meeting. We would support an extension or continuance of this matter to give us time to further explore the feasibility of annexation of the Santa Cruz Ranch Development into Casa Grande. Please feel free to contact me if you have any questions regarding this matter. Cordially, Paul R. Theiss, Planning and Development Director, dated August 13, 2015. And the cover letter that came in the email said Greg, please find attached a letter indicating that Casa Grande is in preliminary discussions with the owners of Santa Cruz Ranch Development regarding annexation and indicating that we would support an extension of their approved preliminary plats to allow for us to explore feasibility of annexation with them. I assume that nine to 12 months would be a sufficient time for us to conclude our annexation feasibility effort. Feel free to contact me if you have any questions regarding this matter.

MORITZ: Okay, thank you. If you're this close to

coming to a conclusion with us, I don't see why we shouldn't grant an ext – a continuance to the December 15, 2016 meeting, and see if that comes through. If at that time, it doesn't, I'd say let's close the book. But again, that's my opinion.

GRUBB: Mr. Vice Chair.

HARTMAN: Commissioner Grubb.

GRUBB: You know, I would stand with Commissioner Moritz in that, you know, we had a presentation on all the development that's going on and all the new business that's coming, and you know, one of the key things to getting this business to come to our County is to get people to come to our County who have the qualifications to work for these businesses. Now this piece of land is very close to some of the things we just heard about that are already in the works, and I think it's, you know, if we're going to have this spirit of cooperation that we heard from Mr. Himanshu and from our County Manager, between the County and our incorporated communities, you know, if this can work to get them into Casa Grande to support this project, I'm all in favor of giving them the time to work on that. However, if it has to come back to us, and again I stand with Commissioner Moritz on this, you know, and then we have to start over again. But, but I would support an extension to December 15th of 2016.

HARTMAN: A continuance.

GRUBB: I'm sorry, a continuance to allow this

applicant, who as you noted, has stood strong through all this political stuff and allow it to – to them to continue to try and build their project. Thank you.

HARTMAN: Okay, Mary Aguirre-Vogler.

AGUIRRE-VOGLER: What's the date on that letter from Casa Grande?

KEELER: Vice Chair, Commissioner –

AGUIRRE-VOGLER: A recent letter from –

KEELER: August 13, 2015.

AGUIRRE-VOGLER: And the letter to Greg?

KEELER: I'm sorry, that was the letter to Greg, from the City of Casa Grande. And the email was dated the same date, August 13.

AGUIRRE-VOGLER: From Casa Grande to our manager, Greg Stanley.

KEELER: That is correct.

AGUIRRE-VOGLER: And so what is his response?

KEELER: Your question is what was Greg's response?

AGUIRRE-VOGLER: Right.

KEELER: I don't have an answer for you on that.

AGUIRRE-VOGLER: The 13th, that's seven days. Staff, is there an answer from Mr. Stanley?

DENTON: No, but our position is that we recommend denial.

AGUIRRE-VOGLER: Continue to recommend denial, okay.

HARTMAN: All right, Commission Members? Any further questions? We are a Commission and staff is a recommending body to us, but we don't have to, you know, just do what staff says.

SMYRES: Vice Chair, just for clarification for me personally. Assuming that we grant you the extension, and then you go –

??: Continuance.

HARTMAN: Continuance.

SMYRES: Continuance, I'm sorry. And you take this plat through the City of Casa Grande and they say okay we're going to annex you in. Do they accept our plat, or do they – with modifications for the drainage, or do you basically come under their jurisdiction and you start all over again?

KEELER: Vice Chair, Commissioner Smyres, that's a very good question, and the city, in the process of our negotiation, has the ability to make certain requests of what we do. We have annexed property before, in other cases, and the zoning is grandfathered and any entitlements that we have are adopted as part of the annexation package, as part of the negotiations of pre-annexation development agreement. When we had our discussions with the City of Casa Grande, there was no indication from them that they were going to throw away our request to have the tentative plat come in with our annexation. However, we have not yet had the opportunity to

have those detailed discussions. We certainly want it to be part of the annexation package.

HARTMAN: All right, Commission Members, is there further questions of Seth? If not Seth, thank you for –

KEELER: Thank you for your time.

HARTMAN: - appearing before us today. Our Chair came in while we were in session, but he informs me that he would like me to continue this case until it's over, and then I'll give him back the chair. So at this time, I would call to the public, is there anyone – we don't on tentative plats.

ABRAHAM: That's correct.

HARTMAN: We don't call to the public. All right, Commission Members, it's back to us to discuss and then a motion. I'm ready for a motion.

MORITZ: Mr. Vice Chair?

HARTMAN: Yes, Commissioner Moritz.

MORITZ: I'd like to make a motion that we forward S-026-05 to Board of Supervisors –

HARTMAN: I don't think we have to forward it.

MORITZ: Oh, okay. That we, that we grant a continuance of S-026-05 until the August 18, 2016 meeting.

