PINAL COUNTY PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION
(PO NUMBER 233382)

Regular Meeting
9:00 a.m.
Thursday, January 21, 2016
EOC Room – Building F
31 N. Pinal St., Florence, Arizona

INDEX:

DISCUSSION OF ACTION ITEM REPORT:

- Action Item Report – p. 1

REPORT ON BOARD OF SUPERVISORS ACTION ON P & Z CASES – p. 1

- December 16, 2015
- January 6, 2016

REPORT ON TENTATIVE PLAT EXTENSIONS: None

PLANNING MANAGER'S DISCUSSION ITEMS:

- Presentation by Rachel Zanuk, Pinal County Health Services District - pp. 1-9

NEW CASES:

- SUP-010-15 – pp. 11-31
- IUP-002-15 – pp. 31-62
- PZ-C-002-15 – pp. 62-118

TENTATIVE PLATS:

- S-013-15 – pp. 119

CALL TO THE COMMISSION: pp. 120-129

ADJOURNMENT – p. 129

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

RIGGINS: Let’s go ahead and call the – or call to order the regular meeting of the Pinal County Planning and Zoning Commission. We have a Discussion of Action Item Report.

ABRAHAM: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Happy New Year Commissioners. The first meeting of the New Year. Hope you had a good holiday. Our Action Item Report is in your packets. Just as an update, and this kind of goes into the Board of Supervisors action cases, the Desert Rose Baha’I radio tower ended up getting approved, and the race track that we looked at last month ended up getting approved as well. So kind of merging items 2 and 3 together, but if there are any questions on either of those two things, I’d be happy to answer them.

RIGGINS: Questions? And so that is also the Board of Supervisors report at the same time.

ABRAHAM: It is, sir.

RIGGINS: Getting agenda items done just like that. Okay. Report on Tentative Plat Extension.

ABRAHAM: The director did not extend any tentative plats last month, so nothing has been moved forward under the new system.

RIGGINS: Okay. Questions? The Planning Managers Discussion Items.

ABRAHAM: Mr. Chairman, Commissioners, I am happy to

have a member of our Pinal County Health Control – I'm sorry, Pinal County Public Health Services District come here and do a presentation with you. Her name is Rachel Zanuk, and she received her bachelors degree in molecular and cellular biology, and a masters of public health in epidemiology and biostatistics from the University of Arizona, where she was recognized as an outstanding student for scholarship, community service and health research. She served as an outreach coordinator for the Bio 5 Institute and completed a Susan G. Komen research fellowship at the Arizona Cancer Center, before coming to Pinal County as a data analyst in 2011. Now Rachel has fulfilled multiple roles within Pinal County Health and Human Services, and is currently the Pinal County Assistant Director for Public Health for the Community Health Division. I asked her to come and talk with us today about some of her healthy living efforts that she is conducting with the health – Public Health Services District, and that kind of coincides with some of the amendments that we looked at last year with our Comprehensive Plan. So without further ado, Commissioners, Ms. Rachel to give you a brief presentation.

ZANUK: Good morning.

RIGGINS: Welcome.

ZANUK: Thank you for having me. Give me a minute to figure this clicker out, but I'm going to talk today a

little bit about healthy people and healthy communities, and really just give an overview on return on investment for health communities.

RIGGINS: Use the mic.

ZANUK: Can you hear me better now? All right. So I'm going to talk a little bit about the return on investment for health communities, give an overview of some of the determinants of health and the health status indicators that Pinal County Public Health is focused on, talk to you a little bit about the community health division, what we've been able to accomplish thus far, and what we hope to accomplish in the future, and I do think that the amendment that was recently passed is a great example and success, as far as public health is concerned. So this is an illustration that public health often shows, and I'm probably preaching to the choir here, but it just shows that there are many, many layers when it comes to determinants of health. So you have a social and environmental factors that play a role. There's very few health outcomes that are the result of one single factor. So this is an onion with multiple layers that we're looking at as we discuss, as we discuss health. To give you an overview on morbidity trends, this is a snapshot of healthy people 2020, and I apologize if it's a hard to read the red text, but it says healthy people 2020 goal is to reduce obesity to 30 percent in Pinal County. Currently one in 3 adults are

considered obese in Pinal County, and the 2030 projections are 59 percent obesity in Arizona. So hopefully we're able to prevent obesity and reduce that rate in the coming years. But that's a snapshot of where we're at now, and this is from ArizonaHealthMatters.org, if anyone's interested. Here's the mortality statistics. On the left-hand side you can see the leading causes of death, and on the right-hand side you can see actual causes of death, so currently as of 20 – I'm sorry, yeah, 2000, heart disease, cancer and stroke are the top leading causes of death. Well the actual causes of death are a little bit more complex, and you have to break them down and look at tobacco, poor diet, lack of exercise, alcohol, many factors. And now some of you may have seen this illustration, I'm going to quickly take you through some slides. It's a map of the United States that shows Arizona in blue, starting out, and if you can't see the bottom, those are percentages. So right now this is a slide of Arizona in blue in 1985, and they were rating us at less than ten percent in obesity. Okay, I'm going to go through the years now. 1990 we jumped up to 10-14 percent obesity. 1995 we stayed around the same. 2000, they had to add a new color and Arizona increased to 15 to 19 percent obesity. 20-24 percent in 2005. And then this is the most current, BRFSS statistics, that's the Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance Survey. Arizona is at 20 to 24 percent obesity. So as a state, one in four adults are considered

obese. In Pinal County it's more like one in three. Diabetes, similarly, has increased as well. As we've seen obesity trends increase, we've also seen the incidents of diabetes increase. Arizona, I believe, is at around eight percent, and Pinal County, the latest statistics I saw put us at 8 to 12 percent of adults with diagnosed diabetes. So what does public health plan to do to address some of these issues? Well you can promote healthy behaviors and you can teach people things like eating better and getting active, or you can promote policy change and make healthy food available, open school playgrounds, create bike paths and smoke free workplaces. So how do we maximize our impact? If we want a higher return on investment, then we do need to focus on health policy and system change, instead of direct services, which Pinal County Public Health does provide and will continue to do so. But we want to work more with community partners and existing infrastructure collectively. We want to keep it evidence-based, and demonstrate cost savings through disease prevention. So we want to prevent obesity and diabetes from happening in the first place when possible. To give an example of some success stories in public health, going smoke free is one of the most successful policies that we've implemented thus far. Smoke free campuses were estimated to save over $240 million when ADHS did an ROI analysis of ASU going smoke free, and the multi-housing unit

policies that are popping up, those are associated with cost savings as well. So you can certainly make an argument for going that route. To kind of back up and talk a little bit about what public health has been doing specifically, in 2012 and 2013 we did a community health assessment and improvement plan, and Pinal County worked with multiple community partners to complete this. There was Arizona Department of Health Services at the time, Casa Grande Regional Medical Center, and Sun Life that came together, did this health assessment on the community. Stakeholders were invited to participate in an interactive community health improvement planning process, and the main priorities that came out of the planning process were addressing obesity and chronic disease. And moving forward 2014 to 2016, we're now in capacity building stage. So ADHS has implemented a Healthy People, Healthy Communities integrated IGA, and a majority of the counties that have received the funding through this IGA are focused on health community design, worksite wellness, and health school policy initiatives. Examples of successful public health partnerships include the Healthy Arizona Worksite program, and within Pinal County we specifically have a school health liaison program model which has worked very well for us.

I wanted to highlight the Pinal County Comprehensive Plan. I think it's wonderful to see the recent amendment that supports access and availability of healthy foods through

farmers markets and urban agriculture. That's an example of a policy systems environment change, a PSE change that really does improve public health.

Pinal County Public Health future goals and opportunities. We really want to adopt this policy systems environment change that many of the counties have been striving towards, and we already see that happening in Pinal County. We'd love to develop a relationship with state and local stakeholders to inform health decision-making at the policy level when possible, implement evidence-based programs, such as employee worksite wellness to prevent obesity and chronic disease, and provide ongoing technical assistance with health impact assessment when possible. So what is health impact assessment? HIA, which I'm not sure how many folks in the room are familiar with, is kind of growing in popularity is my understanding since 2011 – is considered by the CDC and the American Planning Association as a valuable tool that can be used to integrate health into the decision-making process. So the goals are it's a prospective study and it looks at policies, plans, projects, programs and their effectiveness before they're implemented. So it's really an opportunity for public health and planners to work hand in hand. If anyone's interested, there's an APA online course available at planning.org, and coming up - it's hard for me to read the text, but I believe February 22nd through the 23rd there's a two

day Pima county health impact assessment training if any folks in the room are interested in attending. This is complimentary training. They're just capping it at a certain number, so seats are limited. And then in March, there's an Arizona Health Communities conference being held in Mesa, as well as an APA spring conference in April. And topics may be of interest to some of the folks in the room. This again is highlighting the February 22nd through 23rd health impact assessment training. I lifted this graphic from the Pima County Pima Prospers Comprehensive Plan. They've worked a lot with their health department to make sure that health and the healthy community framework was integrated in their comprehensive plan, so that's really neat to see. Besides planning.org, livableaz.org is another great resource that gives information about health impact assessment, and how the process can be beneficial for all members of the community. And if you have any questions, I included my contact information. I have a couple other resources that I emailed to Steve that I don't know if we can share, but one is a toolkit that provides some information about the health department, and other members of the community can be involved in the planning process, and I just thank you for inviting me today. And if you have any questions, I'm happy to answer them on behalf of the health department. Thank you.

RIGGINS: Thank you very much. Thank you very much.

Commissioners? Yes.

SMYRES: I've got a really quick question, and it's just strictly for me. What determines obesity? Do you look at height, body, bone structure, and within that you should be a certain weight? Anything above that you're considered obese?

ZANUK: The way that it's considered, or the way that it's calculated per those studies that were shown today, is BMI. So your body mass index, it's height and weight. If you don't mind, I'll go backwards and show you the exact formula. So here it's a BMI – excuse me – greater or equal to 30. And the way they calculate that, there's more information on azhealthmatters.org, or you can go to CDC's website, but it's, I believe it's kilograms divided by height squared.

SMYRES: Body mass index. Okay.

ZANUK: Mm hm, it's all body mass index.

SMYRES: Thank you.

ZANUK: So it wouldn't take into consideration if somebody was very well built and muscular.

SMYRES: Thank you.

HARTMAN: So don't eat chocolate?

ZANUK: I heard dark chocolate's good for you.

RIGGINS: There we are. Sounds like somebody likes it too. Sounds like somebody likes it too. Okay. Very good. Thank you very much for your presentation. Okay, we'll move

into New Cases then. Our first new case is SUP-010-15. And who's presenting?

ABRAHAM: That would be me today.

RIGGINS: Okay, thank you very much.

ABRAHAM: Mr. Chairman, before we get into those new cases, I do need to make an announcement that – well it's was bad news for us, but not necessarily bad news for one of our staff. This is going to be Ashlee's last meeting with us. She has decided to take a position in the Town of Gilbert, moving to the big city, and her last day will be early in February. So I can say with 100 percent certainty since I've had the unique opportunity of observing this organization from inside and outside, that Ashlee's probably been one of the finer planners that I think that have ever been in – within our walls and she was definitely instrumental in modernizing and bringing our codes up to date, and also our processes. So she will be surly missed. So – not -

RIGGINS: I concur. Congratulations on that move, but yes, you definitely will be missed. Thank you for all the service.

HARTMAN: Your Chair knows Gilbert. He came – that was his area.

RIGGINS: Yeah, and that's why I moved down here. But anyway.

SALAS: Good luck Ashlee.

RIGGINS: Good luck.

HARTMAN: Good luck, Ashlee. Thanks.

ABRAHAM: Okay, our first case today is going to be SUP-010-15, and let me get this PowerPoint going. There we go. And this is a proposal for the approval of a special use permit to allow an subdivided human cemetery on a five acre parcel in the GR zone. Up to date we have received no letters in favor or against the proposal, and the location of the project is about 500 feet north of Highway 238, 3.5 miles west of the Town of Maricopa, nearly at the Maricopa/Pinal County line. The applicant today is Mr. Anjum Alimohamed, and Amir Kazz is his representative. The location of the proposal is indicated by the red star, way on the west side there. In a map showing surrounding zonings, basically GR, except for that SR blue patch, which is actually an existing cemetery, this would serve as primarily an expansion to that existing cemetery, so both sites would be used in conjunction. The project’s located immediately adjacent to BLM land and it has some implications for our comprehensive plan, which I’ll get into in a moment, but north of the property is BLM land, and then southeast and west is GR zoned private property. Here on our Comprehensive Plan, designated as Open space. Now back in 2010 we designated Open space on this side of the County to pride linkages to BLM land to the north, with our proposed regional parks that are south of this area, so there is some

private property that's mixed into the mix of Open space park designations, and our Comprehensive Plan provides some flexibility when you're developing Open space. It doesn't necessarily require a Comprehensive Plan. What - care must be made, of course, to make sure that these uses are consistent with Open space type uses, and further to the effect our Comprehensive Plan allows commercial designations on any property that's designated – any designation in the County up to 19 acres. So being that this is a cemetery, it's a Public/Quasi-public use at its core. There aren't going to be any structures on the proposal, and to that effect, we have included some stipulations that enhance that Open space compatibility by requiring a trail corridor to be installed on the west side to further those linkages to the north. So at the best of our ability, we believe that this use being not impactful to a degree, kind of jives with that Open space designation. Moving forward with the zoom in on the subject site with zonings in the area, the white on this map is GR, the blue is SR, which is the existing cemetery, and then BLM to the north is GR. The aerial photograph here you can see the existing cemetery to the east, some home sites to the west, and mostly vacant property surrounding. Here's the site plan. The property that's under the SUP is going to be on the left of this diagram, under new. So the SUP we're going to be issuing is for that piece there. It's going to be accessed

primarily through the existing cemetery, due to the fact there's no legal access on Rafael, so the access to both components and then when they effectively merge some point in the future, will be off of Rahama. Some photos of the subject site. This is looking north. South. This is looking east into the property. And then west. Now Rahama Street is actually an unmaintained County road at this point, so it looks a lot like this as well. We do have 14 stipulations in the proposal. As far as discussion points go, staff does recommend approval of it. I think the major thing with Public and quasi-public uses, it's really – it comes down to sort of a neighborhood choice of whether or not folks really want to live next to a facility like this. Some folks don't seem to mind as I guess indicated by this particular case, as we've received no additional public input, either from letters or phone calls. I think the one point if staff were to develop a talking point for this particular proposal is that altogether there could be up to 7,500 internments at both sites, so at capacity there could be additional traffic on Rahama, which during, you know, a period of visitations, there could be additional traffic in the neighborhood. But other than that, we couldn't see any other reasons, or any other talking points to this case. If the Commissioners have any questions, I'd be happy to answer them at this time. Thank you.

RIGGINS: Vice Chair Hartman.

HARTMAN: Chair Riggins. I have a question. On your bullets, there's two of them that I don't know, and I hope that you can answer, access to the streets are adequately designed and constructed to handle the volume generated by the use. That's a question. Are they, or not.

ABRAHAM: Well, they're going to have to go through site plan review before they can open up lots, so they'll have to submit a traffic impact analysis to determine the nature of improvements that will need to occur to Rahama.

HARTMAN: Okay, my second question, Steve, is does not result in the use – this is also a bullet – does not result in the residential streets for non-residential through traffic.

ABRAHAM: That, I think, comes down to a notion of impact. That the connection of Rahama to 238, of course at completion of the cemetery there, because of the sheer number of internments, could be an issue that the Commission could look at. I think that traffic probably generated right now would be just construction with burial sites at this point, and of course necessary and custom – I don't know what the right term would be – but to visitations to the burials while they're occurring. At this point I think the traffic impact analysis would probably determine what our appropriate level of street development would be.

HARTMAN: So public works could go ahead and – after

the traffic analysis, and require some additional widths and access if needed? Lester?

CHOW: Vice Chair Hartman, yeah, the analysis will look at the traffic that will be possibility generated by the site and make any recommendations for improvements if it's beyond what's already existing. And then the applicant, through the site plan process, would be required to do those if there are any identified in that report.

HARTMAN: Steve, did you tell us how many feet away (inaudible) Highway is?

ABRAHAM: About 500 feet.

HARTMAN: 500 feet. Okay. Thank you very much. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

RIGGINS: Commissioner Smyres.

SMYRES: Steve - oh, stipulation 7 on the ten foot vegetation. Was that also required on the other cemetery?

ABRAHAM: Yes it was.

SMYRES: What does that look like? Do we have photos of that by any chance?

ABRAHAM: I don't believe we do. Imagine if you would full grown oleanders and what the vegetative density would look like there.

SMYRES: Okay, are we saying that they have to plant them, they should be at ten foot when we plant them, or will they grow to the ten foot?

ABRAHAM: This would be a ten foot buffer measure from the property line, and basically what that would do is allow area for the plants to grow, and then not allow internments within ten feet of a property line.

SMYRES: It was required on the other parcel too, it's not something different.

ABRAHAM: It was, yes.

SMYRES: Thank you.

ABRAHAM: You're welcome.

RIGGINS: Commissioners?

HARTMAN: Chair, Chair Riggins?

RIGGINS: Vice Chair Hartman.

HARTMAN: One more question, Steve. Steve, Estrella Airport, is that immediately west? That doesn't show on my plat at all, but there is an Estrella Airport out there.

ABRAHAM: I would say it's about a mile or two east of the subject site, of this one here. So – actually, let me get another photo here.

HARTMAN: So is that in the flight path of the airport? It could be to the east.

ABRAHAM: It could be. I want to say, and I'm not 100 percent sure about Estrella, but they actually point either northwesterly, east, southeasterly or the opposite, so –

HARTMAN: Okay.

ABRAHAM: It – like for example, even on this area map, it's past that – on the far right side of this map is the far western side of the Estrella Airport, so it's almost two and a half miles away.

HARTMAN: All right. So in my mind I'm just trying to think well would this ground be suitable for residential or this type of use, and if it's in the flight of an airport, it, you know, flight path, it could be beneficial to have people sleeping there, permanently.

ABRAHAM: Permanently, right. You know, I think that came down to the site decision for the folks with the church that they have the existing cemetery there, and I think it's more of a capac – they haven't expressed any issues to this point, so it seemed okay to them.

HARTMAN: All right. Thank you, thank you Chair.

RIGGINS: Commissioner Gutierrez.

GUTIERREZ: Yes, Steve, you said this is an unmaintained County road?

ABRAHAM: Correct.

GUTIERREZ: Will there be requirement for the County to maintain the road if accessibility gets limited after the rain season or?

ABRAHAM: Well, depending on what the improvements are required from a TIA, it may be required to be dedicated at one point.

GUTIERREZ: Thank you.

RIGGINS: Commissioners? Okay. Well, we'll go ahead and call the applicant to come up and make his case with us.

KAZZ: Good morning ladies and gentlemen.

RIGGINS: Good morning, and could you please make sure and sign your name in and address?

KAZZ: My name is Amir Kazz, I'm the architect of the project that we have been working on this project over – since 2004, 2005, on the main cemetery. We have had a lot of difficulties, but with the help of God, Allah, whoever you want to call it, we've been successful so far. And the community in Tempe they came to our office and they request that someone from back east dedicate (inaudible) land for a cemetery for the people that we already in short of needs of cemetery in the area. And they need somebody to approve that. So I look at the land and it's (inaudible), it needs a lot of work, water, electricity and so on and so forth. So I start working on the plan and we went through electrical department, planning department, with the help that we got the first cemetery approved. And since then we put the cemetery in the area, it seems like not only improving the area, but they also request the transportation department, they submit the application to pave the road on Rahama Road, and improving as far as greens, with architect landscape, through a type of

vegetation that it grows on the fence with a minimum amount of water. And water was another big difficulty that we had in desert that we didn't know how to resolve the issue. They came to us well can we dig a well? I said I have no idea. We go to geologist report, (inaudible) fees and get the whole report. But there was a gentleman, (inaudible) across the street, he came over one day. It seems like everything worked out, and he said I'll tell you were the water is. You want to drill a well? I said yeah, this company, they came over here, they charge us per linear foot to dig a hole, but we have no idea where, and nobody takes the responsibility. And he said I'll tell you how to do it. Anyway, he got two sticks in his hand and he hold it like this. And then I can show you – representative – and then he started walking like that, and I was watching. After a while (inaudible) I saw these two sticks go across for some reason and now I have to make a decision how much to pay this company to drill there, and somebody has to take responsibility because they don't. If water comes out, fine, if doesn't come out, they just have to get paid. So the owner looked at me and said what do you think? I said look up. We all tried here so far, seems like everything's going not as smooth, but it's going. It sounds like (inaudible) willingness involve this whole matter, which is the most important part of the whole conversation. And anyway, he did it a few times, and we make a drill in the same

regional. First one came out salty, the second one came clear water. And from that point of view, it sounds like the whole cemetery start blooming, because once you have the water in a desert, pretty much you untie your hand as far as a lot of things in there. And I'm so blessed that it happened. I make the story short. A few years later they came back to this and the cemetery got going and we get a building permit for security, washing room, offices, and so forth and we build that. A few years later they came back to the office and says guess what? Cemetery's getting full, and the needs of the cemetery is desperately we feel it, and we don't know what to do with it. Because the people that they come over, some of them, most of them, they're in very tight budget and they cannot even afford all the (inaudible) ceremony and just basically we don't know what to do with it. Anyway, another gentleman - which I don't know who it is – he dedicate the land again from somewhere else, which don't know who it is, what's his name, back to our office, here you go, we have another land, what are you going to do? Oh wait, this is different zoning, this is long story again. But talking and talking, we've been involved with Steve over long time and previously with that other gentleman, another lady, over two-three years that we've been working – again back to that willing, and seems like finally we get it to this point. That we design it, we – there was a couple of main issue on the

meeting that the address that we need to have a topographic because of the 100 years. If the flood gets there and these two start crushing to each other in the desert area on that type of soil. So of course we have to go to the civil engineering department, and then civil engineering office. He has to redesign the whole things based on the (inaudible) of the soil, re-grade the whole things, the direction of the water spill away from the cemetery, that it doesn't damage the tomb and the grave. Also designing each grave height, I mean depth, length, width, distance to another one, and we completely engineered the whole things and we are planning to do also a digital system in front of the cemetery, so people they can understand where all the road is and the name and so forth, basically. And I was amazed, I had a friend of mine – she was a very nice lady – that she passed away a few months ago and unfortunately she was living in nursing home, and I requested and they (inaudible) of cancer, of lung cancer at 52 years age, and I was there not too long ago and I saw wow, what improvement in this cemetery. First of all, all the medallions is all the same, in a row. Everything has been taken care of by one of the people that they put (inaudible), a lot of time and effort to make the area green, to manage, to secure the whole area. And I was amazed, and I mentioned to you if it happen again and if we get it approved, the other cemetery, you have to just keep this as it is. And he

mentioned to me since we have been to this area, there are other resident that is coming in this area, and all the houses there are more activity, I feel more energies going on in this (inaudible). And that's where we are so far, and again we still have a lot of hope in this (inaudible). Thank you very much. If you have any question.

RIGGINS: Thank you. Commissioners, questions of the applicant? Vice Chair Hartman.

HARTMAN: Chair Riggins. Thank you for coming and presenting this case to us. I'm in from the Maricopa area, but on the other side, and I know pretty much this area. At one time – my question is – one time did the City of Maricopa try to annex your area? Do you remember that?

KAZZ: I am not familiar.

HARTMAN: And the city limits. Well they did, they did on the south side of the tracks, but they – the railroad tracks – but they didn't ever take it in the city.

KAZZ: I believe I remember now you mention it, something, I heard something but I never find out if really seriously going through or whatever happened to it. I just barely, fogly, I heard something about it.

HARTMAN: Well that's kind of the way it – it was kind of dropped, I believe, you know the idea. So okay, my other point is the City of Maricopa does not have any cemetery, so you've got to be a benefit to some degree. Now

do you restrict who can be buried there? It's a private cemetery, but is it public, but private?

KAZZ: No, it's not really matter of private, very private cemetery. Basically the idea of the cemetery was started at the idea of people that they are in needs of costs when they die. And that idea is very flexible, started almost when I remember 2004 when we started the main cemetery, was very amount of money, was barely nothing. And now, of course, the cemetery has expenses and so forth, they put a small fee, which is (inaudible) not really some kind of high price or anything. So at the moment, as far as I know, there's a lot of – I'm not (inaudible) of different religion has been there, to be honest with you, but I believe if someone in a needs of this, they wouldn't reject for no reason, because that's the whole idea.

HARTMAN: You wouldn't have to be of the Islamic faith to be buried there?

KAZZ: Well, Islamic faith is basically it's a universe idea of your personal relationship with God. You could imagine God is sitting on top of a big mountain, everybody climbing from their own direction, we all having the same destination. It's no different. I'll go this way, you go the other way, but the idea, I believe is we all created as human beings, all the same. We all children of God, and if somebody needs really any help, my understanding is if they go

to the committee and they ask for, they're willing to help. Like I said two months ago I lost one of my good dear friend Angelina (inaudible), that she was teaching (inaudible) and she got involved with the lung disease, and five years in nursing home since the age of 52, and when she was going she was (inaudible). And she was studying all religion, and her major was basically different type of religion, and we had a joke with each other what we believe, what do I believe, we had a lot of conversation in that regard, but it was very universal. Anyway, when I asked the people, they had no rejection and they buried her with a minimum amount of (inaudible). So to answer to your question, I don't believe it's specifically designed for some people, it's just the idea that I mentioned.

HARTMAN: All right. Okay. My last question is, the other portion of this cemetery has actually people buried there, retained there, buried there? There's how many people are actually in the other portion? Not on this five acres, but the adjoining portion?

KAZZ: Oh, as far as the number of graves?

HARTMAN: Yes.

KAZZ: Very good question, very good question. I probably can show you on the diagram what it is basically. Can I use your board?

ABRAHAM: Pull it up over here if you want. Is that

sufficient for your needs or?

KAZZ: Yes, I just need to (inaudible) the number of each graves and the distance with each other. I think (inaudible) we spoke about (inaudible). I don't have that fresh memory, what was those dimensions?

ABRAHAM: Mr. Chair, if you would like to allow him to draw, that's certainly up to the Commission, but I think a square foot would be okay, if you know the square footage we can do the math for you.

KAZZ: All right, basically what we have is every four and four, eight – every eight foot by eight foot, and then we have the square footage divided by acres – acreage, and then minus the road and easement, which I am not – I haven't calculated that yet, but we can easily provide you, if that's what the number you're looking for.

HARTMAN: So my point is there's definitely a need for the future for this five acres, and that's why you're in the process because it takes – it's like you said, it's taken a long time just to get where you are.

KAZZ: Absolutely. Positive.

HARTMAN: All right. Thank you.

RIGGINS: Okay. Other Commissioners, questions? Commissioner Gutierrez?

GUTIERREZ: So just to be clear, you're not planning any structures or anything on that cemetery? A chapel,

mosques, structures, or anything (inaudible).

KAZZ: On the new site.

GUTIERREZ: Yes sir.

KAZZ: Well, if you look at the whole project, cemetery of course it's occupancy, they need certain requirement as far as office, security, and especially on cemetery, washing room, storage. Since these two cemeteries going to be one piece and circulation is going to be on one side, and we can treat the whole thing as one cemetery, we already have the permit, we already build, actually, the office, storage and whatever they needs, which is just a few small building, and I don't see any reason for any further buildings or anything like that for the new cemetery, at all. Whatever it could be, would be surface improvement, nothing structurally.

GUTIERREZ: Okay, thank you.

RIGGINS: Other questions? Comments? Okay, thank you very much.

KAZZ: Thank you.

RIGGINS: Any questions of staff? Yes.

HARTMAN: I have a question. I don't remember seeing in the stipulations whether there was any – if you found any archeological findings that they had to be turned over to either Ak-Chin or Gila River, because this is right in between and that might be something that we should consider,

Steve, that – in respect to Native Americans.

ABRAHAM: Sure. Under the current law now with the State, if they find anything they're supposed to stop construction immediately and turn it over. If the Commission would like to add a stipulation, you could go a number of ways with that, just a stipulation to that effect, that they stop and turn every – any artifact over, or the Commission could require an archeological study prior to opening. That's – there's certainly a wide spectrum of what the Commission would like to see on that.

RIGGINS: Just as a comment, as a comment to that, (inaudible) already has its set of laws.

ABRAHAM: They do?

RIGGINS: Yes. And so the requirement that they do that is already there. I don't see why a zoning case, you know, takes over the top of existing state law, personally. That's just an opinion. I guess it would be up to the, up to the opinion of the Commission.

HARTMAN: Mr. Chair, you as a farmer know that if you're, if you're getting some assistance in putting – installing ports on your concrete ditch and you need (inaudible) to do an investigation to be able to dig for the ports.

RIGGINS: That's true, but I don't need another entity telling me that I have to coordinate with them, either.

RIGGINS: All right. I just, I think for, you know, historic reasons and whatever, it – I don't want to make it difficult on them, but rather than to have them just dig it up and put it into somebody's backyard or something like that, you know, I would like to see it go to the proper nations.

ABRAHAM: I have access to a map that shows known archeological sites in that area.

HARTMAN: All right.

ABRAHAM: What I can do is look at that map and see if this site is either near or on it, and if it is, I can put a stipulation that they do additional study with the Board, if it would help.

RIGGINS: I noticed in the write-up that both the Indian reservations were given the opportunity to comment on this –

ABRAHAM: That's true.

RIGGINS: And they did not.

HARTMAN: I'm surprised.

RIGGINS: So it seems to me that existing State law does exactly what is being looked for here, and to put something in here is something else that our compliance people then need to be working on, and making sure happens, and I don't see the reason for two levels of authority when one is what takes care of it anyway. But again, that's my opinion. The Commission could decide on it. I think probably when we

discuss stipulations, would be a good time to decide whether or not that's the time to do it.

LANGLITZ: Mr. Chair, Mark Langlitz, Pinal County Attorney. Our office agrees with the Chair on that matter. This is not something really within the jurisdiction of the County and whether we tell them to comply with State law or not. They're required to comply with it, so it really – I agree with the chair – it would be unnecessary and doesn't really accomplish anything.

HARTMAN: Okay.

DEL COTTO: Mr. Chair?

RIGGINS: Commissioner Del Cotto.

DEL COTTO: Could we make a motion?

RIGGINS: We're not done yet.

DEL COTTO: Okay.

RIGGINS: We're not done yet. We need to – if the Commission is done with questions and comments, we need to open up the public participation portion of the meeting and we need to ask if anybody wishes to speak for or against this case. And there apparently none being, we'll go ahead and close the public portion of it, and I'll ask the Commission is there any reason to call the applicant back or are we discussion, or we need a motion?

GRUBB: Mr. Chair.

RIGGINS: Commissioner Grubb.

GRUBB: Thank you. I'm looking at an aerial photograph of, or the aerial shot of the site, and there is a road that actually leads out to Rafael, and is that going to be closed? It looks like it was a driveway and this was a – it looks like it had a house on it at one time. Is that, is that going to be isolated from Rafael so that it doesn't have that exit, or?

ABRAHAM: Are you referring to the road that's on the west side?

GRUBB: Yes.

ABRAHAM: That is actually being utilized as a driveway for other residents, and it's not actually legal access.

GRUBB: Okay.

ABRAHAM: So I mean if it becomes an issue, our Public Works guys can go out there and talk with those folks, but there's been no discussion of blocking that access.

GRUBB: Okay.

RIGGINS: Okay.

GRUBB: That's it, thank you.

RIGGINS: Thank you very much. Are we ready for a motion?

SALAS: Mr. Chairman.

RIGGINS: Commissioner Salas.

SALAS: I'd like to make a motion. Excuse me. I

move that the Commission forward SUP-010-15 to the Board of Supervisors with a favorable recommendation with the attached stipulations.

RIGGINS: Do I have a second of the motion.

HARTMAN: I'll second the motion.

RIGGINS: Okay, Vice Chair seconds. Any discussion? None being, let's call for a vote. All those in favor, signify by saying aye.

COLLECTIVE: Aye.

RIGGINS: Opposed? There's no opposition, so it passes unanimously. So you'll stop by the Board of Supervisors to carry this recommendation and make your final case with them, and good luck with your project. Okay. Let's move into our next case, which is IUP-002-15.