HARTMAN: Do I have a second?

GRUBB: Mr. Vice Chair, I'll second that.

HARTMAN: Thank you for the second. With that, is there any further discussion? If not, I'll call for a voice

vote. All those in favor say aye.

COLLECTIVE: Aye. Opposed?

SALAS: Nay.

AGUIRRE-VOGLER: Nay.

HARTMAN: Dedrick, did you get that? The number of nays?

DENTON: Yes.

HARTMAN: Majority has it?

DENTON: Yes. There was only two, correct?

HARTMAN: Right. And both of these cases are – both S-026-05 and S-033-06 are considered together?

DENTON: That's correct, you just need to make a motion for S-033-06.

MORITZ: Mr. Vice Chair?

HARTMAN: Go ahead.

MORITZ: I'd like to make a motion that we have a continuance on S-033-06 to the August 18, 2016 meeting.

GRUBB: Second.

ABRAHAM: Mr. Chair, hold on a second. On that first one, did we say 16th or 18th on the one we just –

HARTMAN: Well, I heard 16th and then I heard Commissioner Moritz say 18th.

ABRAHAM: It should be the –

MORITZ: Isn't the third Thursday the 18th?

ABRAHAM: Third Thursday the 18th.

HARTMAN: 18th is what I heard.

MORITZ: Yeah.

HARTMAN: All right, if there's no further comment, call for a voice vote. All those in favor say aye.

COLLECTIVE: Aye. Okay. Opposed?

SALAS: Nay.

AGUIRRE-VOGLER: Nay.

??: Nay.

HARTMAN: We picked up one on that. I think we got three. Did you (inaudible)? On the first one too.

??: Yes I did.

HARTMAN: Okay.

??: (Inaudible).

HARTMAN: All right. Okay, motion carries. August 18th. Now will they appear back before us, or is there just an automatic –

DENTON: If the City of Casa Grande annex them, then they will need to come back to us.

HARTMAN: They will need to come back.

DENTON: We'll probably have the meeting, but we would probably let you know that they got annexed.

HARTMAN: Okay. All right, with that, for the work session, I get to turn it over to our Chair and he will carry on. Mr. Chair I said that when we quit – when we go for lunch because of the confusion of not being able to have our lunches

here, and we have to go and everything, that we'll probably just go home.

RIGGINS: That's a very good chance. Very good chance.

HARTMAN: Staff doesn't particularly like that.

SALAS: Have a chance to take a break there.

RIGGINS: Well thank you very much. And great apologies for my being called into something this morning. But we will begin with the Work Session, and I assume that staff will be presenting that to us.

ABRAHAM: We will, Mr. Chair. And just a couple updates. This is our annual review of the comprehensive plan major amendments, and just a reminder, they happen once every year, and they get – they start actually way back in May for our 60 day review. There's a series of work sessions that occur with the Board, the Planning Commission. We go through the Citizens Advisory Committee here in early September. You're going to be seeing it next month on your September agenda. Now we have four – actually we only have three cases, but we have – there's three – four cases agendized and we are going to actually – staff is going to request that we not proceed with letter C, which is PZ-PA-003-15. That was a text amendment to the – a proposed text amendment to add language regarding medical marijuana dispensaries and medical marijuana offsite cultivation locations. And we're going to be

withdrawing that one. So it is in your packets because we had sent it out as part of the 60 day review, but we're not going to move forward with that one this year. The reason being for that, is that case is - we need to have some more time and work with our stakeholders and our decision makers on that one. We were, as staff, trying to really ride the wave of that agenda period being open, and since we can only do these once a year, we were trying to like get something going and launch it so we could move it forward with this 2015 agenda cycle. But working our way through that one, we determined that that's going to need a lot more work, so that one's going to go away. We're not actually going to - we're not actually prepared to talk about that one at all today. The other three, though, there's going to be two of them that are staff generated, those A and B, and then D is a major amendment from the property owner. So today we're going to talk to you about A, B and D. Generally you don't take public comment at work sessions, nor do you hear from the, from the applicant. There'll be plenty of time to do that next month. But without further ado, I'll go ahead and turn it over to Ashlee. She's going to handle the first one.

ASHLEE: Thank you, Steve and Chair. This first case is PZ-PA-001-15. This is a County-wide text amendment. The applicant, again, as Steve mentioned, is the Pinal County. And what the request is to add a subsection, Healthy Places

within Chapter 8 which is our Healthy Happy Residents chapter. Part of the reason that we're looking at doing this is there's a growing trend to support local and healthy food sources making more widely available food sources, such as farmers markets, community gardens and urban agriculture. The healthy places section that we're seeking to add will address the availability of healthy foods and will include a series of goals, objectives and policies to further that mission. The impacts on the policy direction. This will further reiterate and pass on our agricultural heritage to future residents. It will allow staff to look into, and will support future zoning ordinance amendments to allow for the co-location of farmer's markets on school sites, recreation areas and worship sites, and in recreation areas of planned area developments, and it will support the location of community gardens. The language that staff is proposing is within your staff report, so hopefully you've had an opportunity to take a look at that. If you have any questions, I would be happy to answer them at this point.