ABRAHAM: Thank you, Mr. Chair. I'll also be doing this one. Today this is an Industrial Use permit, 002-15. And the proposal today is approval for a photo voltaic solar power plant, and it's located on a 622 parcel in the CI-2 zone. As of this date we haven't received any letters in favor or against. It's located approximately two miles south of the Red Rock interchange, on the east side of I-10 off of Camino Adelante. For folks who aren't familiar with the area, that's a frontage road that is on the eastern side of I-10. The applicant today is APS, and Tracy Wieczorek is their representative. And they have their whole team today too, so

you'll be getting a number of comments and technical advice on the proposal. Located here as indicated by the red star on your County map, down towards the southern part of our County. Here's a zoom in of the zonings on the subject property, and land ownership. It's mostly surrounded by State Land, which is kind of that light blue color. It's GR zoned to the north, south and east, and west. However, there is a donut, if you will, of industrial zoning surrounding the subject site. Designated Employment on our Comprehensive Plan. Further zooming in on the subject site, CI-2, which is our Industrial Zoning category. Aerial photograph of the subject site, and you can see the existing Saguaro Power Plant is off to the left of that yellow box there, that generating plant has been there for a number of years, and this site is owned by APS and it's immediately adjacent to that subject site. Spoke briefly about the solar – focused energy solar demonstration site on the southwestern side of the proposal, that's kind of that graded area on the bottom left of that (inaudible). I-10, heading northbound is that red line on that – on the map there. Now this is the site plan of how the layout's going to be, so we're zooming in a little bit. The existing power plant is on the (inaudible). You can see sort of the transformers and wires and things that go along with that, and then the actual panels themselves (inaudible) that black (inaudible) that is on the far (inaudible) I'm sorry, eastern

side of the property and then kind of follows the contours of that wash corridor that's running through the property. There's a pretty substantial easement running down the middle, that's where the break in the panels would be (inaudible). Imagine if you will a solar panel field of photo voltaic power plant. Some photos of the subject site. There's Picacho Peak. So we're looking northbound. That's into the plant there. This is pretty much the view you get from I-10. There's – we didn't include any photo sims, but this as folks are racing down I-10 getting to Phoenix or to Tucson, the site itself is actually visually dominated by the power plant itself, and the field of power poles. That's the plant again. And then this is across the train tracks, looking off into State Land. Now there are 13 stipulations attached to the report. Staff would like to add an additional stip 14, as part of your recommendation that IUP-004-93, which was an industrial use permit to allow a paper plant there back in the early 90s, that's going to be null and void as a result of – if this proposal gets approved, so we'd ask that that be added as a stip at the end of your report. A couple talking points with this one. Our Comprehensive Plan allows solar photovoltaic power plants in a number of different designations. Kind of talked about this as an amendment last go around that there's three designations now that allow photovoltaic power plants, and they're located in one of them.

Additionally you'll see in your packet that there is a letter from the Game and Fish Department. They provided a packet. Now going back a number of months, maybe even a year now when we were look – were looking at another facility, it's called the Bonnybrooke Solar Facility, it was out there east of town. In your packet there, the Game and Fish Department submitted a letter that outlined a number of concerns about solar photovoltaic facilities, and then at the end of the letter they basically said pending future study and identification of resources. So fast forward to now, they've modified and they've been able to identify specific species of concern and specific recommendations for us to forward. So that contributes substantially to the width of the packet that they gave you. So they – in that letter, they had some specific species, some specific tasks that they wanted APS to perform. We've reflected many of those in the stipulations, primarily – and this dovetails with the efforts with the turtle, the Sonoran Desert turtle – I hope I'm saying that right – about mitigation measures for either the relocation or habitat protection of that species. So what APS is going to have to do is to hire a third party analyst to go in and inspect the biological resources that are onsite, submit that to the County, submit that to Game and Fish, and begin – before they begin construction and relocate any sensitive species, if necessary. So those are stipulations that are on the back end

of that stipulation list in your packet. And also, you know, in terms of stips, some of our standard development stips that it's only photovoltaic only, the focused energy, tower power, that's not permitted at this site, so I'd be happy to answer any questions that the Commission may have about the proposal.

RIGGINS: Commissioners? Vice Chair Hartman.

HARTMAN: Chair Riggins. Steve, there is a parabolic mirror concentrator there, and this Commission approved that several years – quite a few years back, and I had the pleasure, along with the Chair then, of going to that open house and that - we've never heard much about that, but anyway, that's - the parabolic one, is the one that kind of causes problems.

ABRAHAM: Well, the amount of energy that's collected and used is substantially higher than photovoltaic, and unfortunately that site's going to be decommissioned, so it won't be around much longer. Which I – and maybe APS can talk about this - I'm not sure of any focused energy sites in the State that were used as a demonstration, but that's, I guess that's progress.

HARTMAN: Thank you.

RIGGINS: Other Commissioners? Okay. Let's have the applicant come up and begin the case. And if you could please sign your name and address before you begin your presentation.

PIOTROWSKI: Good morning, Commissioner, Chairman. Thank you very much. My name is Jim Piotrowski, I'm the director of solar generation for APS, so thanks for having us. First of all before I get started, I want to thank Steve and his team, he's been great to work with. Normally when we build these projects - and we've got a lot of experience in this space, we, APS, doesn't get up and do this, we hire an EPC, or engineer procuring contractor to do this. Time has been very, very critical on this project because it needs to be done what we call provisional acceptance by the end of this year. There's some stipulations why we need to get it done. So APS started this, working with Steve back in – was it November timeframe – we started the process here. So that's why we were here and Tracy actually which will be talking after me, started the process, and then this is all going to be transferred over to McCarthy, which is our contractor that we've selected for this project. But my job – let me see here – which one, I got to (inaudible) this way?

ABRAHAM: Yeah, it take a minute to flip. It's flipping over here. Let me try something real quick.

PIOTROWSKI: Try it now? There we go. Thank you. So this is just a high level agenda. Our approach on this was basically to – we looked at staff's comments back to the Commission and how we can try to address all those questions for you, and we brought a team of people, actually, hopefully

that can answer each and every one of those questions for you. So my job is to kind of give you an overview of APS and our solar portfolio and what's going on. Kind of a site overview, which Steve gave a pretty good job, and then we'll get into biological study and what we've done in that space, and kind of the environmental side of it, and then we'll turn it over – Tracy actually for APS, she'll be giving that part of it – we'll turn it over to McCarthy, and then at the end I can come back up and close it and answer any questions for the Commission if they have any questions. So moving forward, APS, based off of the ACC and the Corporation Commission, we were mandated to have 15 percent of our renewable energy portfolio by 2025. In doing that, we have residential, commercial and utility scale. Utility scale is the large sites that we're proposing to build on this property. This is just an illustration of just the large. We have over 500 sites out there. We have nine what we would call utility scale sites, and that's kind of where they're located. This site will be the largest that we've built up to date. The largest up to this point is down in Yuma, which is 35 megawatts AC. This particular project is 40 megawatts AC, so it'll be the largest site. However the construct on this is a little bit unique for APS, because it's not going through the RES, or the Renewable Energy Standard. It's a partnership with a couple of our major customers that will be announced

when this project finally gets approved with the Commission, which is going to be on their hearing on March 3rd. But the premium to build the solar plant is actually being funded by a couple of our large customers that see a lot of value in renewable energy, and then they can go to their customers and say we've actually contributed to building new resources in the renewal space. So this is totally new for APS in this space right here. I'm not going to spend a whole lot of time, because Steve kind of did this right here, but there's kind of the high level view of where the plant is, the blow up view with the State Land around, and then this is kind of a little bit better of a view where you can actually see the power plant itself to the left, and then our build (inaudible) down on the right-hand side. So like I said, it's a 40 megawatt plant. Out of the 600-plus acres that the permit that we're asking for, we're only actually going to use about 340 acres. So there's a lot of land out there that the habitat can still, the animals that are out there will be able to use. And then I talked about McCarthy. McCarthy has got a lot of experience, they've actually – we built two last year, one out at Luke Air Force Base and then one that we call Desert Star which is closer to Gila Bend, and then they've worked on other projects. So we've got a really good competent contractor to work with on this project, so we're really, really comfortable with that. The project budget for this, as you can see, just

under $90 million. That's the all-in cost for this project. To date, we've spent almost a billion dollars, APS, in building renewable energy our in our system. And people ask this question, what would a project this size, how many homes would it actually drew power to - and average homes because there's huge homes and then small homes – average homes is around 10,000 houses is what this actual plant will provide power for. So I'm going to turn it over now to Tracy. And Tracy really is the subject matter expert out of our land department. She's the one that filed all the paperwork on our behalf, she's done a great job working with Steve, and she's going to talk about a couple of the other steps that APS has actually done, and then we'll turn it over to McCarthy after that.

WIECZOREK: All right, what's the trick?

PIOTROWSKI: The one on the right, then you have to point it to that laptop.

WIECZOREK: Okay, super. Good morning. Perfect. So as Steve noted, the Game and Fish Department went ahead and responded to the project and had a couple of comments regarding the project. Realizing, though, this type of project we anticipated those types of concerns, and so back in November we contracted with Logan Simpson to go out to the site, review the site for potential habitat, and for species that might be located at the site. The species and the

habitat that were reviewed were reviewed for the species that were noted by Game and Fish Department, but also for any potential endangered species that might be in the region that are within endangered species databases. Nothing was found in either of those databases that would reflect species or critical habitat at the site that would be protected under the Endangered Species Act. Further, the species called out by the Arizona Game and Fish, the Sonoran desert tortoise, the burrowing owl, the kit fox, and the Tucson – sorry, the Tucson shovel nose snake, the habitat at the site is not really favorable for any of those species. Very little rodent activity – and this might seem like a sidebar – but very little rodent activity was found at the site. And what that then does is it limits the burrowing sites that are at the project area. And as the result of the lack of burrows, the tortoises are really not interested, the kit foxes are not really interested, and the owls have no place to go there either. Separately from that, APS in a proactive sort of stance - moving into the native plant and then I'll come back to the wildlife awareness training – but moving into the native plant then, in a means to be proactive in terms of these migratory species that might enjoy some of the vegetation at the site, APS did coordinate with the Arizona Department of Agriculture, provided a notice of intent to clear the land. We waited the mandatory wait period of 60

days, and receiving no other comments from Department of Agriculture, the site's been cleared and we don't anticipate any migratory species to be present at the site when this project does hopefully kick off. Heading back to then the wildlife awareness training, should any of these species – although there's, as I've indicated, a very low probability of encountering any of these noted species at the site – should any be encountered, all of the construction personnel, all of the personnel onsite as part of this effort, will have received training in advance of the start of construction or as they are introduced to the site. That training will alert them to the species of it could potentially be there, as well as let them know what they should and should not do in the event any of these species are encountered. What they should not do is try to handle any of these species themselves. We have coordinated, like I said, with Logan Simpson. They have biologists on staff, as does APS, and those personnel would be contacted to either recommend avoidance of that particular location to protect the species at the site, or to remove the species from the site to allow construction to move forward. I'm going to turn it over to our good folks at McCarthy now, that can tell you a little bit more about the project itself.

DYER: Commissioners, Vice Chair, Chairman. My name's Judd Dyer, I'm the preconstruction manager for this project. I'm going to walk you through the plan for the plant

here, and walk you through the different things that we went through to come up with this final layout. So when we're designing these plants, it's always advantageous to have a nice square plot of land and be able to set these arrays in a square fashion. Unfortunately with this site, as you can see, we have somewhat of a, you know, non-square to work with, and that's based on natural landscaping and also some of the easements that run through the property. So our job is to play the game of Tetris – I don't know if you're familiar with that old computer game – and be able to really maximize the power production with the available land, while being sensitive to the natural landscape and the hydrology of the land which Kent Norcross, our civil engineer will discuss in further detail, to come up with and meet the goals of our client, APS. So the project is going to be – we went through several options as far as how we would enter the site. We landed on utilizing the area of the existing parabolic site, coming off the private road just south of the existing saguaro plant to gain access to there. Again, with the intent of minimizing the area of disturbance. Like Tracy indicated, we have 622 acre lot to design the facility, and we were able to minimize that footprint to 340 acres. So the other challenge of this site is the hydrology. As you can indicate on the aerial view, there is some existing washes and some offsite flows that we have to make sure that we have a plan for. Kent

will go into detail on that, but as I've stated, but we've really tried to situate our site to use those natural waterways. The other area of concern is lighting. All of the technology used on this plant uses the antireflective coating on the panels, and also we have really minimized any site lighting. There is only going to be two light poles, one at the equipment shelter, and the other at the site entrance. And that's within the confines of the zone two requirements. And next I will hand it off to Kent Norcross, our civil engineer.

NORCROSS: As Judd indicated, my name is Kent Norcross, I'm with Dibble Engineering, working with McCarthy, performing the civil engineering on this project. And just for instance, the items up there noted four and five are – were speaking to stipulations four and five that are in your packets. Judd spoke to the stipulations 1 and 13 on the previous slide. And one of the concerns was traffic and so the access to the site will be from I-10. There's an off-ramp northbound immediately adjacent to the site that we'll use, otherwise coming from the north to the south you'll get off at the Red Rock interchange and come down the frontage road to the site. The site ultimately will be an unmanned facility. There will be – in final stage, there will be some maintenance vehicles that will occasionally be there, but it's an unmanned facility. During construction there will be some traffic, but

it's – the construction period's about an eight month period and even the main bulk of that where there's a lot of people on site is probably a more of a four to five month period. But we will be working with Lester and his group to provide a traffic statement to outline the impacts of the construction traffic, and then ultimately the fact that there'll be no impact with the unmanned facility. The other request that the County had was to dedicate 55 foot of right-of-way on all the section line areas of the project, and I can't see it so I'm sure you can't see it either, but I want to assure you that we are in the process of dedicating 55 foot right-of-way along the north side of the section, the east side of the section, and then the south side over to a point where TEP has a piece that intrudes into that section. But on all the northeast and south sides of our project we will be dedicating 55 foot right-of-way to the County for future roadway improvements. I forgot to ask which button. It's easier than I thought. We are in the process of putting together the site plan submittal to Pinal County. It will – it will encompass a drainage plan, as well as a drainage report as required in the stipulations. The drawing that you see there is the existing flows across the site in the multicolored, overlaid with the future solar plant. And so as you can see, we had some challenges that we had to deal with from a drainage perspective. The neat thing is is this site is outside, it's in a Zone X, which is outside

of a floodplain, so it's not within a floodplain. We don't have floodplain use permit requirement as a result of that, but there are flows in the 100 year, two hour storm, that do flow through the site. On the north side our project encroaches slightly into that flow, and so we've taken – made provisions with swells and other things to divert that flow around our site. But at the western border, the flows will enter back into its natural channel, and so it won't be impacted; as well as we're making sure there's no impacts to the property to the north of our site. Similarly in the – kind of the middle of the site there, a fairly substantial wash that flows through our site that we're rerouting – channelizing, if you will, through our site in order to allow us to maximize the space so we can use for solar panels, so that it will enter our site into that channel, and then the site plan you're seeing is slightly different than the one you had in your packet, so as the project has progressed, we've modified it slightly, and the channel now turns to the south slightly so that the water is discharged into the same channel that it normally would have been. So as the project has progressed, we've had some minor modifications, but the 40 megawatt solar panel field is virtually the same. So another thing that APS did ahead of time, TEP had done a study of this area for washes and the Corps of Engineers determined that the washes in our area were not (inaudible) washes, so we don't

have to deal with that issue, which is fortunate. But just want to make sure that you're comfortable that we're doing everything that we can to make sure there's no impacts, either upstream or downstream, as far as the washes flow. With that, I think I'm done. Andrea.

RAMOS: Good morning, my name is Andrea Ramos, I'll be the project manager for McCarthy Building Companies on the project. A couple of the items that you guys –that were addressed by the staff, or questioned by the staff, was cleanup debris leaving the site, or staying onsite, and then also our quality standards. We take both of these items very seriously, as they're conducive to a good working environment as well, so all of our employees when they come onsite go through a training process before they're able to work onsite, that's where we'll also address the items that Tracy mentioned with the wildlife awareness. But we also talk to them about cleanliness around the site, cleaning up on a regular basis, where all of that needs to be deposited, etc., and then we also go through the air quality standards and how they're going to maintain our water on the site to keep dust down, etc. So those are the items that we'll do through our project management on the field during construction to help address those concerns.

BRANDT: Hello, my name is Jim Brandt, I'm a project director with McCarthy. We are, again, the EPC contractor

working for APS. Went too far. Trying to get to the schedule slide. Not there. Okay. Oh there it is. Don't do anything else. All right, so I just wanted to give you an overview of the project schedule so you'd have – it moved?

??: Maybe you need to talk about the technology first.

BRANDT: Yeah right. At any rate, the project's – okay there's our, there's our – I just want to go over some of the milestones. So we're in the process of executing our EPC agreement with APS, and that should be completed this week. Again, we are working on the design and coming up with all the drawings. We hope to submit those next week, and looking to get a permit to begin construction sometime in February. As Jim mentioned, the Corporation Commission needs to approve the project, which would be the first of March, so we're looking to get a full NTP from APS the first of March, and then we would mobilize. There's approximately six to eight weeks worth of mobilization and earth work mass grading that needs to happen before what we call the equipment production would begin. And the equipment production is broken out into kind of three key points, which are the driven piles that go into the ground that support a racking system, racking system supports the panels, and what we call modules. Interconnect to the grid would be in September, looking for a provisional acceptance in December, and then final acceptance the first of

March of 2017. Just some interesting facts, just to kind of put things into perspective. So the driven piles is the first step that has to happen. There's over, almost 30,000 of those driven piles on this project, and those have to be installed over a six month period. So that comes up – or about a five month period – so that comes up to about 6,000 driven piles a month, and basically equates to one driven pile every five minutes that we need to install over that five month period. And then when we get ready to install the panels, or the modules, there's 183,000 modules that need to be installed in a three month period. Essentially we need to install a module every 30 seconds. So if you have any questions about the schedule, I'll be happy to answer. Thank you.

PIOTROWSKI: So I'll come up for any kind of questions. I can hopefully address your question that you had earlier about the trough down at Saguaro. So that was originally, literally, state of the state art. I mean it was on the bleeding edge, not the cutting edge of technology. It was a one megawatt site, where this is a 40 megawatt site, and I believe the most it ever put out was 373 kW, so it never performed like it was engineered to perform. So that's part of the evolution, the solar and the different technologies, but that same trough if you go towards Yuma down I-8, you can't miss it, it's three square miles. We don't own and operate that, but it's what they call a PPA or a purchase

power agreement. That technology works, it's just a different technology. It's an oil that they heat to create the steam, versus a pentane gas, so that's a pentane gas; and the one that's at Saguaro, and hat never did pan out to be a system that they wanted to keep moving forward. So Vice Chairman to answer your question on that, that's what happened there. So let me see if there's any – I think there's a final slide here. So this is just kind of a wrap up of really what the plant will look like. And that's a plant that we built, McCarthy built for us last year and I just want to answer any questions that you have. I mean we have one slide in there for technology in case there's any kind of questions, what kind of technology we use, the inverters, but it's – that's what you're going to see if you drive up to it next to the road, that's kind of the exact view you're going to look at right there. So if there's no questions, I -

RIGGINS: Commissioners? Vice Chair Hartman.

HARTMAN: Chair Riggins. Jim, you mentioned that facility in Gila Bend, I saw where they were filing for bankruptcy on that particular project. You're – is this, is this project really feasible? I mean I want to ask you that question, but I want to, well, load it with another question about how the power that is generated, is this going to – out of state, or does this power stay in the state? Is it APS's obligation to provide to other states power, and is this

facility going to be used for that purpose?

PIOTROWSKI: So I'll try to answer your first question first, about (inaudible) filing bankruptcy, and they did file bankruptcy. They were a Spaniard company and they have different divisions in their company. So that's a concern for APS as well, because that's all we have in that is what we call a PPA, so it's a Purchase Power Agreement. So we've agreed to buy the power over the 30 year term at X-cost, and that's how they recoup their money. So that's how they get their financing. That one there we all should be worried about, because that was government backed, so if they go bankrupt, then we all are going to pay that through the government. So at this point we're not seeing any indications of them shutting down. It seems like it's still going to move forward, so I – to answer your first question, I don't know all the detail-details on that, but we're getting information from them that that's going to continue to move forward, that project, as far as generating the power. The question is is that APS builds for our customers. So this – the power from this is going onto the grid and will go to APS customers. Now, you know, basic kilowatt is going to go where the energy is, but everything is metered in and out of that power plant just like those two steam units are there, the power came back to Phoenix and all of our customers in this region as well. The same intent for this solar power here is for the APS

customers. Now with that being said, APS has an M&T or Marketing and Training floor in our building that there is exchanges at different times of year, i.e., in the summertime we have a very high demand with our air conditioner load, so we're importing power because we don't have our base load covered, so we buy power, we have those purchase power agreements. In the winter time, we could have excess generation capacity, and we will sell that to California or Nevada or wherever that is, if the market plays right. So that's, you know, the way electricity business. We're a balancing authority that we govern our balancing authority. So – but it's built for our customers to be sold to our customers.

HARTMAN: So it's basically a benefit to Pinal County, the State of Arizona, to have this facility, not to some out-of-state entity.

PIOTROWSKI: absolutely. The ones that are on the California border, and there's some very large sites out there, they have actual PPAs or purchase power agreements with California, and all that energy is heading to California. This is not the case, this is all for us. This is for –

HARTMAN: That makes me feel good.

PIOTROWSKI: Okay, it's for APS.

RIGGINS: Commissioners? Commissioner Putrick.

PUTRICK: Yeah, I have a – you know, I really like

solar. I mea it's clean energy, it's quiet, it doesn't generate any unnecessary RF energy or anything like that. The problem I have with photovoltaic is generally it – the technology's good for about 10 to 12 years, and you have to replace it. But the problem is ROI is like 36 years, which is – that's a never ending cycle. So if it takes three years to pay for something that only lasts, you know, so many – I mean, you know, 30 years to pay for something that only lasts 10-12 years, it doesn't make a lot of sense. So if you have different statistics, I'd be happy to hear those. The second part of this thing is that all of this concern by Game and Fish about the animals that are in that area, I suspect that it's not going to have as much impact as the Union Pacific Railroad or Interstate 10 has had on that environment over the years, and in fact it may be – both of those things may be a problem for you down the road in keeping the cells clean. But as far as Game and Fish is concerned, I'd like to tell them a little story about Midway Island, if anybody's familiar with gooney birds and Midway Island. The navy in – during World War II when they moved into Midway decided that it'd be a great thing if they could get rid of the gooney birds. So they cemented over all their nesting sites, they gathered up all the gooney birds and took them way down to the South Pacific. The very next year during nesting season, they were all back building nests on the cement. So you can't tell

animals they can't go somewhere. So I'm not sure that gathering up tortoises and snakes and burrowing owls and all those kinds of things and to move them somewhere else is actually going to have any impact on those creatures that don't want to, you know, they'll come back, if you will. The other thing is, you know, maybe having the shade of the cells is more beneficial than it is a detriment to the environment. And so I just wanted to bring that up and if you could address the issue with the technology and the ROI, I'd appreciate it.

PIOTROWSKI: Commissioner yes, I can address that. So you're correct in the inverter technology. So if you put residential solar on your house, typically the inverter is what converts it from DC, because it's produced from the sun from DC, converts it to alternative or AC energy. Typically that's a ten year warranty on an inverter, so to your point, the inverter needs to be replaced at that point. However, the modules themselves that are on the roof that you see when you drive around, and the modules in the picture, those have a 25 to 30 year warranty. And we've been in this business, APS if you guys are familiar with University and McClintock where we have the Ocotillo Power Plant, we call that our star center, Solar and Test and Research, and we've been literally in the solar business for 20-plus years, and we have sites that are older than that. So we've got proof that the modules themselves in some cases don't last, in some cases they do,

but it's been evolving over the years. So we're expecting the modules themselves to last for the duration. The inverters, these are what we call central inverters. So we're not expecting replace them in ten years, however there are components. IGBTs which is a part of the inverter that we will change out, and that's part of what our technicians do. How we basically protect our customers from any of these major catastrophes and failures in the inverters. We buy an extended ten year warranty on the inverters with an O&M agreement, so at least the inverter for the first ten years is covered, and then we'll make an assessment at that point whether we should replace a whole inverter or just continue to upgrade that. So there's a point there that you're always going to have to do some maintenance, but it's not as much as one would think, that it's not – in 10 to 12 years you're going to throw it away.

PUTRICK: Who manufactures the inverters?

PIOTROWSKI: These particular ones – now we've got SMA, we've got a lot of different ones, Eaton, Advanced Energy, this is Power Electronics. So Power Electronics is the manufacturer that's going to be the inverters on this particular project. So we've got a four – this will be the fifth technology that we have on all of our utility scale solars. To answer your other question as far as the, I call them the bugs and bunnies, and moving them, APS has internal

biologists. I mean we're very environmental conscience. We have archeologists internally that we have as employees that kind of have directed us on this project as we move forward. So we're very conscious of all that. However, we understand that they will come back into those areas after the site's built, but what our intent is is through the construction period is everybody's trained that we're not bulldozing them and running them over. So they will typically move them within a mile or so of that area, through construction. Typically after construction, they will kind of migrate - to your point - back where they're used to going into. But we've taken a proactive approach because per the requirements between February 15th and August 15th if there's any migratory birds with a nest, we're unable to touch them. So that was why we started back in November and put in with the State to be able to remove frankly all the trees. We've leveled the site, it will be finished next week. But we went through the protocol to make sure we got the approval to do that, because we could not have a risk that the agreement – we don't go to the Commission until the 3rd, we get approval on the 3rd, and then all of a sudden we have got migratory bird nests, then we couldn't build the site. So we took a proactive measure on that was to go out there, so the site will be leveled from a tree perspective. And most of it, if you'd look at the pictures, it was not – you know, around he washes there's some

trees, the - basic pretty barren land, the rest of the yard is. Does that answer your question, sir?

PUTRICK: Thank you.

RIGGINS: Commissioners? Commissioner Gutierrez.

GUTIERREZ: I had one question. There's 622 acre site, and it was mentioned that about 350 of that was going to be utilized for the construction and the cells. The other portion, is that going to be left in a natural state? And then is that going to be sectioned off by fencing or other means if it's left in a natural state?

PIOTROWSKI: Commissioner, so the plan is to build on 340 acres, and then we'll come to the site through that existing solar site that was there, that's the easiest route to come in. It will be fenced with an eight foot fence around 340 acres. Anything we do not disturb will actually stay the exact way it is today. There is a – we're not going to put up a new fence, there's like a – I'm not even sure, what's out there, Judd? Is it like a cattle fence? I've not gone to the perimeter, it's like – because there's cattle out in that area, so I believe there's like a small cattle fence that's actually around the outside boundaries and perimeters, and we're not planning in the scope of this project to change any of that. So whatever's migrating in and out of that space will continue to migrate. APS bought that full section and the other half section back in the 50s, so we've owned it that

long. The main power plant has been fenced off from all this the whole time, so now that we're building in this, we're going to fence off the build envelope, but leave the rest pretty much open the way it is currently today.

GUTIERREZ: If this is approved, and you go forward with the project, the way it's written are you going to be able to use that other portion at any time?

PIOTROWSKI: The way it's written today, if we chose to do that, but that would not be our strategy. There's a point that when you, you interconnect because we interconnect at a higher voltage is at 115, typically we like to interconnect at a lower voltage, but because of the power plant, it's not cost effective to go back and add another 20 megawatts. And all we could, in that build envelope, would be add another 10 to 15 megawatts max, so we would be better off to build in a new site. So there's no future vision of going okay, let's expand this into that area that's not been developed for solar.

GUTIERREZ: Okay, thank you.

RIGGINS: I do believe I also see in the stipulations that any change to the site plan require another case. So. Commissioner Aguirre-Vogler.

AGUIRRE-VOGLER: A couple questions. Is the Saguaro Plant, is it active all year?

PIOTROWSKI: The Saguaro Plant is actually going to

be decommissioned. So we've got what we call CTs or gas turbines, that are on the site, but that site has become an unmanned site as well, so the big picture – the picture you saw of the big steam units, those are decommissioned today. They are not working. So they have not – they're kind of at the end of their life cycle, they were built in the late 50s, so they're decommissioned. They're just in a static mode, but they're literally disconnected from the grid today.

AGUIRRE-VOGLER: Okay, so let me reissue the statement that I asked, do you have electricity generating from that area?

PIOTROWSKI: Yes.

AGUIRRE-VOGLER: Okay. To supply about how many homes?

PIOTROWSKI: Okay, what's out there today are what we call peaking units. So we've got APS in the grid, we have what we call base load units. Base load means they run all the time. Palo Verde's a good example of a nuclear power plant. That covers our base load. Electricity goes up and down as the light switches come on and off. Those units we typically turn on when the load goes up and in the summertime, so they are actively used and they are part of our dispatchable units that we currently have, but they're not running 24/7 everyday, no.

AGUIRRE-VOGLER: Okay. The construction company,

where is it out of? Based out of where?

PIOTROWSKI: Phoenix.

AGUIRRE-VOGLER: Okay. Thanks.

RIGGINS: Commissioners?

GRUBB: Chair?

RIGGINS: Commissioner Grubb.

GRUBB: Okay, my turn for the question. Who's providing emergency response on this site?

PIOTROWSKI: That will be out of Tucson, but that still needs to be worked through, typically, the EPC contractor. We don't even have the contract signed yet, we're still – this is still the early stage, but all of that is defined in the plan. But Tucson, I started in – I'm dating myself – I started in 1982 at that power plant for APS, that's how long I've been working for APS – is out of Tucson. So it's serviced – was serviced out of Tucson back then. I'm not sure today, so we'd have to work through the EMS on that side. But that would be McCarthy and their contractors, they go through that whole process.

GRUBB: I'm just curious because back in the 80s I worked with the provider that provided response to that – to the plant, and it's not very close. And, you know, you put this many construction workers on a site, you start to get a little worried about it. And I know (inaudible) Valley's pretty close to the area, but I'm not sure if they would come

over there or not, but that would be a concern of mine is you're putting a massive amount of people in an area that does not, at this point in time, have a primary responder.

PIOTROWSKI: That's a great question, and that is definitely addressed in part of our process, it's just not yet because again, we haven't even signed the contract. Everything you've seen on the drawings has all been at risk, because we don't have an approval for this until – we're going to try to get the contract signed this week.

RIGGINS: Commissioners, further questions? Vice Chair Hartman?

HARTMAN: Chair Riggins. Jim, on that Saguaro Plant, at one time - I am a native Arizona, and at one time that plant was totally diesel, was it not? Fueled by diesel?

PIOTROWSKI: It had a crude – it had different combinations, you know, so it had natural gas and I believe it was a crude-based diesel, so it wasn't like the diesel we run in our pickup trucks, but it had - like those big tanks that have been emptied for many, many years.

HARTMAN: Ships and stuff like that.

PIOTROWSKI: Exactly, but at one time it was that. But those tanks have been empty for many, many years and it's been a natural gas burning plant for quite a few years.

HARTMAN: So that's what I was eluding to is the crude still being used or is it not, and now you're going to

solar, and do you really – does APS feel that solar is the future?

PIOTROWSKI: I'm probably not the right person to answer that question. As far as the future, I think it definitely is a very critical part of our overall portfolio, but it's not the future. It's not the silver bullet. I mean the sun doesn't shine at night and we need to use our lights, I mean so it definitely helps in the overall portfolio, but it's not – you know, it's part of our future, but it's not the future.

HARTMAN: Thank you.

RIGGINS: Commissioners, are we – questions? Okay, thank you very much. We might call you back up. Any questions of staff or discussion? None being, then it's time to open the public portion of the meeting to see if we have anybody in the audience that wants to speak to the case. Is there anybody that wishes to get up and speak to the case? And there none being, we'll close the public portion of the meeting, and I'll move it back to the Commission. Any questions of staff? A motion? Discussion? Vice Chair Hartman?

HARTMAN: I will make a motion if you're ready.

RIGGINS: I believe we are.

HARTMAN: Okay. I would like to make a motion that this Commission sends – forwards IUP-002-15 to the Board of

Supervisors with the 13 stipulations as so written.

AGUIRRE-VOGLER: I'll second that motion.

RIGGINS: They wanted to add a stipulation 14.

HARTMAN: Steve, a stipulation 14?

ABRAHAM: Yes, that IUP-004-93 is null and void.

HARTMAN: Favorable recommendation.

SALAS: I'll second.

RIGGINS: Is your motion including the recommendation?

HARTMAN: Yes, yes.

RIGGINS: So the stipulation number 14, removing the prior IUP, is added to the list of stipulations in the primary motion. And I have a second from Commissioner Salas. All those who are in favor, indicate by saying aye.

COLLECTIVE: Aye.

RIGGINS: Opposed? It passes unanimously. So you'll have a case with the Board of Supervisors down the road. Good luck. And I'm going to go ahead and call a ten minute break. We'll be back at ten minutes to 11. [Break.] I think it's time to get things resumed. Okay, we'll now hear case PZ-C-002-15. And I - is that Ashlee.

MACDONALD: That is me.

RIGGINS: Yes, thank you very much.

MACDONALD: Okay, so this is a case that's been going on for quite some time. Staff has been before you a

number of times over the past couple of years, most recently end of last year we did some work sessions. I'm going to go through this presentation kind of explaining where this came from, the work that we've done for both the benefit of the Commission and the Public. So our existing zoning regulations are outdated. There is a definition that says an RV doesn't exceed 8 by 40, it only allows vehicles owned by the property owner or a resident to be parked on a residential lot. It doesn't allow for any guest parking at all. It also prohibits any type of hookups from electrical, sewer, water, and does not allow occupied RVs at all. So this is our current ordinance. Again, doesn't allow for trickle charging of batteries, so there's just some things that need to be updated. How staff has handled the issue in particular of RVs being occupied on a property, we've done some friendly enforcement, we've allowed a seven day grace period when a complaint comes in for those RVs to be removed. But because of an urbanizing population throughout the County, and abuse of this, we have to re-examine our approach. So back in 2013 we started looking at an ordinance amendment to allow temporary guest housing within RVs. We started that process by doing community meetings countywide and I've included the notes of that meeting in your staff report. Hopefully you've had an opportunity to look at those. What you will see in those notes is that there was a wide range of ideas coming

from the residence on how they wanted this handled, and concerns with it from some thinking that it – we should continue with the ordinance as is, to others thinking that it should be unlimited in terms of guests residing in these RVs. So staff has come up with some ordinance concepts that is to redefine RV, revise the language that says an RV doesn't exceed eight feet width and 40 feet in length because as we know, the modern RV is larger than that. We also want to allow residents to leave their RVs plugged in to electrical to trickle charge their batteries. And then getting into the temporary visitor housing. We are looking at allowing that for a period of no more than six months and no more than one RV. And just explanation to where that one RV came from, this mirrors the health code. The health code states that a trailer coach park is two or more RVs, and so we settled on one RV just to kind of mirror that language. We would also propose in our draft that these are only allowed in our rural zones. So GR, SR, SH and then the comparable RU zoning categories, and not within the single family residential zone. We have added in language that the RV must meet the side and rear setbacks of a detached accessory structure, and the front setbacks of the main structure, so there would be setback requirements for these RVs, and we've set up guidelines for applicants to obtain a temporary RV permit. So there would be a 15 day period where no temporary RV permit would be required

after that, so between the 15 days and six months an applicant would have to receive a permit from Pinal County. And then the final thing that this code addresses is RV parks. The code currently requires a minimum of ten acres to develop an RV park, and our proposal would reduce that minimum size to five acres. An applicant would still have to come in and get their property rezoned through a public hearing process, but it just reduces the amount of acreage that they would need to have. If you saw in the notes of those community meetings there was some concerns with being able to find lots that were ten acres in size to develop RV parks, so that's essentially where this one came from. And then kind of jumping back to the rural zone versus single family residential zones and why we've proposed to prohibit RV parking in the residential zones. This is a typical single family residential development and if you look at these lots, even the largest ones that you see in the corners, really couldn't accommodate an occupied RV, and when people are buying into these types of developments, the expectation isn't that the density could be doubled, perhaps, by you know, the lots having an extra dwelling for up to six months of the year. So just kind of further explanation on why we've limited it to our rural zones only. That really concludes my presentation. I would be happy to answer questions from the Commission.