HARTMAN: Chair Riggins, questions?

RIGGINS: I was reviewing.

HARTMAN: Yeah, you're always –

RIGGINS: I have, I have no questions concerning – I have no questions myself. Does anybody else have any comments or questions of staff on the Healthy Places amendment that's

being discussed? Doesn't seem to be any.

ABRAHAM: While that's getting spooled up, I'm going to be handling the next one and – which is PZ-PA-002-15. This is also a major amendment, and it does two things. One, it's going to create a new land use designation in our additional land use designation category, and then it's also going to allow requests to this designation as non-major amendment up to 320 acres. Basically it's going to be called the Green Energy Production, and where this came from was the – last year we handled a major amendment for sun power, and throughout – that was a photovoltaic of solar power plant. That was going to be located off of Diversion Dam Road east of town here, by – south of the canal. And that ended up being withdrawn. It didn't get a lot of positive response from the Board of Supervisors. But throughout the processing of that, the – and looking back on that whole process, I think what it did is kind of unveil a little bit of a soft spot in our Comprehensive Plan. One of the major drawbacks of that one – let me scoot over a little bit. Bouncing back and forth between slides. What it did was it – there was some neighboring property owners who identified the fact that photovoltaic power generation locations are kind of unique. They're passive, but then again they're really – you don't want to locate them too close to houses, and there's – sometimes they might not be fun to look at, but our

Comprehensive Plan made us process them in two different ways; either you process it as an industrial land use, which is purple on our land use map, which allows industrial parks, manufacturing, you know, job-generating things, which solar voltaics really not that. Or the other thing, which is what Sun Power asked for, was to process it as a general public services and facilities. Now a neighboring property-owner of that brought up the true fact that public services and facilities also allows things like wastewater treatment plants, prisons, transfer stations and general public uses that are really not good next to residential or very sensitive land uses. So we had this really unique land use that really didn't fit with either of those designations. Staff at the time felt that public services and facilities was probably the best because, you know, those are very - since the blue color is very unique, it takes a lot of planning, a lot of coordination, those, those types of uses don't just pop up like if you would with an industrial park, if you kind of build it them will come type idea. So after that got done going through the process, the Commission, I think, was very close on that one. I think you ended up going like a 5 to 4 type deal on that, and for very good reason. There was some, there was some definite concerns with that. They ended up withdrawing. So one of the ideas that staff thought that, that since this is so unique, create a unique category for it.

That, that way we know what they're asking for, there isn't any, you know, anything cloudy about what might end up there. The Board of Supervisors and the Commission, as well, and some property owners were very concerned about the fact that due to the way solar energy is marketed, sold, coordinated, I guess is the best way to put it, that there's a strong possibility that this facility, after they get done doing their - doing whatever they do, they go away and now we're left with 400 acres of industrially designated property in the middle of houses, or as some other folks brought up, it could be something either far, far worse than that in terms of a transfer station or wastewater treatment facility. So we did two things with this amendment. One is we create a new designation, it will get a brand new color specific for photovoltaic facilities, and also that 320 acres of this will be - be able to be processed as a minor amendment. So there we can get the zoning and the amendment together, that way there could be some - at least what we thought - there could be some assurances that they'll transition right to zoning, rather than this cooling off period that is required as part of major amendments. Now, through our public outreach up to this point, we've had several comments to enlarge that, from 320 all the way up to 640. So what we did is we took that opportunity to advertise that as such, so there's - in your packets you're going to see the language that says 640 rather

than the 320 on your agenda. And we did that to overshoot, that way we can come back if need be, and let those discussions take place. Again, obviously if the idea is completely sour and, you know, not ready to be plugged into our Comp Plan, of course the whole thing can be denied or - and not move it forward. But that was one thing that we came up with up to this point. So did I miss anything here? I think the big, the big long-term impact of this Comp Plan change is that it creates a specific placeholder for future green energy possibilities. The Comp Plan is a policy document, and if you create areas in the Comp Plan where future land uses could be placed that we don't know about yet or we don't know what the technology will bring, we'll have an area and we have a policy direction that says okay, we do green energy, right now it's just photovoltaic, we might be able to open that up to something in the future. We don't know yet, but right now it's going to be photovoltaic, that focused energy with the pipes and the liquid sodium and all that, and the tower of power, that's not part of this. This is going to be photovoltaic only. It'll allow facilities to be either done through a zoning amendment that we could do our zoning code at a future date to allow green energy production as an actual district, or possibly SUPs. I'm personally not too keen on that one. But the other thing could be is that it, it opens the door to a specific district sometime in the