RIGGINS: Okay, Commissioners, questions on the

presentation.

HARTMAN: Chair Riggins.

RIGGINS: Vice Chair Hartman.

HARTMAN: Thank you, Chair Riggins. Ashlee, we discussed - when we were in a work session, we discussed fees, did you ever come about setting a fee for this six month permit?

MACDONALD: We haven't. That would come. If this proposal gets adopted, we would have to look at the process for obtaining that permit and kind of calculating what our costs would be in reviewing and going through that process. So we haven't gotten to that point yet.

HARTMAN: I thank you for saying that, because at one time there was discussion that there wouldn't be any cost, and it actually it takes staff's time to do this and that makes me happy. All right, thank you.

RIGGINS: Okay. Other Commissioners, questions on this case? Okay, in that case since the applicant is the County and we've already heard that report, we will go ahead and open the public meeting portion of this case. A question I have to begin with is how many people are intending to speak? If you could raise your hands up? Okay, fine then. That's fine, no problem whatsoever. In that case could we – whoever would like to come up and speak first, could you please come up? Very good. And remember to please first sign

your name and give your address.

HAWKINS: I did.

RIGGINS: Okay, thank you.

HAWKINS: Thank you very much, my name is Nancy Hawkins. I am a current resident, and I'm also a native, but I am a resident on horse property on acreage and I can personally tell you that we've always had people with RVs come in; and I was one of the first ones in the area, so as a realtor, I sold half of those people that came in in their RVs land and acreages in my neighborhood. But I am here specifically to talk today about your revisions or suggested revisions. I understand that the RV zoning is out of date, and I appreciate the time that you've taken to date to try to improve it and make it better. My office, which is a real estate brokerage in Arizona City, I have given you – and I didn't realize there were so many of you – handouts and hopefully I have enough for all of you, and I want to specifically focus on Arizona City. And I too went to some of the meetings that you had, that Supervisor Smith had over in Arizona City, and in all due respect, the photograph that you show of a single family residence is not typical of Arizona City at all. So with that in mind, what I tried to do, other than my cover letter which is probably not as articulate as it needs to be, is I tried to attach some facts for you there. And going back through the multiple listing service to the

beginning of time that it's reporting, what I did is I went through all of the transactions on single family homes just in Arizona City that have taken place and I highlighted at the top there, like right now we have 88 active listings in Arizona City. To date we've had about 4,880-some closings in Arizona City from the beginning of time, so – and out of the whatever we have, about 29 pending out of that particular area. If you go down and if you just – and the realtor has to specifically put in that it has RV parking – we can do all the remarks and fluffing we want to in the remarks section, but unless we go and drop down, and a lot of realtors will miss a spot, and put in that it has RV parking or an RV gate or something, that area is missed and it does not report back to you. So if you go in and just put in RV parking, it shows that 800 or more of those properties have RV parking to them. If you go and add to that that you put in an RV gate, because a lot of times realtors will assume well if it has an RV gate, you know it's probably going to have RV parking, so they won't click on the RV parking and RV gate, that adds another 400 properties. And then just so it wouldn't be misleading, so you don't think because I did put in RV garages, there's been a total of six RV garages ever on the market in Arizona City, and that's about all there are. So we're limiting RV gates and RV parking. So the properties in Arizona City, they're on larger lots for the most part, than what is shown in the

single family residence. Builders built with RV gate, RV parking. Because there is no HOA, that is a huge attraction to Arizona City. I can't tell you as a realtor, who's been there for years, how many people buy specifically in Arizona City because they can park their RV there, and they can have a friend come down, and maybe if they don't have an RV, they have the accommodation to be able to park an RV for those people and let them stay for a week or two. And I can't tell you how many people I have sold houses to and how many sales and everything generate off of people being able to park their RVs in Arizona City. We have close to what, 11,000 people there now, and if you look – we have basically about 24 percent of our homes have some sort of RV accommodation attached to them. So if we put in the stipulations that I think are being proposed with an eight foot setback from the side, such as a permanent structure, there's no way these 1200-plus homes – and that's minimum I'm thinking – can comply. I mean what do they do? And also to just limit it to no occupying at all. I mean there's just too many people and it's too much of a boon to our economy to just, to just eliminate these possibilities, and especially in a town like Arizona City. So I know you have spent a lot of time on this issue, I know you're probably very tired of this issue, but I hope that you please will reconsider and not go forward with your recommendation today with what you have proposed on the

books at this time. And I would be glad to answer any questions that anybody has.

??: (Inaudible). I live there.

HAWKINS: Okay. It's zoned primarily for -

RIGGINS: Pardon me, but we have a –

HAWKINS: Oh, I'm sorry. Oh, call to the public (inaudible).

RIGGINS: We can't take questions from the audience, but you're more than welcome to come up and speak. Okay. I have a question.

HAWKINS: Okay.

RIGGINS: You make the statement that you urge these restrictions not to come on. Do you realize that the way it is now –

HAWKINS: It's more restrictive, I understand –

RIGGINS: It's not more restrictive, it's totally restrictive.

HAWKINS: But it's not enforced.

RIGGINS: Virtually every single thing – yes, that's correct, it hasn't been enforced. But by the same token, as more people move in, there becomes more and more compliance issues to force compliance, because people complain also. There's two sides of this. Some people don't like it. So this is being done as an attempt to open this up, still qualify for health standards, and still make zoning work. I

do understand exactly what you're talking about, and more review of this might be the way this needs to go, but I do believe that it really needs to be understood that the way it is right now, virtually everything that's going on is out of compliance.

HAWKINS: I understand that, but I'm just asking please before you come to a decision, let this go forward and not make a decision on it today with what has been proposed, because you're knocking out a quarter of the residents in Arizona City that are there; a good, you know, a good portion of them for that one reason, and I think the people that are there and the positive effect far outweighs – it's my understanding we've had maybe 30 complaints, and that is not a lot when you look at over 1200 residents that are there because of RV parking, or because there is that feature. So I just ask – I understand that we're out of compliance there, but we're asking for it not to be more restrictive or something that can't be – maybe not more restrictive, bad use of words, okay -

RIGGINS: Can't be more restrictive.

HAWKINS: But the eight food setback from the side would totally eliminate 90 percent of the homes. And that single family picture, or snapshot is not Arizona City, I can tell you that. And the fact too, that there's just too many people that do come in and visit, and one person has somebody

come and visit, then that person likes the area, they bring somebody in, and as a realtor and that's all I've done all my life, I know that is the case and how it does work, and it's a boon to the County, our little town, because we're not a city, but – and it's also a boon to the County, whether it be on acreage or on residential lot. So please keep that, because it's one of the attractions to Pinal County.

RIGGINS: Well I'm going to let the other Commissioners ask questions too, but I just need to point out when you say please keep that, what is there –

HAWKINS: Bad choice of words.

RIGGINS: - is absolutely full restriction and no applicability at all.

HARKINS: Right, I understand.

RIGGINS: No restrictions.

HAWKINS: I understand.

RIGGINS: It's not keeping anything.

HAWKINS: Yeah, I understand.

RIGGINS: Other Commissioners, questions? Commissioner Smyres.

SMYRES: I believe you stated the average size house is approximately 1200 square feet, do you know what the average lot size is, and what are you setbacks for your housing now?

HAWKINS: It depends on our lot, but I think it's a

minimum of eight, I believe, on the side of a house. A lot of them will have 10, maybe 11 between them, and some of them have eight, but with those our lot sizes vary. There's a lot of them that are 60 by 108, 65 by 108, then there's a lot of areas where they are 80 by 100, and on those 80 foot wide lots, there is plenty of room for our homes, because our homes don't tend to be that large in Arizona City, and that's just for, I'm going to say about 70 percent of the lots – and I'm picking figures here - but then you get over by the golf course, you get over in other areas, cul-de-sac lots, some of those are 100-125 wide, so you get onto some much larger lots there. But they are not right – they're not like when you go into a typical little subdivision. Our builders, because our representative needs to build, our builders, if we were on a narrower lot, they design that house to be narrow, it'd be a shotgun approach, so they would have space on the side to allow for RV parking, because that was a feature and is a feature in Arizona City. You know, if you have 80 foot wide, and your house is 50 feet wide and there was plenty of room, but they did. I mean I know builders that, we did it, so.

RIGGINS: Commissioners?

SMYRES: If that's the case, then the lots that now where RVs are parked, how close are they to the house and how close are they to the property lines?

HAWKINS: They would (inaudible), but here again,

this is where I'm asking you for your consideration is, don't give a temporary RV the same setbacks as you give a permanent structure for a house, because those RVs do come in and out, and they are not permanent. So no, that's why I'm saying, if we have an eight foot setback on an RV from the side fence there, it's going to wipe out probably 90 percent of our RVs. But that's why I'm asking not to make it the same setback as you do a permanent structure.

SMYRES: Thank you.

RIGGINS: Other Commissioners, questions? Commissioner Aguirre-Vogler.

AGUIRRE-VOGLER: Did you submit any of these suggestions to the County as you speak right now? Did you previously submit any of these?

HAWKINS: I've been there when they had the County meetings. I just came up with the idea of trying to go through MLS to show you statistically instead of just my opinion, and so I did email all of this to the Board of Supervisors also, because these are just facts, these are not my opinions, these are facts, and this is – I don't know how far our MLS system goes back, but that – I asked from the beginning of whatever its time is.

AGUIRRE-VOGLER: You're definitely right on the setback, you know, it can't really be eight foot, you know, it needs to be a smaller setback. There's practically no way you

could have an eight foot setback.

HAWKINS: I mean they do if they clear the eves and if they clear the fence, and they can go through their RV gate, which is eight feet, and they can put it back there and park while they're here for three or four months, or if they have a friend and they can park their RV here. I mean obviously we're not going to make setbacks, but it is – please keep in mind this is temporary, not permanent.

AGUIRRE-VOGLER: So if you were to submit suggestions to the County, one would be the setbacks, what else?

HAWKINS: To let people stay in the RV. Not to set up an RV park, but at least to allow temporary guests to stay in an RV for a week or two. I can't tell you, I have agents that live in Arizona City and they have an RV, and if their friends come and stay with them and they don't have room in their house, they'll let them stay with them in their RV. Or if they have – they have houses that can accommodate an RV, and I just – I have too many clients, I have too many – I just know too many people that, you know – in my neighborhood, right where I'm at. I can't tell you how many people came and visited in their RV and then turned around and became residents and bought property because they liked the weather.

RIGGINS: Okay Commissioners, further questions of – okay, thank you very much.

HAWKINS: Thank you.

RIGGINS: Next speaker, please. We have two coming up, one of you will have to be first. Okay. If you could please sign your name in and give us your address.

GILLIES: Yes sir, I'm already signed in, address and everything. Good morning Mr. Chair -

RIGGINS: Could you give us your name?

GILLIES: I'm getting there.

RIGGINS: Okay.

GILLIES: I'm Fred Gillies, a resident of Arizona City, and I'm here to represent the principals of Citizens RV Ad Hoc Committee, who were unable to make it today because of a previous engagement. And those principals of that committee have asked me to ask for a continuance of a month in this process. In other words, don't finalize anything or approve or disprove any changes at this point in time and would you give us a continuance so that they can also give their input. So that's the first thing I'm here for. And the second thing is, I would like to read into the record three letters that the members of this ad hoc committee, RV committee, have written and are not able to present today. So I ask your indulgence in reading those letters today, if I may.

RIGGINS: Are they quite lengthy or are they –

GILLIES: They are. One of them is fairly lengthy, but I'll -

RIGGINS: As long as you can try not to be repetitious.

GILLIES: Yes sir, I certainly will.

RIGGINS: Okay.

GILLIES: So the first one is from a Mr. Ken Parsons, who's a member of this ad hoc RV committee, and he writes that I'm sorry I was not able to attend his meeting on January 21st. I was only notified on January 5th, and we're principals in another organization that has a commitment for several years to be out of town during this entire week. I would ask the Commission to continue this discussion for one month so our members could be able to identify – or testify in person and answer any of your questions. And if I may just add here that a number of questions that have been asked already would be better answered by the people that are unable to make it today. He continues to say we all must keep in mind the economic impact of this RV issue. Millions of dollars come into Pinal County from RV'ers, snow birds and Canadians. This issue is very important to me as a co-author and co-organizer of the RV Parking Committee. Our committee consist of approximately 200 members, mostly living in Arizona City and Maricopa areas. There are members in other parts of Pinal County, but for committee membership we do not require city or address, or whether the person is pro or con of the issues we represent. Most RV'ers that purchase property in

Pinal County were told that Pinal County welcomed RV'ers. In 2010 I purchased a home on a single lot in Arizona City, only because I could store my RV on my own lot and have enough room for RV friends to stop for a night or two. Several of our RV visitors and other friends purchased property here also. Soon I was rudely awakened to an urban problem, the chronic complainer. I learned during a code compliance visit that a 1962 RV ordinance stated I could not have an occupied RV on my property, even my own property. Wow, what a surprise. We became acquainted with code enforcements. We were advised that RV occupancy violations would have 30 days to comply before a cease and desist order would be issued, and have another 30 days to comply. Being told that I could violate an ordinance is not something I'm comfortable doing. Note, I was also told about this compliance time by Planning Department Steve Abraham last week. Back several years code enforcement informed us that a new RV ordinance was in the works. Our interaction with code enforcement gave us the impression that the Planning Department wanted to work with us to find an amicable solution. In the fall of 2013 there were 14 county-wide public meetings. We attended three or four of these. A PowerPoint program with proposals was presented. Upon audience discussion, never was the proposal even close to acceptable by the attendees. A second PowerPoint discussion – or presentation – was given the next year, with the same

negative result. Supervisor Smith asked our RV citizens committee if we would like to provide our own draft, which we did. And that, Commissioner, may answer that question, was there any input given. This draft was sent to all our committee members, all the Supervisors at Pinal Planning. The RV parking committee members are mostly senior citizens who take pride in their property and respect their neighbors and the law. I've obtained a copy of the code violations from 2014 after several requests, and noticed that many complaints were filed on the same date and in the same area, up to 20 at a time. From confronting two parties that have filed complaints against me, I know that my actions did not harm or inconvenience the complainer in any way. In fact, the complainers didn't live anywhere close to me, or even see my home RV from their home. They were just drive-bys. In talking to both of them, they stated that they didn't like RVs parked anywhere and quotation marks "those Canadians shouldn't be able to buy land and move here." I was told by code enforcement that if I purchased a lot behind me and put up a wall, I wouldn't have any problems with code enforcement. That is what I have done, so I can have RV visitors who stay for a short period of time. The Thunderbird Farms area is a real puzzlement. We don't understand why there's a problem there. Many Canadians have purchased homes with acreages so they can enjoy the Arizona winter weather with their horses.

The property owners have a few friends come to stay in the property, that also bring their horses. Because the complainer doesn't like RVs and Canadians, the complainers started using a 1962 RV ordinance to file against the property owners. Since the only violation with any possible merit is "septic tank," the County deemed it necessary to get involved. Keep in mind that the guest RVs are not permanent buildings, but self-contained RVs. Modern RVs have electric power, water and sewer holding tanks. RV sewage tanks can be dumped off property, if necessary. Even if the sewer was to be dumped into a septic tank, why would that be a violation for the landowner? What if the property owner had six friends move into his home? Would that be a violation of the septic tank size? What if a homeowner had ten children living full-time on that same septic system? A violation of health rules would only come in if the owner didn't remedy a problem of sewage leakage. Pinal County counts the number of toilets to determine the size of a septic tank on a given property. Just because there are four RVs parked on the property, does not necessarily mean four more toilets in the septic tank, since RVs are self-contained. Are RV'ers and Canadians being singled out for discriminating treatment? No one that I'm aware of is trying to have an RV park or gain wealth by hosting RV friends. If someone is running a pay RV park, then we already have the laws to handle that situation, and I would

be the first to report them. We would suggest the Planning and Zoning Commissioners, plus the County Supervisors, realize that it is easier to increase restrictions if an actual problem is identified. It appears now the proposals are restrictive based on what could be, instead of actual facts. It would be like a state trooper stopping and issuing a citation because your car is capable of speeding, even though you are actually under the speed limit. We do not wish to see Pinal County become known as an unfriendly to RV'ers. Other cities and counties in the US have seen this negative impact. The economic loss to Pinal County would be great, plus many hard feelings among current residents. So, that's the first letter and the second one is not as long, so.

RIGGINS: Was that the quite long one?

GILLIES: That was the quite long one.

RIGGINS: Do either letters bring up different points?

GILLIES: Yes, they do. All three of them bring up different points.

RIGGINS: Okay, please continue.

GILLIES: So the second letter is from Mrs. Joanne Parsons, addressed to the Commissioners of the Planning and Zoning Commission. She writes, I personally can only imagine how challenged each one of you are related to approving recommendations for the RV guest housing situation in Pinal

County. To critically analyze the viewpoints from a myriad of citizens is not a simple task. Indeed, each sees the same view through his or her own lenses and jumps to an expedient solution of “my way is the only way.” I encourage you to join with me in critical thinking approach that find common sense solutions. After all, we live in Arizona. We are a diverse population, but we are caring and intelligent. Let’s think outside the box and engage all parties involved to understand the issues, and ultimately draft some workable solutions. Here is just one example. Some facts. We moved to Arizona City only because of the RV-friendly atmosphere portrayed by the realtor. We were welcomed by our immediate neighbors. Being the brunt of a couple of RV complaints, we scheduled a meeting directly with the code enforcement officer over in Florence. Our complainers were well known by their staff. Each complainer was not impacted by our visitors. The head of code enforcement could “read the reality” of the situation and use common sense. We ultimately agreed to notify code enforcements when we would have a visitor for the length – and for the length of time. Through the past six years we’ve combined a second lot with our home and erected a fence around the double lot property. In reality, we have only three or less guest RV’ers per year. The most have stayed just over a night, or only a few days, and one has stayed a month. Our neighbors have been delighted with our visitors. So what is

the common sense solution? An appropriate grace period for conscientious citizens certainly makes common sense. The proposal of absolutely no guest RV parking does not work for us. Note that my husband now retired from Washington State Patrol spent his career in law enforcement and I'm a retired university professor of economics and education learning disciplines. We do not break the law. Likewise, I believe the designers of the new proposal for RV guest housing need to use some critical thinking analysis. For example, we've heard concerns about the sewer. Hey, these are RVs that can be moved. Let them dump water and sewer somewhere other than on private property if the current sewer system is inadequate. In Arizona City there's no difference if a guest uses the sewer drain or if they use the toilet in our house. We've heard that an RV blocks a view. Now a guest RV is there for a short period of time and moved. By the way, a stored RV doesn't move as often as a guest RV, and a detached accessory building can be much more derogative to a view. The list goes on and on and I'm sure you hear many perspective. For us personally, we are not hurting anyone other than those with the initial assumptions that they don't like RVs. In reality, please read the recommendation of the RV citizens committee, as they take into consideration factors of safety and public services, they provide common sense. Thanks for keeping an open mind as you consider all perspectives of RV guest housing

issue. Signed Joanne Parsons. So those are from the prospective RV owners. The third letter is quite short, you'll be glad to hear, and it relates to the fact that the health – Public Health Department got involved in this with the sewer issue, and the writer, Rich Wist, writes: We're being told that Article 5 of the Arizona Administrative Code applies to RVs. It does not. The article makes no reference to RVs whatsoever. All references are to "trailer coaches." The clear intent of Article 5 of the State Code is to address issues with "manufactured" or "mobile" homes, not RVs. All parts of this section refer to trailer coaches in all instances. RVs are very different in that they are self contained with holding tanks that trailer coaches do not have. The point of this part of the code is to address the necessity for a sewer system because trailer coaches are not self-contained. If RVs are included in this code, then all semi trucks with sleeper cabs would also have to be included. There would need to be a county-wide ban on more than one truck stopping for the night on any property. There would also be a need for County-wide ban on fairs and other similar events, since many of the people involved stay in their RVs during the operation of a fair or other event. And as an example, Pinal County Fair, a lot of people park their RVs there. Across the country there are many private and public campgrounds in other areas that have no sewer system where RVs

are permitted to park for multiple days. For example, many national parks and national forests with no sewer system at all, allow multiple RVs to park for several days. Many of these are in the State of Arizona. The Bureau of Land Management allows RVs to park on millions of acres with no requirement for sewer systems, some areas that are within Pinal County. The County has many events held at the County Fairgrounds without any sewer connection at any of the sites. Oak Flat Campground is just one example in Pinal County of a place that allows RV parking for several nights, and has no sewer system. Our impression is that from the beginning of this process there has been an attempt to find a way to accomplish the preconceived goal of severely limiting RV parking anywhere in the County, except in approved campgrounds. Article 5 of the Arizona Administrative Code was chosen to try and accomplish this, by trying to force RVs into the definition of trailer coach. RV parking on private property does not need to meet any requirements under Article 5, because RVs have self-contained waste systems that are not included in Article 5. If I may, I'd like to leave these – copies of these letters with the committee – or the Commission for your reference. I'm sure that nobody was taking shorthand and writing all that down. And I would like to just add two very short items. As Ms. Hawkins said, the plan of a typical residential, or single family residential development has no

bearing on either Thunderbird Farms or Arizona City. So to say it's typical, I think is prejudicial. And I might add that suggestions have been made on the changes to the code that would satisfy the people living in Arizona City in Thunderbird Park, so we have gone to great lengths to work with the County in coming up with a code that is not restrictive to our particular area. Thank you very much. If there's any questions, I'd be glad to try and answer them, but I'd rather we not make a decision today, but – or you, rather, don't make a decision, but have it continue it for one month to allow these people that wanted to speak be here.

RIGGINS: Commissioners, questions? Yes. Commissioner Gutierrez.

GUTIERREZ: Yes sir, we did get the copies of the letters and stuff, I read them last night. The last letter you wrote, who was the author of that?

GILLIES: His name is Rich Wist.

GUTIERREZ: Okay. And he's from Arizona City?

GILLIES: He is, yes, and he's a member of the Arizona – or that Ad Hoc RV Parking Committee.

GUTIERREZ: Yeah, he didn't, he didn't –

GILLIES: I believe his name should be on that.

GUTIERREZ: It's under number two. Yeah, and then you mentioned your proposals. And what is the main, on your letters, what is the main issue that is causing the concern?

Is it the setbacks? Setbacks and guest parking?

GILLIES: Yes, yes, that's the main concern. As it currently stands, both in the existing regulations from 1962 that you're addressing, and the proposed one, the ones that the County is proposing, it would disallow an RV to be parked on a residential lot to house guests.

GUTIERREZ: Okay. Thank you.

RIGGINS: Any other questions? Commissioner Grubb.

GRUBB: In number three, he addressed the Arizona Administrative Code, Article 5, Trailer Coaches, and I just wanted to correct it in that there are two definitions in there, one of which could be identified as an RV, and that's the difference between a dependent travel couch, which requires outside connections, and an independent trailer coach, which means a trailer which has a flush toilet, bathtub or shower, and lavatory, which would indicate that obviously it has a holding tank. And so, you know, his point there is not valid. I read that, you know, the other day when I got this package and looked at the – so his interpretation, I don't believe, is correct.

GILLIES: I understand what you're saying. Not being my letter, I, you know, I –

GRUBB: Yeah, I understand, and – okay. Thank you.

RIGGINS: Commissioners, any other questions of the? Thank you very much sir.

GILLIES: Thank you for your -

RIGGINS: Oh Commissioner Aguirre-Vogler, pardon me, one more question.

AGUIRRE-VOGLER: I do have a question. I'm a little concerned. There's so many people here that have shown up and there's been so many meetings, I don't understand why there's still a problem between you and staff. That's what I'm trying to understand.

GILLIES: Yeah, I don't either. I don't understand either. The fact is that, you know, I don't understand why so few people complaining about, you know, the RVs being parked is such an issue, when there's so many people that actually do park them. And I think there's a preponderance of people that, from these communities, that are big enough or the lots are big enough to (inaudible).

AGUIRRE-VOGLER: Okay, and so what I'm trying to understand is some of the meetings you refer to are 2013, and then some that I looked at of 2014, so let me ask staff, why is there still some problems here?

MACDONALD: Chair Riggins, Commissioner Vogler, we've – we have met with – as recently as last week with Rich and Ken who those letters were from, and ultimately it's just a difference of opinions on what's right to adopt in our code. You know, we think that when people move into these single family residential developments they have a reasonable

expectation that it's going to be a neighborhood-type feel, and not have this potential doubling of density with RVs parked next to them that are occupied. So essentially it's –

AGUIRRE-VOGLER: Excuse me just one thing. The picture that you showed up here was a typical subdivision as we know. But as we know too, Arizona City is not a typical subdivision. So could there be an exception?

RIGGINS: May I intercede at this point in time? Why don't we get our various people that wish to discuss this, and then let's reserve this discussion after the people talk and say what they wish to say. But I would certainly like to bring that back up to staff, I just don't think it's the time to do it right now.

GILLIES: Thank you to the Commission for -

RIGGINS: Any other questions? There none being, thank you very much. Our next person that wish to speak with us. And if you could please make sure and sign your name and address, and then tell us your name.

TRUDEAU: My name is Leonard Trudeau, I live in Arizona City. My wife and I specifically purchased this home less than two years ago with the understanding that RVs were allowed to be parked on the property. Our RV is worth almost twice what we paid for the home, so this is not like a rattletrap thing. We don't have people living in it all the time, and that seems to be the big concern, and the vast

majority of them aren't. It's either folks like us that travel – we'll be gone for two-3 months at a time, which is the same with our neighbors, people across the street, down the street. We purchased the home to live most of the year, and to travel part of it. Saying we have to have an eight foot setback for a temporary vehicle, it's like having your car parked on the side. Same kind of thing, it moves. I see no problems with having them generally in good condition, roadworthy, license plated and such, but to say me as a homeowner I can't have an RV parked there, yet I could have my boat, I could have my cargo trailer, I could have other things parked there in the same space. You know. And like I said, we specifically purchased in the area because we were told RVs are allowed, and now we find out that there's an extremely restrictive code. You know, I understand people not wanting to have garbage trailers and such, but we need to be able to park, you know, our stuff. It's of large expense to have to find a place to park this separately, we're talking, you know, a couple hundreds bucks a month realistically to park this somewhere else. We don't have availability to plug in, we don't have a lot of other things, we have to winterize them because we can't run a heater or do these kinds of things to keep this in good condition. And, you know, like the real estate agent said, this is – you know, these are larger lots. A lot of these homes were situated so that an RV can park

there, but it doesn't have an additional eight foot. There might be 14 feet on the side setbacks. So there's, you know, plenty of room for an eight foot to go in there to have room to move around it. But, you know, a lot of homes in the neighborhood, a lot of homes in Arizona City, look rougher than most of the RVs that are parked out there. Most of the RVs parked out there are actually of higher value than most of the homes. We want to be here, we want to participate, it's a nice area, but to say well you have an RV and, you know, you're some kind of second class citizen, you can't park it there. Yet, I see all kinds of, you know, virtually abandoned vehicles parked around. But that seems to be okay because it has a license plate that's registered. That doesn't balance out real well. And another thing is I just learned about this yesterday, literally, and I'm here, I take the time to come out here. It needs to be less restrictive. You need to be able to allow vehicles to park – RVs to park on your property. You allow boats to park on property, correct? Trailer boats? Yes? So it's the same kind of thing. And that's about it. Any questions for me?

RIGGINS: Commissioners, any questions for – Mr. Hartman.

HARTMAN: Leonard, on your particular setup, how – what kind of setbacks do you have with your motorhome on your lot?

TRUDEAU: Setbacks on my motorhome?

HARTMAN: Yeah, from the property line. From your neighbor's property line.

TRUDEAU: From the fence line?

HARTMAN: Yeah.

TRUDEAU: See I purchased, I actually purchased the lot next door because of my large dogs to have some extra room, but I have not attached them. So I'm technically being held to the single lot, rules and regulations. There is approximately 14 feet from my property line to the side of my house, minus a foot and a half for the overhang.

HARTMAN: And your motorhome is eight foot wide?

TRUDEAU: It's actually the new standard of 8'6" by 40 foot.

HARTMAN: Okay. So there's at least a couple of feet.

TRUDEAU: There's several feet on both sides, yeah. I mean there's, you know, I'm not a little guy, and I can walk on either side of my coach around the house, around the fence.

HARTMAN: All right.

RIGGINS: I'm going to go ahead and interject a comment here. One of the things with zoning issues is there's always competing desires to have things happen. There's also regulatory issues. If you have a 14 foot space with a foot and a half overhang and have 12 and a half net, and have eight

and a half going the center of that, it means that you have something very, very close to your home, and not all that much distance from the home next to you, and those circumstances –

TRUDEAU: There’s an eight foot setback -

RIGGINS: I understand that, but by the same token, that person could have one in there too. So all of a sudden you have a situation from emergency vehicle and personnel movement and fire danger that never would be allowed to be built.

TRUDEAU: But they’re not built, they’re movable.

RIGGINS: But they’re there, and they have human beings in them, and they could be there – and they can – pardon me – and they can be there up to six months.

TRUDEAU: Not according to either of your regs. That’s only if (inaudible).

RIGGINS: According to what’s been proposed.

TRUDEAU: If you apply for a permit and you’re granted it. And it doesn’t automatically grant.

RIGGINS: No, it doesn’t grant if it doesn’t – you know, and we’re not discussing exactly what the proposal is, what we’re discussing is the reasons why these things are being brought up.

TRUDEAU: Right.

RIGGINS: Being able to take RVs and put incredible density around houses in a fashion that never would have been

allowed, is one of the reasons why you have zoning is to protect structures and protect health, safety and welfare. Now again, I'm not insinuating at this point that this is the only way that this can be done. There'll be votes taken and there'll be decisions made. There'll be public input given to it. But a person needs to understand the reason why these things are being brought up.

TRUDEAU: And in my previous position I was a property manager and a property – and a real estate redeveloper. I was a project manager. I'm extremely aware of this. I've been in front of people like yourself many times over the years, and I understand this. But by the same token, you're allowed to park a boat that's eight foot, eight and a half foot wide, you know, 24 to 30 foot wide for just a regular trailable boat. The same issues then. You know, access to the space around it. Many boats now have some type of sanitary system set up in them, but those are allowed. It's the same thing. Your sanitary system that's close – is made to a health standard. You know, my RV doesn't leak waste, and that seems to be part of the perception is somehow I'm going to be leaking waste that's a close – it's a system that's onboard that's – in my case I have 50 gallons black water, 50 gallons of gray water. I take this and I can go to Picacho Peak, I can go to various truck stops and dump. I'm not looking to dump on my property. I'm not looking to dump

into the sewer system. I could, but I don't. Almost no RV'ers in the area do. So let us have some of our property. Let us be able to park it on the property in a safe manner. You're not increasing the fire hazard.

RIGGINS: Again, I just have to remind everybody that wants to get up and speak right now, the system that is in place right now allows none of it.

TRUDEAU: I understand that.

RIGGINS: And everybody that bought into their properties, everybody that has been doing this all this time, has been doing it absolutely out of compliance. And that's the reason why it's been brought up.

TRUDEAU: It's been stated your compliance officers don't even enforce it.

RIGGINS: That would be without my understanding. So –

SALAS: Mr. Chairman.

RIGGINS: Yes, Mr. Salas.

SALAS: Do you have (inaudible) vehicle to your RV? (Inaudible)?

TRUDEAU: Do I have another vehicle?

SALAS: Yeah.

TRUDEAU: Yes I do, I have a couple.

SALAS: So that's another part of the problem. There's a lot of RV'ers that carry another vehicle or two with

them (inaudible) so that they can commute back and forth to wherever. So that adds a little bit more –

TRUDEAU: No it doesn't, sir. We tow my wife's car. My wife is going to have a car regardless if we have an RV or not. So that's –

SALAS: But if you have an RV and you have another vehicle in there.

TRUDEAU: We have a two car garage, we have a two car space driveway, so this is already accommodated in –

SALAS: No, but it adds to the congestion, and I would be remiss if I didn't say that you're comparing (inaudible) something else is parked there is the same thing. The boat is not inhabited. Nobody lives in the boat, okay?

TRUDEAU: (Inaudible).