future. Also, if the process is kind of convoluted in that - and this is a reflection of what I learned as part of the way that these projects are being built lately, is that some of them, they're, they're direct fit, like we have a provider, there's a company that this is where they want to go, and then sometimes there's like a middleman there, that, that want to market these areas for future development or future capacity. So if we have this designation that only allows green energy, they have to come back through the process to change those plans, which I think is a very important thing. Furthermore, I think the good part of this is that this will not prohibit future proposals to be put in employment and public services and facilities. So you've got three options now of where these places can go. You can do the purple, the blue, and this green energy designation. We haven't really picked a color yet. Obviously employment designations, you might want to steer away from those, because you want to reserve that area for industrial land uses and solar power, you know, can take - the Sun Power one was like 309 acres to generate only about 40-45 megawatts, so it's very land consumptive exercise. So when this comes back to you, it'll be noticed as 640 acres, rather than the 320. I'd be happy to answer any questions that the Commission may have.

RIGGINS: Well I'll jump right in. I believe it's here. I would point out that somebody to find out that there

is a streamlined easy to pass-through system, that it would allow a 640 acre solar facility to be built next to their property, is somewhat monstrous on its face. It is a, it is a hugely, hugely visual problem. They oftentimes don't make, because there's such public resistance to them, so what we want to do is make the public not have the ability to have the resistance? I think this is a very, very bad idea. And then you can get something that is even worse when you have a green power district. Somebody might even come up with the idea of wind, which should be zoned in the same place that a nuclear waste repository would go, because it's horrid. It's a great thing for people living a long ways away, that they can put something that has no environmental footprint, so they don't have to worry about it, but the people that have to live around those things, they're terrible. They're absolutely terrible, and I do not believe that this should go forward at all. I think it should stay exactly as it is. Is there any other -

AGUIRRE-VOGLER: I agree.

RIGGINS: I think it stays, I think it stays the way it is. I'm very disappointed to even see it.

GRUBB: Mr. Chair.

RIGGINS: Yes.

GRUBB: You know, I would support the fact that we need to look at a designation for solar power. You know, I

agree with the idea that – you know, I don't want it in the 640 acres next to my house. But then it should not be allowed in that zoning. It should, you know, it just gets denied because, you know, if we look at areas and designate them now in the unpopulated areas of the County, and say this is where you can put solar farms if you want to put them, rather than, you know, just allowing somebody to walk in here and say hey, I want to put, you know, on this 640 acres at, you know, Attaway and 287, so that you have to look at it from your house.

RIGGINS: Well I have one I am going to get to look at from my house that's being built right now.

GRUBB: And that's the point. I'm in favor of having something that says this is where they fit in the general plan. They have a designation, this is what they – and if they want to come in for an amendment to allow it to happen, you know, that – you know, if we – I mean we have areas that have been designated purples and blues that keep them away from the residential areas and the green can go similar away from the residential areas. Say its okay to build solar farms here, but not over there. Don't put it in the middle of Johnson Ranch, don't put it in the middle of, you know, Picacho Peak, and those kind of things. Don't put them – but find out designated areas where they can be built, so that if somebody decides they want to bring a solar farm to

Pinal County, it's already designated this is where you can put it.

RIGGINS: I was about to say just go (inaudible) put a mile on either side of the major transmission lines that have been put in our County, and that's where you can put your green. And so every single person –

GRUBB: But we don't have a green –

RIGGINS: - on those properties is the subject of that.

GRUBB: You know what I'm saying is support the idea that it has its own designation, and I don't know if we want to continue with it being photovoltaic because somebody might invent a new solar power generating system next week that doesn't follow photovoltaic guidelines, so –

SALAS: (Inaudible). Look at the New Mexico (inaudible) that we just heard about. Why? Because California's has already screwed up its (inaudible) for these goddamn windmills that they're putting up, so they said you know, great idea New Mexico has a lot of wind over there, let's get our power from Arizona and New Mexico.

GRUBB: No, I firmly believe that if somebody wants to put these kind of facilities up, they have a very high burden to get over with the surrounding property owners, and I don't think that should be reduced in any way, because it's a horrid thing to happen to somebody.

MORITZ: Mr. Chairman.

HARTMAN: Yes.

MORITZ: I have a question. The blue and purple, whatever, is that major or minor?

ABRAHAM: That would be no amendment.

MORITZ: Okay.

ABRAHAM: Yeah, if they were located in an area that's already blue or purple, it would just go through zoning.

MORITZ: Okay, all right. And – is, is it –

GRUBB: (Inaudible) designate, then they can go into those areas.

MORITZ: Right.

GRUBB: We've already identified them where we would like that to be.

MORITZ: Yeah. Yes. And that's right. Well I would be opposed to the 640 on a minor, and I don't know whether it's an issue of the size and/or the ability to combine the application and the movement of it. So I think it would be both the size and the minor.

RIGGINS: Vice Chair Hartman.