SALAS: It's not the same thing. I don't want to argue with you, but –

TRUDEAU: It seems to be this argument of somebody's living in it all the time and that's why we can't have it, but the vast majority of the RVs are out there, are being stored because they're not in use currently. We might want to use it, have a guest visit for a few days and stay in it, because it's more comfortable. You know, instead of changing the whole situation of the house to accommodate a couple a couple of people, it's easier to open up the RV and give them separate bathroom and such, but that's part of its self-

contained system and that's drained separately.

SALAS: For me, I don't think I'd be making an argument that you're all out of compliance, because if that's what you're asking, it seems to be you're asking the County to start, you know, getting you into compliance.

TRUDEAU: You can make the argument you haven't enforced it in so long, it's unenforceable.

SALAS: It's an argument, but (inaudible).

RIGGINS: We are here to not argue.

TRUDEAU: I'm not asking to argue.

RIGGINS: But in the venture here, we don't need to get in an argumentative state.

TRUDEAU: I appreciate that we're trying to come up with a reasonable solution to this.

RIGGINS: Precisely.

TRUDEAU: And I would like that too, but you know to say, and especially in the case of Arizona City where the vast majority of the people have an RV, have a trailer, have these types of things and in part purchased there because they were told, you know, by the real estate agent, by the multi-list, by all these things, that this allowed. You look around, you just physically look around, there's an RV across the street, there's an RV next door, there's an RV right behind me. There's an RV down the block. There's – there are all these RVs in the area and they're all parked in the backyard.

They're all plugged in.

RIGGINS: Pardon me, I was going to recognize Commissioner Grubb.

GRUBB: You know, and I see our attorney is – you rattled his cage pretty well when you made 0a statement, he reacted about this, because we haven't enforced it for so long, it's no longer the law.

TRUDEAU: Well I –

GRUBB: Yeah, but anyway let me back up, and the Chairman took some of my thunder. First, you've heard of buyer beware. And did you research to find out if it was legal when you did it?

TRUDEAU: One of the things I did is I asked my real estate agent and I was told yes.

GRUBB: That's not what I asked. Do you have in writing that your RV is allowed on your property? And if so, then you'd better get an attorney and sue whoever said that, because it's not –

TRUDEAU: Well I also had my eyes open and I look around and I see –

GRUBB: That's not what I'm asking.

TRUDEAU: Half or more of the homes –

GRUBB: Just because everybody else is doing it, doesn't make it right. I learned that a long time ago. And you could make an argument that that is an RV, and you said so

yourself, people have lived in boats and backyards, I've seen it. And the Chairman did take my thunder, because I'm the retired fire chief here, and – in the area, and I can tell you that the – and I've seen Arizona City, I've been down there many times for meetings and I understand what the Chairman mentioned, and I've seen it happen to where we've lost almost an entire block because there was no fire break. It was house trailer, house trailer, house trailer, and fortunately not in this county, it happened up in Maricopa County, and it's happened down in Pima County. A little wind does a lot of damage pretty quickly. I've seen eight trailers go down at the same time because of the wind. And so, you know, it's been against the rules since 1962. Whether it's enforced or not is not – you can try and make an argument against that. However, it's been the rule and I'm an RV'er. I mean I had an RV for ten years. I sold it a couple years ago, and now I'm looking to buy another one, and unfortunately where I live, I can't park one at my property. When I lived up in Maricopa County and when I lived down here, I live at a place that I can't do that. So if I buy that, you know, I'm saddled with that $125 or $150 a month to store it and to have access to a dump site. It's just no way I could not do that. And I was aware of this even before I sat on the Commission, because I looked into it when I moved into the County, where can I park my RV? And I went back and found out that there were only

certain places I can park it, so that's where it got parked. So, you know, I understand the issue in Arizona City, and maybe the entire City is out of compliance. But you still live in the County and it's our job to make sure that we provide for the safety and the security of the residents. And so I'm not saying I'm against allowing RVs on larger lots, but right now everybody's out of compliance, and we're looking at some way to try and fix it.

TRUDEAU: And by the same token, these RV parks are parked right on top of each other, and as you said, it only takes a slight breeze to spread a fire. That's in compliance.

GRUBB: It is in compliance, because that's what it says in the law. So they're in compliance. That's why I always pick the spot away from everybody else.

TRUDEAU: How frequently, realistically, does that happen? Really? I mean, you know, we'll have occasional fires like in Philadelphia where the whole row goes up and this type of thing.

GRUBB: I was there too. Because that's where I came from.

TRUDEAU: I'm sorry.

GRUBB: Well, you know, I wasn't on the fire department, but I was in town when the whole block went down (inaudible). And I understand that. But it happens more often than you think. RVs burn more often than people think.

I probably responded to an equal number of RV fires that I did to mobile home fires.

TRUDEAU: No, I'm talking RV parks, not mobile home parks.

GRUBB: No, I'm talking about RVs too.

TRUDEAU: Okay.

GRUBB: Equal number of RV fires that mobile home fires. They do.

RIGGINS: I believe we understand the concept why there is a difficulty with density.

GRUBB: Density is an issue for us.

RIGGINS: I think we understand that, and that's part of the reason why these rules are being reviewed. Now is there any other questions? Yes, Mark.

LANGLITZ: Thank you, Mr. Chair, Mark Langlitz, Pinal County Attorney's Office. Just for a point of clarification, residents in Arizona City are not prohibited from parking their RV on their lot, they can park it and store it. There's no restrictions at all. What – where the problem comes in is if it starts to be occupied and non-family member, non-property owners coming down and parking their RVs on the lots. And what I see the rub here is while that's currently prohibited, it would be permitted in rural zones. The problem is Arizona City isn't a rural zone, so all the owners can park their RVs on their own property, that's not the problem. What

they can't do is have their friends come down and park their RVs on their property and stay. And I think that's what I see is the primary issue here. My last comment – kind of just popping my head as I was going along – but the point I wanted to make was I seem to hear arguments that Arizona City residents are saying we can't park our RVs, and they can. (Inaudible) and there's no setback requirement. You just can't live in it, or have someone else live in it.

RIGGINS: That's correct.

LANGLITZ: Thank you Mr. Chair.

RIGGINS: And that's a very good point, because I think the rhetoric was leading towards the point that the people thought they couldn't, and they can.

TRUDEAU: And I'm not suggesting -

RIGGINS: Occupied and parked are two very different things.

TRUDEAU: Somebody fulltime living in it, being able to use it as guest quarters is another matter.

RIGGINS: And noted, and noted, and that's part of what we're discussing right now.

TRUDEAU: And, you know, I appreciate for you to address that. And you have a way to have somebody spend an additional amount of time, which is appropriate.

RIGGINS: Yes.

TRUDEAU: But, you know, to have these set up and

this is the way it's reading right now, that – and I'm a little unclear how this doesn't apply to Arizona City on this. I'm not certain I understand that, but you know, the main intent is to be able to park our RVs there, have them plugged in so that the batteries can stay charged.

RIGGINS: And this is exactly why we're reviewing this to see how we can make some of those things happen. This is why we're trying to make this more liberal, not as tight as it has been. That's exactly what we're trying to do. We're also trying to do it under the context of public health, safety and welfare, most notably densities, impacts on zoning of other people's expectations, and there's a lot of comments concerning if RV is self-contained, but that doesn't mean you won't public it into the sewer. Just because it has the ability to be self-contained, doesn't mean that it isn't hooked up into the system. But these are the reasons why we're going through these things, and unless we have something new, unless we have something new, we probably ought to move to the next speaker. If there's something else new?

TRUDEAU: Well, just to comment, just because my car can do 140, doesn't mean I'm going to do that, and I shouldn't be given a ticket just because my car might be able to do that. And that's what you're saying about hooking it into the septic systems.

RIGGINS: Not at all. Not at all.

GRUBB: I don't think that's relevant.

RIGGINS: Yeah. Yeah, that doesn't work that way. But any other questions? Anything new? Okay. Thank you very much, sir.

HARTMAN: Chair?

RIGGINS: Vice Chair Hartman. Please come forward.

HARTMAN: Ashlee, on your – I think – excuse me – on your comments and the discussion, you said something about a – if you had a lot next to you, you could park the RV there, but it had to have a residence? Did you say it had to have a dwelling I think is what I read some place?

MACDONALD: The Code requires that there be a primary use on a property, so you couldn't have a vacant lot with no use on it and start parking RVs. There has to be an established primary use.

HARTMAN: That's what I need to get cleared up. Thank you.

RIGGINS: Okay, did you sign your name and address in?

QUIBELL: Earlier.

RIGGINS: Yes, thank you. Could you give us your name?

QUIBELL: Karen Quibell.

RIGGINS: Thank you. You're going to need to get a little closer to the mic.

QUIBELL: How's that?

RIGGINS: Better, thank you.

QUIBELL: And I jotted down some things so I wouldn't forget. Good morning ladies and gentlemen. My name is Karen Quibell. My husband Sid and I are Canadians who are fortunate to have a second home in your beautiful state. We have attended several informational meetings over the past two years regarding RV parking. At these meetings we were asked for our input, and last year we presented a petition from Thunderbird Farms area where we live to Pinal County Supervisor Anthony Smith. And I will give you our petition after I speak. It seems that you also had some decision-making meetings after the Canadians and US citizens had gone home and we feel we have offered you several reasonable solutions. All electrical and water bills are metered and paid accordingly by each landowner, as well septic tanks must be in compliance with regulations for each homeowner. Snowbirds are only here for a limited time, but pay yearly for all services. Our consumption of utilities is much less. The zoning committee would have complete control if they set limits on the utilities, be it by month or by year. We contribute to the economy in Arizona. We pay taxes, buy fuel, groceries, insurance, employ Arizona companies to do work for us in our homes and on our properties. We're not here to make money. We know that the majority of Arizona people welcome us

back because we do contribute. There are only a few who oppose us. And another solution to propose a reasonable bylaw for RVs and take a vote, which you are doing, thank you. We invite our family and friends to our Arizona home to share and take part in this wonderful area, and it should not matter whether these people stay in our home or stay in an RV on our property. Thank you for your time.

RIGGINS: Thank you, and I also before you step down, a question. The concept of people that oppose RVs and being RV-friendly, are not. This County has started a review of these regulations to make more things permissible, not to make them less. What we are trying to do – and doing things by democratic method is not always the easiest way to get things done because there’s a lot of different opinions – there’s a lot of different things to weigh here to try to find the compromises that’ll work the best. And some of the things that some people might think are the absolute way to go, other people think is just not the way to do it at all. But there is an existing zoning code here that requires certain things, and they’re done that way for a very good reason. Mobile homes that sit stored are nothing but an inert box, and they’re allowed. Storing of mobile homes is allowed. It’s when they become a home on a single family lot that would not permit a second home to be built there, by zoning code, that things get different and you have to look at things in a

different fashion. And nobody's trying to impose anything on anybody, because it's already imposed since 1962. What we're trying to do is make things to where they're as much a fit for all members of the community as possible, in as good way as possible, and that still meet the regulations and the moors of health, safety and welfare. So I just hope that everybody that's been a participant in this realizes there's no impositions trying to be put on anything. What's been trying to find is a good fit, to protect certain aspects and to allow certain aspects best we can.

QUIBELL: I understand.

RIGGINS: Any other questions or concerns? Commissioners Putrick.

PUTRICK: Yes Mr. Chairman. Just to reinforce what you said. I don't think there's anybody on this Commission who doesn't believe in property rights. We don't want to restrict what you do with your property. But we also are tasked with protecting everybody in Pinal County, so we're what? 425,000 people now? That's our responsibility. So we have to – we want to listen to you, but we have to think about the entire County, and we have to think about all the people in the County. So what Chairman Riggins said is the truth. That's where we are. We're trying to make it better for you, but we can't just open up because, you know, like you said, sir about not hooking up to a septic tank. We don't know that

you're not going to do that. The third thing that I really, really bugs me is that a lot of you have been misled by the realtors who sold you your homes. We can't address that, but we understand it. So it's – don't blame us for what your realtor told you was the truth or the reality, when in fact it was not. We're trying to do the right thing here. That's all I have to say.

QUIBELL: And we just want to give our opinion.

RIGGINS: Certainly.

QUIBELL: And hope that you will listen to us.

RIGGINS: Certainly. And for the record, I'd also like to state, I live in Rural Pinal County and I own an RV, and I don't intend to sell mine. So I am very sympathetic to the things that are being said here. Commissioners, any other questions or comments? No. Thank you. Any other speakers? Could you hand that to staff please? Any other – anybody else wish to get up to speak on this? Please come forward. And if you could please sign your name and address in on the register there, and then give us your name.

METIVIER: My name is Gary Metivier. I am a resident of the unincorporated County areas to the southwest of City of Maricopa. Collectively, they go by three names – there's Papago Buttes, Thunderbird Farms and there's several things within Thunderbird, there's north, south, east, west and the Hidden Valley area. I can't speak to, you know – I'm

probably going to be the lone voice of opposition to all those who have spoken previously. So you're going to hear – they're going to get a chance to hear our side of it now. Most of them are bringing up points that were actually raised as a result of the meetings that were held by, you know, the County, by Supervisor Smith and others, in their respective areas. Okay? No one has ever had a problem with Uncle Fred and Aunt Myrtle coming down for the holidays, staying over for Christmas and the New Year and going home. The situation – and again, I cannot speak to the other areas, but I can speak to the neighborhood that I live in – and what's been happening is basically incremental in nature, all right? The problem didn't start out and bloom overnight. It's been over the years, an increasing number of property owners are bringing multiple RVs onto their lots and creating what amount to de facto RV parks, or and/or RV storage, because once they bring them down, they never leave. The visitors come, stay in them for several months over the winter months when the weather's nice – and we thank you for your economic contribution, by the way – kind of a little bit nervous here. I'm also speaking not just for myself, but for a group of others who have similar thoughts. And again, the problem was one of multiple units. No one objects to a property owner storing their own personal property on their property. No one really had an objection, again, to someone who came down for a brief period

of time, stayed and then left. But the problem's one of, I guess you could call them serial violators, because the County code doesn't permit any of this right now, so year after year after year, these some visitors return back to these same lots where the property owners have allowed this, and move back into these RVs. So they are de facto second housing units on the properties. In one instance in Thunderbird Farms, there was an individual who on a three and a third acre lot had in excess of ten RVs on his lot. Now I'm sorry, but that's an RV park. Whether it's official and sanctioned by the code, it doesn't matter, it amounts to an RV park. Now particular in Thunderbird Farms North, my personal observation is because I'm in that area quite frequently, that probably about 25 to 30 percent of the lots in a neighborhood that's basically about one mile square, have multiple RVs on them. Anywhere from two to three, and up on these lots, and it's virtually every other lot. So this is what the complaint is from those of us who are objecting to this. It's not just one, it's the fact that there's many and that with each passing year, more and more lots are doing this. I'm going to move on now to a couple of specific things. One thing that might be brought up here also is that the County adopted a new environmental code last year, and that new environmental code defines an RV park as two or more RVs. So if you have more than two on your lot, you're defined as an RV park under the State environmental

code, and unless I'm mistaken, the County adopted that code, did they not? Yes, okay. So what we have are a bunch of unlicensed RV parks. Again, a violation of the law. Now those of us that are raising this issue up, all right, we don't disagree with most of what's on here. The group that I represent has asked me only to address a couple of specific things. Item F on the – let's see, that's 2.150.01 through whatever, okay, states in no case shall there be more than one RV used as short guest housing on a parcel at any one time. We would have no objection to your adopting that because it limits it to one. Nobody has a problem with one, we just have a problem with two, four, six, eight or ten, and there is a question I would like to ask - the reason why they want to change this particular part of the code, or at least why the Commission is thinking about this. Overall park development standards says minimum lot area will be changed from – basically from ten acres to five acres, inclusive off rights of way, easements and dedications. Now the display board that you had up there earlier that these folks prepared for us, that the intent is to make it less restrictive for those who would want to open an RV park. We feel that this is not a good idea, because in these developments to the southwest of Maricopa, the average lot size is around 3 1/3 to four acres. Now there's some parcels that are smaller, and some that are larger, but the majority fall in that range. If you allow it

to drop to five, what would prevent one property owner from purchasing an adjacent property, and then going through the process they would have to in order to change that and make it one lot, and I have a six and a third acre lot, they've now met at least the basic requirement for opening an RV park, which then would have to go through a process to try and get done. But it opens the door and it makes it easier, and we object to that. It should remain at ten acres. Let's see. A lot of things have been brought up about hooking up to the septic systems and stuff, and everyone so far said no we're not doing this. I would invite any of you to take a drive through Thunderbird North and look at the RVs on the lots. They're all connected to the septic systems. For the most part they're all – I'm not going to say 100 percent, but most of the ones I've seen, are connected. Some of those lots have been, you know, in such a violation of the law that they actually have permanent concrete pads with electrical, water and septic hookups, okay. Now not all of them may be occupied at any one time, but that to me demonstrates an intent to open a park to do this on a continuing basis year after year after year. And this is what we're objecting to. It's the number, it's the – we understand occupancy is the issue. All right, no one's ever going to question you storing your motorhome or your travel trailer on your property. That's never been an issue as far as the code is – we are concerned with the code.