HARTMAN: Commissioner Riggins. I think the way the Comprehensive Plan is set up is really what we – we look at each case individually. I don't want somebody to say that in the Comprehensive Plan we'll amend Hartman property for solar.

I think I'm the one that, through the current guidelines, can do what I want with it, and I don't, I don't think that we ought to be changing the Comprehensive Plan to, to specifically identify solar. I think it's up to the neighbors, the surrounding properties, and then the regular hearing process to determine whether they have a solar farm or not.

RIGGINS: Other Commissioners? Okay. Work Session. We have one more.

HARTMAN: Steve is going to explain that further. Let Steve tell us what we're limited to say. Mr. Chair?

RIGGINS: Oh, I thought we had a work session. PZ-PA-004 – I thought staff was going to –

ABRAHAM: Yeah, we're getting, we're getting loaded up here.

RIGGINS: Yeah.

BALMER: Okay, okay, we're ready to go. So this is – Mr. Chair, Members of the Commission – this is PZ-PA-004-15. It's our only citizen-initiated Comp Plan this time around. The request is to change the designation from very low density residential which allows up to one dwelling unit per acre, to low density residential, which would allow two dwelling units per acre, on approximately 320 acres, located adjacent to San Tan Mountain Regional Park on the south side of Phillips, about a half mile west of Thompson Road. The applicant is San

Tan 320, LLC. Can see on the County map that we're in the San Tan Valley area, the northern end of the County. Zooming in a little closer, you can see the subject property highlighted in yellow. The green areas surrounding the property are the - is the regional park. This slide shows what the applicant is proposing. On the left is the existing conditions with the very low density residential. That's also the Comp Plan designation of the surrounding properties immediately adjacent. The orange area a little bit to the east there are rural ranchettes with a three and a third acre minimum lot size. The yellow area north of the property is San Tan Heights. The image on the right shows what the map would change to if this were to be approved, the low density residential. I have an aerial photo that doesn't have a lot to look at, but in the northwest corner you can see the entrance to the San Tan Mountain regional park, which is what I wanted to point out there. This is the conceptual site plan the applicant provided. It does show a few different densities within the property, and a few different housing types. The south end of the property is very low density residential development. The areas kind of in the middle and in the northern end of the property are the low density, and those areas provide a few different lot sizes. The area, the brown area right in the middle adjacent to the proposed aquatics center is actually multi-family condos - casitas.

The red lines and the orange lines are kind of the circulation networks within the property. The red lines are the pedestrian trails, yellow line is the multi-use trail. So there are a few different housing varieties provided, which is something staff looks for when we review these, because it gives residents, you know, different options as far as housing types go. I did have a few discussion points on this one. The Comprehensive Plan gives us planning guidelines for staff, that staff uses when we evaluate these proposals as they come in. The low density residential falls within this urban residential planning guidelines, and according to the Comp Plan the intent of the low density designation is to provide a rural lifestyle with options for compatible suburban development. One of the, the big guidelines that staff looks at is the compatibility with the existing surrounding land uses. And if this were to be approved, the two dwelling units per acre would be the highest density designation in the immediate area. However, the applicant is proposing approximately 40 percent open space, and a great deal of that open space is what we call conversation open spaces. So they're preserving washes, natural landscaping, things along those lines, which would really help the development kind of integrate into the surrounding, the surrounding development patterns. Another guideline that we look at, like I just mentioned, is open space, and the applicant is proposing

approximately 40 percent, which the ordinance would require 18 percent. So it's quite a bit more than what would be required by the ordinance. One thing that staff would look at is moves a little farther in the process, is some things like pocket parks and amenities for residents of, you know, different age groups, different activity levels. Open space that really serves all the residents. Another guideline to consider is the impact on the transportation system. It's reasonable to assume if you double the density, that potentially could double the traffic impacts in the area. The applicant is actually – has a target density of around one and a half dwelling units per acre, so, you know, the impacts might not be that severe, but the designation would be up to two dwelling units. It's not a guideline, but specific to this project and something I wanted to point out, is that it is directly adjacent to San Tan Mountain Regional Park, so it's important to consider how this proposal would interact with the park. The applicant is proposing a 2.3 acre parcel in the northwest, adjacent to the park entrance, and then like I mentioned before, a trail network through the property. So there is a potential to interface with the, with the park if that's what they're, what they're going for. Another aspect of the development is they're also providing – or excuse me – proposing an equestrian trail along Phillips to help facilitate access to the park for the surrounding kind of

lower density development. The concludes my presentation, but I'd be happy to answer questions.

RIGGINS: Commissioner Aguirre-Vogler.

AGUIRRE-VOGLER: So in granting this, you were kind of weighing on the fact that there was going to be 40 percent conservation stuff, right? So if you don't grant this, it would probably be 80 percent then, wouldn't it?

BALMER: The –

AGUIRRE-VOGLER: I mean if you don't, you're doubling the size of the request, or the zone, or whatever, and so if he's – if he – if he stays at the very low density, he's going to have to do a lot of conservation, in my point of view.

BALMER: There's – currently this is actually part of the San Tan Heights PAD which was approved for 15 percent.

AGUIRRE-VOGLER: Yeah, but he's asking for more density, right?

BALMER: He – that's correct. They are asking for –

AGUIRRE-VOGLER: And impact on all the roads right now is really crucial, so that's a very, very big item in my point of view that you're doubling practically all of the infra – all of the, you know, the residential. So anyway, I'm opposed to it. But anyway, that was my point.

GRUBB: Mr. Chair.

RIGGINS: Please.

GRUBB: I'll start. And back in – and you may remember these too, those of you who have been around a while. Back in the early days of San Tan Heights when they were breaking ground, you know, and they were making presentations to the community – I still own the San Tan Heights property with Larry Miller and Ron Smith from Omega Development, who was the original project developers - where they made a promise to the community that there would never be more than one house per acre on those hill sides. They promised the community that it would never go there. Now I realize that they're probably not involved anymore, you know, they – with the crash that occurred, you know, a lot of property has exchanged hands and those kinds of things. This room will be full of people from the, from hill country, from the San Tan Foothills people when this comes up for a public hearing. There's going to be a public outcry and – about this, because this was a promise to allow the densities that went into San Tan Heights, this was the tradeoff that Larry Miller said we will never put more than one house per acre up there and nothing on the hilltops. And I don't see – and I know you didn't make the promise, I realize that. But, you know, there was a lot of promises made by people in the past in the San Tan Valley and some of those just haven't been kept, and this is yet another one that – and I realize the world changes and those kind of things, but you know, this is pristine property.

This is very pristine property up there and, and you know, to, to go in there and do what they're going to try and do - you know I appreciate that they're trying to keep the densities down, but as soon as I hear condos, that's not keeping the density down. You know, and those condos appear to be near the hilltop, and so that's what the people in San Tan Heights are going to see. And, you know, this is - I'm sorry, I can't support this. I can't because of the promises that were made to the community and I just can't.

RIGGINS: Other Commissioners? Vice Chair Hartman.

HARTMAN: As, as a citizen, I - and a farmer - I once - we had, in the Maricopa area we once had livestock feed yards and we were really high density and there was controversy whether we're going to go residential or stay agriculture. A friend of mine once told me that man's laws can be changed at will, nature's law have stood the test of time. So I remember that. And I've seen man's law change so much, like with the feed yards. They were there, they grandfathered and the whole thing, and they sure changed that and took the feed yards out, because the people said we want to change. And when you start trying to do things where the people don't want it, then you really run into a wall of resistance. So I, I'm like some of the other Commission Members, I think we're going to run into a wall of resistance, and I don't like the higher densities anyway. So there's

where I am.

GRUBB: Yeah, Mr. Chairman, unless Gordon Brown stands – unless Gordon Brown stands at that podium and says that they support this, because he was around back then, and you know, and he and I don't always agree, but unless he stands up there and says that the Foothills community will support this, I – you know, we're gonna have, you know, quite the public hearing on this.

RIGGINS: Commissioner Putrick.

PUTRICK: Yeah, I just like to comment along those lines. If you go to some other states like Oregon and Washington, they have very strict laws about hillside structures, and you – in some counties in Oregon you are not allowed to clear cut your property and build a house, because they don't want to disturb the view of the mountains with the trees. And in one case, somebody built a house and clear cut on the Oregon side of the river, and people on – I mean on the Washington side of the river, and people in Oregon raised such a fit that he had to tear his house down. I don't know how they did that, but – but the point is, if you're looking at, if you're looking at flat land and you're looking at developments, you know, it's – it doesn't matter as much how many rooftops there are per acre. But when you're looking at the hillside, that's part of the aesthetic value of, of this area, and even though it's not covered with trees, it still

has a certain amount of aesthetics. And if you start plunking big houses up there in it, it just – it's just like windmills. You missed by diatribe Mr. Chairman, on windmills. The – and so the point is I would agree with you, I don't think, I don't think I would like to see more density in the higher elevations. Thank you.

RIGGINS: Other Commissioners? I would like to point out that I do believe I recall this when it went through, and one of the reasons it went through is because it was offered the way it is. And that's what got it through public process at that time, and I fully agree that if a lot of people out there remember those promises and the things that were done, it's going to be pretty tough for me to say it should be able to be changed. Any other comments on this staff? Oh, Mr. Hartman.

HARTMAN: Okay, I have one comment. I remember when the Superstition Foothills was being developed and people were coming before this Commission and they were saying I bought my lot because I have a site view towards the Superstition Mountains and now you're letting that residents build a structure there that blocks my view. So we, we have gone both ways. I mean that's a personal property right and it was in – within the ordinances. So I don't think we ought to inhibit site view any more. I just – and higher density does that. You can - with lower density you can ask the individual to

locate in specific areas, maybe a lower spot or something else, whatever, so that it doesn't disturb view to other residences.