What we're concerned with, again, are those people who, as your own people pointed out, have abused this by putting multiple RVs on these lots. So we would encourage you to adopt the code as you have it here, but to reconsider your change from downsizing from ten acres to five for the requirements for an RV park. And any questions?

RIGGINS: Commissioners, any questions? Okay. Thank you very much. Thank you very much. Does anybody else in the audience wish to get up to speak? There none being, we're going to go ahead and close the public portion of the meeting, and we're going to turn it back up to the Commission. Commission, any questions among ourselves, or questions of staff? Vice Chair Hartman?

HARTMAN: Chair Riggins, Ashlee, on that – on – why did we come down from ten acres to five acres? What is the intent? I – we kind of assume it was to make it easier so people could have their own RV park.

MACDONALD: Yeah, that essentially was one of the things that we heard when we did our community outreach, was that oftentimes it's hard to find a ten acre parcel and to develop an RV park, so there was the suggestion to reduce the size.

HARTMAN: Okay, I have seen us, the Commission, recommend to the Supervisors RV parks before, but under a special use permit where such and such was limited to the

number and it was a generally connected with a roping arena or something like that, but they had to notify their neighbors, they had to do a zoning request, and they had to notify their neighbors and so it had to be approved, and their neighbors knew what was going on and all that. So if anybody came in under the five acre request, they would still have to go through the zoning request, would they not?

MACDONALD: They would. It would be a rezoning process. So that would come before the Planning Commission and the Board of Supervisors.

HARTMAN: All right.

RIGGINS: And I want to jump in and also state that in my tenure on this Board, the neighborhoods with suburban ranch zoning, when somebody tries to go in there and double something up and change things, those neighborhoods usually get pretty unified in not wanting that to happen, so I don’t believe that in the suburban ranch example that was given, I don’t believe this five acres is going to make that easier for anybody in suburban ranch. So –

AGUIRRE-VOGLER: I have a question.

RIGGINS: A question for staff.

AGUIRRE-VOGLER: Well actually for staff and the Commission. Do you think at this time that we should continue or go forward?

RIGGINS: That’s probably a discussion item with the

Commission.

AGUIRRE-VOGLER: Okay.

RIGGINS: Probably not to staff. Any other questions of staff? Okay.

DEL COTTO: If I could?

RIGGINS: Yes, go right ahead.

DEL COTTO: Chairman. I was under the impression, though, that over the years with some of the horsing around that had went on in Thunderbird Farms, that some of the local people did have permission to set a number of RVs. I don't know how much information there is on that, or – but I do know that there have been people there for 20 years, or 25 years, that had – according to them – had approached the County in regards to having the permission to conduct whatever they had going on. So there may be a little bit of a discrepancy there, or those may be -

RIGGINS: Would you like to –

MACDONALD: There may be some SUPs for that in their area. I didn't do any specific research on the number of those that exist out there, but it's certainly possible that somebody came through and got a special use permit to allow that.

RIGGINS: Any other questions of staff? Commissioner Gutierrez.

GUTIERREZ: Regarding the code compliance, that's

something the County would basically inspect and check on, though, right? Over a period of time? I mean if a complaint did come in regarding a violation or issues out there, that is something that the County would be interested in reviewing, correct?

MACDONALD: That is correct.

RIGGINS: Any other questions of staff? Then I'll turn it on the Commission. Discussion or a motion?

HARTMAN: If you're ready for a motion.

RIGGINS: If there's no further discussion. Doesn't appear to be.

HARTMAN: What's the comment on continuing the case? I'm ready to make a firm motion.

RIGGINS: This is the time for discussion then. Doesn't seem like there is any discussion on it.

HARTMAN: Okay. Chair Riggins, if – Commission Members, I would like to make a motion that we send to – we forward PZ-C-002-15 to the Board of Supervisors with a favorable recommendation.

RIGGINS: Do I have a second for the motion?

GRUBB: I'll second that.

RIGGINS: We have a second and a motion. I think we should probably go ahead and do a roll call vote on this.

ABRAHAM: Mr. Chairman, Commissioners, this is a roll call vote to forward a recommendation of approval of PZ-

C-002-15. Commissioner Grubb.

GRUBB: Yes.

ABRAHAM: Commissioner Del Cotto.

DEL COTTO: Aye.

ABRAHAM: Commissioner Salas.

SALAS: Aye.

ABRAHAM: Commissioner Putrick.

PUTRICK: Aye.

ABRAHAM: Commissioner Smyres.

SMYRES: Aye.

ABRAHAM: Commissioner Gutierrez.

GUTIERREZ: Nay, and I'd like to –

RIGGINS: Go right ahead.

GUTIERREZ: Justify it. I think there were some very good points brought up by the public regarding setbacks and some of the limitations that's going to have – and repercussions that it's going to have in some of the more rural areas regarding this. Even though the goal of this is to liberalize certain things and make it easier, I think to a certain degree this becomes more restrictive. It's going a little too far the other way.

RIGGINS: Okay.

ABRAHAM: Commissioner Aguirre-Vogler.

AGUIRRE-VOGLER: Nay. I think there has to be more of a meeting of the minds. There's still a little bit of a

problem, I think, with it so I guess I'll just go with a nay. I wanted a continuance.

ABRAHAM: Vice Chair Hartman.

HARTMAN: Yes. And I'd like to clarify that. This – we all have to realize that we're just a recommending body to the Board of Supervisors, and this will go to the Supervisors, so there will be further public input into this code amendment. Thank you.

ABRAHAM: And Chairman Riggins.

RIGGINS: Aye.

ABRAHAM: 7 in favor, 2 opposed. The motion carries.

RIGGINS: The motion carries. Thank you all very much, and as Vice Chair Hartman said, we are simply a recommending body to the Board of Supervisors, and this will go to them and full public process will occur at that point. Okay, we don't have much of an agenda left. Do we want to just push through and get her done?

HARTMAN: Tentative plat.

RIGGINS: Yes I know. We have a little bit, not much. Let's wait for everybody to get clear. I'm sorry, we're still in public meeting. Folks, I'm sorry, we're still in public meeting here, so the conversations need to go out in the hall. Okay, all right. Let's move onto tentative plats. Case S-013-15.

BALMER: Yes, Mr. Chairman, Members of the Commission. This is case S-013-15 and I actually did get a letter yesterday from the applicant asking for one last continuance to the March 17th hearing. There's one last thing they wanted to finalize on the tentative plat before they presented it to you.

RIGGINS: Okay. Let's – any discussion from the Commission? A motion then would be appropriate.

GRUBB: Mr. Chair?

SALAS: I move for continuance.

RIGGINS: Well Commissioner Salas.

GRUBB: Second.

SALAS: S-013-15 to March what?

BALMER: March 17th.

SALAS: 17th.

GRUBB: Again, I'll second.

RIGGINS: 2016 at 9 a.m. in the morning.

BALMER: That's the other part.

RIGGINS: Do I have a second?

GUTIERREZ: I'll second.

RIGGINS: We have a second from Commissioner Gutierrez. All in favor signify by saying aye.

COLLECTIVE: Aye.

RIGGINS: All opposed? Okay. We'll see the – hear that meeting in a couple of months. Call – there are not work

session items, Call to the Commission. Any discussion items?

AGUIRRE-VOGLER: I'd like to ask a question.

RIGGINS: Well this is Call to the Commission, so this is informal. Go ahead.

AGUIRRE-VOGLER: Okay, so – well for one, I've kind of asked for the County Manager to come in and evidently he went and talked about impact fees somewhere and I wasn't able to make that, so is there an update that we should be informed about?

ABRAHAM: Only that it's been continued again for additional discussion. So nothing new has been submitted. I think this is maybe the fifth continuance. This is a big issue that we're trying to work through.

AGUIRRE-VOGLER: Are we talking about the Greg Stanley, the manager? I'm asking about the impact fees.

LANGLITZ: Mr. Chair, Commissioner, if I may. You're referring to the new development fee study and the new fees that will be implemented. There were some recent discussions again. There's been a couple of objections. The Home Builders Association of Central Arizona still objects to the tiered approach for size – that the fees are based on four different sizes of residential properties - the larger the residential property, they more the fee goes up. The County has determined that they want to stick with that as recommended in the study, so that may be an issue that the

Board will address.

AGUIRRE-VOGLER: Excuse me, my question was he went out and gave a talk to a breakfast group.

LANGLITZ: Okay.

AGUIRRE-VOGLER: And I would like to more or less have him summarize that for us. That's all I really would like to know, if that could be possible. And my second question is, on this tentative – on tentative plats, why aren't these kind of held so these people don't have to sit through our whole meeting? Why aren't they put at the beginning of the list?

SALAS: Because the public comes to talk.

AGUIRRE-VOGLER: No, I just wondered why the plats are not – you know, they're so simple for us to forward, so I just wondered why they couldn't be put -

RIGGINS: I've been at one or two where they weren't that simple.

AGUIRRE-VOGLER: I just asked.

LANGLITZ: Mr. Chair, my only comment to the Commissioner is I was attempting to provide a summary, but I suppose if another person can provide a better summary, then so be it. I guess the request will be to ask Mr. Stanley if he has the time to make the personal appearance here, or perhaps whatever presentation he made, can be provided to the Commission Members, or maybe even read to the Commission

Members. Thank you Mr. Chair.

AGUIRRE-VOGLER: He does that every so often. He'll make a State of the County, so to say, State of the Union, State of the County, State of the State.

SALAS: Put it on the next agenda.

AGUIRRE-VOGLER: State of the County, and it can be put on that. That's my – it's been my request for the last few months. I don't – whenever he has the time.

DEL COTTO: Mr. Chairman?

RIGGINS: This is call to the Commission, just jump in.

DEL COTTO: If I could.

RIGGINS: Yeah.

DEL COTTO: Without overstepping my bounds once again in regards to what I talk about, so you guys can shut me up if you hear a word you don't like - we do have some issues still. I – now this is in regards to the RV thing that we just took a vote on.

LANGLITZ: Mr. Chair, yeah, let me interrupt the Commissioner. The problem with continuing the discussion on that, is that the public has the right to attend and listen to all the discussion. The matter has been voted on and it's over with, and all members of the public who were here would have the right to listen to any further discussions. So I – it's not that I'm trying to be mean, I'm just saying that the

discussion's cut off.

RIGGINS: Basically I can even take that. Public process at this point is really quite simple. The Board of Supervisors will hear it and they may decide to remand it back to us, it's always possible. At that point in time, we might schedule a work session to where we could just discuss it like crazy. But to carry it further at this point, really we can't. No.

AGUIRRE-VOGLER: But you're not going to talk about the case.

RIGGINS: But there's no –

AGUIRRE-VOGLER: (Inaudible) talk about the case.

RIGGINS: No, exactly –

DEL COTTO: (Inaudible).

RIGGINS: Exactly we're talking about a case, it was just in here. If he wants to talk about RVs, then he's talking about a case.

SALAS: You know what, discuss it with your partner over here (inaudible).

RIGGINS: Anything else? Yes, Commissioner Gutierrez.

GUTIERREZ: Yeah, Mr. Chair. Just a little announcement there. With a heavy heart, I got to announce that due to my work schedule and stuff, I talked to Steve Miller, my Board – my Supervisor, and he's going to find a

replacement for me.

HARTMAN: No.

GUTIERREZ: Yeah, and it's hard for me to (inaudible) talked to him previously and told him that if I wasn't going to be able to meet the obligation, it was going to be – you know, we would have a talk and stuff, and I think for the Commission's sake, I think it's better – it was a move we had to make and stuff. I really enjoyed my time here, learned a lot. Finally got to the point where I can understand what the heck's going on, you know, but it –

SALAS: They already caught Chapo.

GUTIERREZ: But the – just work obligations are taking me away a little more than I anticipated when I accepted the assignments, and so it's been a pleasure working with everybody and it's been great.

SALAS: (Inaudible).

GUTIERREZ: Well I told him – talking to my Supervisor, he's going to find – try to find a replacement. He's had some applications. I told him I'll cover – I'm here this month and next month, I think. So I told him I'd cover until he found a replacement and that's what he's working on at this – as we speak, so it's been a pleasure, and it's – learned a lot.

RIGGINS: Your participation and outlook will be missed.

GUTIERREZ: Well, in the years in the future maybe I'll be back, but right now it's just a – it was just – you know, my obligation to the Commission was that I would meet the commitment, and I just – my schedule may not permit that, so.

SALAS: It's been a pleasure.

GUTIERREZ: But it's been a pleasure. Thank you.

RIGGINS: Anything else? Vice Chair.

HARTMAN: Kent Taylor, Parks and Recreation gave a public presentation out in the Stanfield area about proposed BLM lands to be turned into a Pinal County Park that they're working towards, it's I think 23,000 acres over there, and it's going to be a multiuse park. It's going to have motorized trails, bike trails, horse trails, all different types of land uses involved in that acreage, and he gave, he gave his presentation to West Pinal NRCD. Now the rest of you – Scott knows what – who that is, but West Pinal is – West Pinal Natural Resource Conservation District, and we're – the Conservation District's concerned with our airs and waters and ability to use the land, so it was a good presentation and I just think that maybe Kent – maybe if this Commission wanted him to – Steve could ask him to maybe give that – a short presentation to the Commission on that so that you know what future uses of lands that are federal lands now -

RIGGINS: Didn't he just give us that? Didn't we

just hear that?

HARTMAN: No, that's another one.

RIGGINS: That's a different one. Okay.

HARTMAN: He gave you one. This is on the West Pinal.

RIGGINS: I'm sure he come in and talk to us.

SALAS: Where is that going to be located now?

HARTMAN: It's West Pinal. It's on the western boundaries of Pinal County, and part of that BLM land is in Maricopa County, and it's a long process, a real long process. But he did talk about some other lands to the eastern part of the County, but this – it's interesting. And there's another person, I can't think of her name right now, but she talks a long time, so we probably don't want to get her. She's the originator of it

AGUIRRE-VOGLER: So can, can we talk about the National Planning Conference?

HARTMAN: Oh, national convention.

AGUIRRE-VOGLER: How many can go?

ABRAHAM: Well I don't know. Right now I've got two Commissioners that – and that would be Chairman Scott and McD have right of first refusal to go this year, so -

RIGGINS: When exactly is it?

ABRAHAM: I don't know. Do you know –

AGUIRRE-VOGLER: Right here, it's April 2nd to the

5th.

ABRAHAM: Okay, April 2nd to the 5th, so –

AGUIRRE-VOGLER: Only two can go.

ABRAHAM: Well, I don't know the final number yet, but we've been on that Commissioner rotation and Scott gave up his seat last time, so he's got right of first refusal.

RIGGINS: I might go.

ABRAHAM: It should be in your planning magazines that you got.

RIGGINS: Yes. I might go to that, we'll see.

ABRAHAM: Okay. Registration's not due for a while here, so we're okay.

DEL COTTO: Chairman, are additional members allowed to go, or do we have to pay their own way?

ABRAHAM: Well if you wanted to go on your own, that would be fine. You could pay all the fees and everything. I think if the County was going to sponsor it, I'd have to see what our budget is.

GRUBB: Is there a possibility that we could attend without housing and commute? Is that –

ABRAHAM: That was what – for the – that was what I was going to tell us, that you'd have to get back and forth yourself on this one, since it's local. But yeah, if there's opportunities for other – more than two to go, then yeah you could get yourself there. That'd be fine.

HARTMAN: How much is the registration? I'm sure it showed in there.

ABRAHAM: Yeah, it's – I think it was about $700.

AGUIRRE-VOGLER: Oh my gosh.

RIGGINS: Whoa, really?

ABRAHAM: Yeah, national conferences are much longer than state ones.

RIGGINS: Okay.

HARTMAN: A lot of material.

ABRAHAM: Oh yeah.

RIGGINS: Anything else? Oh, I do have one observation to make. You know you all probably don't remember, but last month I did not have a book for the case, provided – the cases provided to me at all. You probably remember that, or don't. But just as further evidence of Steve Abraham's conspiracy to deprive me of information, a week after the meeting, he dead dropped my book and creosote 100 yards away from my driveway, so you know, it's kind of almost an admission of guilt. But other than that.

ABRAHAM: I'll talk to the person who – and it may have been one of your neighbors because we were able to (inaudible).

RIGGINS: I am kidding, but obviously it eventually showed up. So it was out there.

ABRAHAM: Well that's good to hear.

HARTMAN: Maybe a newspaper boy threw it.

GUTIERREZ: You know, (inaudible) departing and stuff, one of these things is going to be available and they sure are nice to have.

RIGGINS: I like (inaudible). Okay. Anything else? Okay, motion to adjourn?

??: (Inaudible).

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

??: Second.

RIGGINS: All in favor?

COLLECTIVE: Aye.

RIGGINS: Okay, we're done.

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

Julie A. Fish