RIGGINS: Okay, very good. So, it's 12:00. We are done with the work session, and there is a Call to the Commission and I understand there's going to be a discussion on it.

ABRAHAM: Well before we do that, there was a - one Planning Manager Discussion Item that I wanted to talk about at the end of the meeting, it was about some of our notice requirements. You can do the Call to the Commission if you'd like, then we can go to that, or we can skip (inaudible).

RIGGINS: Now this isn't agendized, so I don't know.

ABRAHAM: It's on the Planning Manager's Discussion Items.

RIGGINS: Oh, okay. All right. Oh, by golly it is. Okay.

ABRAHAM: Okay, where are the notice requirements?

HARTMAN: Come on, Steve, you're running our lunch time.

SALAS: We have a prior engagement.

ABRAHAM: Notice, here we go. Okay, notice requirements. Okay. This is a real brief presentation to talk about how zoning cases get noticed and how we encourage public participation. A lot of times I get a lot of questions

about, you know, how come I wasn't involved, or how come they were and I wasn't, and what are your notification methods and one thing I always try to encourage our applicants and our folks who surround projects to understand, is that as planners one of the most valuable things we do is try to encourage continuous and active participation in our public hearings. So - and there's some legal requirements, and then there's some practical requirements to achieve that goal, and State law and our zoning ordinance outline most of the requirements. In fact State law sets up some minimum parameters that you absolutely have to follow, and then our zoning ordinance refines those and I'm showing you in the future slides here, they actually enhance our public participation significantly over what the minimums are required by State law. Now some of the Commissioners who have been on the Commission for a long time, probably remember back in the day when we used to just follow the State guidelines, which were, you know, 300 foot around the subject site, there's two postings that occur which the minimum requirement is this. So you get two of these boards every quarter mile along public roadway, you'd get a mail out that basically just was a notice of public hearing that said when the meeting was going to occur, and that was only 300 feet from the subject property. The newspaper advertising, which basically is only 15 days prior to a proposed hearing, and the we only have to post the, just the

agenda 24 hours prior to the meeting today. So what – we got a lot of feedback from folks that they were being – they felt that they were being left out, they weren't being included, there wasn't a good amount of notification. People could – you could see, easily drive by this at high speed and not – if they survived long enough for people to actually to look at them, they could – they would get a lot of last minute folks that really felt like they were left out on purpose, rather than just that they weren't part of it. And that one thing leads to another, and then you have folks who not only don't understand the process, but feel like they were purposely left out. Now our zoning ordinance, based on all that feedback and years of interaction, we included a neighborhood meeting notification, so along that change, where that change is occurring, we require applicants to notify folks within 1200 feet of a proposed change, which is a quarter mile. We also require that there's a four by eight – four foot by eight foot yellow board with the applicant's contact info that is put on the site. So in addition to these little guys, you're also going to get a four by eight yellow board. We increased the notification radii from 300 to 600 feet, and that – that notice would include this. So if someone 600 feet from a subject site would get this in their mailbox. This is a – this comes in like that and it has the notice information that's required by State law, some other information about how

to file protests, a map that's included, and then also some contact information. This one in particular is – it's got Ashlee's signature on it, and her phone number, and her contact info. We also provide a website so where you can go down and download the entire application, which is also not required by State law, but we put that on our website so people could understand what's going on. Also what we do is we post the entire Planning and Zoning Commission agenda, and the packet on our website about a week prior to the meeting so that folks can go and look at that. Now one – the cool thing that we started doing that I wasn't sure if the Commissioners knew about, is we have on our County webpage – and I'll go through it here while I talk a little bit more about some of this involvement – we created a Google map that helps answer the question what's going on in the County. We get a lot of folks who are just kind of generally wondering if anything's on its, on its way or has anything been submitted, and we created this map to that effect. So these are all, these are all things that we kind of learned throughout our process here, and this is actually a link on the cover page here, to try and enhance public participation and really put, put the documents into the hands of the people that are affected. Now I think it was last month or maybe the month before that, we had some discussion about mapping, and the State requires that we create a map that a reasonable person could look at and

determine where the change is taking place. Now the parcel affected is a requirement by the State – by State law is sometimes it's bigger or it's a part of two parcels, so you have a rezoning area that doesn't really line up exactly with a defined parcel boundary. In fact we're gong to have a case next month that does just that. They're coming in to rezone a specific area in line with their development plan that doesn't really line up with defined parcel boundaries. But the map has to be conducted and the mail outs are all based on the overall parcel, which is good because that's more than what you would get if you just advertised the change itself. So here's our website here that shows where - these pins are where there are proposed cases. We also use this website to notice our board of adjustment cases as well. So if a person came to our webpage, they'd see that pretty much everything's kind of happening up in the north side here, but these pins would then begin to populate at different parts, in areas in the County. Green are county-wide, and then at the bottom of this page, we actually have a list of the notice of public hearings. So these things are the entire app that folks can take a look at. These things stay on our website 31 days after the case is heard by the Board of Supervisors, in case anybody wants to take advantage of their referendum rights under State law, they can file that and go from there. After that, they're promptly removed. So already talked about the

mapping. Here's a typical case map that folks take a look at, streets. The red dot is basically 600 foot surrounding that, and you know, again just to try to encourage continuous voluntary and thoughtful participation. Where this is going, it's increasingly web and internet based. Several of the planning conferences keep talking about working in Facebook and Instagram, and then also it really helps add value to the process and really, you know, help people think that maybe at the end of the day the decision that they were looking for wasn't there, but at least they felt like they weren't left out. And then that's really our – one of our primary goals. So thank you for that, and if any questions or anything else, I'd be perfectly happy to answer.

RIGGINS: We're going to make a Call to the Commission right now. We actually have before you give your presentation, we have a comment. Commissioner Aguirre-Vogler.

AGUIRRE-VOGLER: Yeah. You printed out a copy, you're going to talk about that, I guess, but – and I want to know, it says here – you, meaning Steve – have recently approved commercial project, has a handout at the meeting. What does that mean?

ABRAHAM: Oh, you asked me to put together of things that were recently approved so when folks ask you what's going on over there, you'll have a list that you can look at. I didn't print out all the copies, I was going to give it to you

on your way out.

AGUIRRE-VOGLER: Oh, okay. Thanks.

RIGGINS: I asked for that, Mary. We do it at Town. We get an update, so I just asked for that.

AGUIRRE-VOGLER: Are you going to comment on the Call to the Commission?

ABRAHAM: No, it was just that we had skipped it the last meeting or so, so that was the presentation that I was going to give. But if you had any questions about that. We did it last month, and that was exactly what we were looking for in terms of the back and forth. You know, if you have anything you want me to take a look at or bring up for future discussion, I'm certainly ready to do that.

AGUIRRE-VOGLER: I asked you personally at the beginning of the meeting here about the cyber security possibility of that person if anybody's interested in that. And again, can we talk about lunch? Is there any kind of – not to day, obviously we're leaving. But in the future, is there any possibility that we could be treated a little bit nicer?

ABRAHAM: Well right now it's a money issue, so –

AGUIRRE-VOGLER: Well what's the difference, you're giving us $11.00. You know, why can't – I mean it seems to me like, you know, if, if you only ordered lunch for the Commissioners and not all the staff and not all of the other

employees, it seems to me like two pizzas would probably work and just don't give us the $11.00.

ABRAHAM: Sure and –

AGUIRRE-VOGLER: I don't understand. It's just too much trouble. And then you have no regulation, or how do you call it, regulatory – if we got – what is a quorum? Five of us going to lunch, then what, we start discussing things, well that's bad. So –

HARTMAN: We got to take our County Attorney with us to lunch –

AGUIRRE-VOGLER: Yeah, right

RIGGINS: We used to.

AGUIRRE-VOGLER: So when you're, when you're doing all this investigation at different counties, could you just kind of find out what other counties do to treat their commissioners a little nicer?

RIGGINS: And I will go ahead and jump in on that, just since we're discussing it. Since this policy came into play, we've had very short agendas. Just wait and see what happens the first time we don't. Just wait. You're not going to like it.

MORITZ: Is that a threat?

RIGGINS: No, it's just a reality. It's what's going to happen. The public will not be properly served by doing this.

RIGGINS: And you said have – you asked for us to have a private conversation amongst our self on what we do. I think we took a polling.

AGUIRRE-VOGLER: I mean if you're going to pay us $11.00, why don't you just calculate having lunch for us within that $11.00?

ABRAHAM: Going back to the staff commitment to lunch that basically there – the staffing levels to basically bring in food service for the Commission, it's not there. That we ask you to basically coordinate amongst yourselves to either go out and get something, bring it back, or –

AGUIRRE-VOGLER: In 110 degrees? We're not doing that. We'll just shorten your meetings then, and we'll just meet from 9 to 12.

RIGGINS: It's a mistake.

HARTMAN: Yeah.

RIGGINS: It's a mistake. So, we've had our Call to the Commission. Any other comments or aspects of it? There seems to be none, so in that case, I'll ask for a motion for adjournment.

AGUIRRE-VOGLER: Make a motion to –

??: (Inaudible) adjourn.

RIGGINS: We have a motion, do we have a second.

AGUIRRE-VOGLER: Second.

RIGGINS: We have a second. All in favor?

COLLECTIVE: Aye. So it's done. Thank you.

I, Julie A. Fish, Transcriptionist, do hereby certify that the foregoing pages constitute a full, true, and accurate transcript in the foregoing matter, and that said transcription was done to the best of my skill and ability.

I FURTHER CERTIFY that I am not related to nor employed by any of the parties hereto, and have no interest in the outcome hereof.

Julie A. Fish