

**MEETING NOTES OF THE
MARICOPA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS
PLANNERS STAKEHOLDERS GROUP**

Friday, March 29, 2002
MAG Office Building, Suite 200 Saguaro Room
302 North First Avenue, Phoenix

MEMBERS PRESENT

Wahid Alam, Mesa
James Carpentier, SRPMIC
Lynn Favour, Maricopa County
Jon Froke, Glendale
Phil Gardner, Peoria
Don Hadder, Sr., Scottsdale
Matt Holm, Maricopa County
Diana Kaminski, Tempe

Kristen Keener, DOC
Kate Langford, Glendale
Joy Mee, Phoenix
Hank Pluster, Chandler
Julie Romig, MCDOT
Ron Short, Glendale
Andy Smith, ADOT
Phil Testa, Surprise

OTHERS PRESENT

Anubhav Bagley, MAG
Michelle Green, MAG
Jack Tomasik, MAG

Rita Walton, MAG
Don Worley, MAG

1. **Regional Governance and State Trust Land Reform Updates**

Regional Governance

Michelle Green presented, stating that with respect to regional governance, a subcommittee of the management committee was formed to discuss the role of the executive committee its make-up and voting structure as well as the formation of a Transportation Policy Committee. The sub-committee is recommending to the management committee that, the executive committee membership be expanded by two members at large from regional council, that the voting structure remain the same, and that the composition of a Transportation Policy Committee be moved back to Regional Council for further direction. MAG Management Committee is meeting on April 10 to discuss the recommendations of the sub-committee, among other items.

State Trust Land Reform

The parties are back at the table discussing a preliminary framework that was put together by the chair of the group. This document will be discussed over the next

couple of months. The frequency of meetings has been reduced from weekly to perhaps every three weeks, at least until things settle down at the legislature. The next meeting of this group is April 29th.

2. **September 2002 Official Projections & Database Review**

Jack Tomasik led a short discussion about MAG's official sub-county projections.

There is a dilemma arising because Arizona DES is having problems with the county-level projections, which need to be approved by the State POPTAC prior to MAG and other Councils of Governments beginning the sub-county projections. Originally due to be adopted in January 2002, DES is now on a schedule for May 2002. As of April 18, 2002, there has been no word about the projections from DES.

The lateness of county projections is holding back sub-county projections, which are needed both by member agencies and MAG for a number of studies and plans.

The dilemma is that MAG is scheduled to adopt the official sub-county projections in September 2002. In prior years, the slowest part of the projection process has been the prompt return and complete feedback by member agencies. We are requesting that all member agencies do their best to shorten their review and feedback time in order to avoid too much iteration of draft projections prior to final projections.

MAG Information Services has distributed a CD to all member agency POPTAC representatives. This contains information for the year 2000 (minimum projection) and build-out (maximum) projection. Each member agency can use this CD to review assumptions and provide feedback to correct those.

We cannot emphasize enough the importance of this review, which alone can shorten the iterative review and feedback process of draft projections.

Jack also asked senior planners of MAG member agencies to review the assumptions and projections for their jurisdiction. Since MAG several member agency departments use projections (e.g., planning, water resources, economic development, transportation, etc), he requested that Planners Stakeholders Group members distribute draft MAG projections and assumptions to other city departments.

3. **Planner Stakeholders Group Discussion – MAG Regional Development Mission Statement**

At the March 1 2002 PSG meeting, we discussed a number of ideas about how to make the MAG Planners Stakeholders Group a more effective body. A number of issues were discussed, but that meeting concluded with a consensus that the

best starting point is to develop a new mission statement for the Regional Development Division. There was general consensus that the mission statement should combine the reality that there is no authority for regional planning, but that it may be possible to move towards informal, but effective joint planning at the regional and community levels.

Jack Tomasik opened the discussion by reviewing the current MAG Regional Development Division Mission Statement. A great deal of discussion ensued, and every member agency represented in the meeting contributed. At discussion conclusion, planning directors were asked to volunteer for a short-term task force that would develop a mission statement(s) to be reviewed via email by all PSG members prior to the April 26 2002 meeting. The following attendees volunteered for that task force:

- James Carpentier, SRP-MIC
- Don Hadder, Scottsdale
- Diana Kaminski, Tempe
- Andy Smith, ADOT

The following text is a summary of the mission statement discussion, organized by themes that emerged:

MAG desire for action – “informal, but effective, regional planning by member agency planners and MAG Regional Development”

- Figure out how we can work to solve regional issues under the rules we are currently working under.

Information

- Promote education and understanding and also promoting solutions to those problems by providing information.

Focus on physical development

- We cannot solve everything. We need to focus on physical development that has some social components. However, really need to focus and understand the broader ramifications, recognizing that we cannot solve everything.
- Physical development is a good way to describe it. The language needs to be more direct. Concern with the terms social equity and regional approach because I am not sure that is the way we are going

Understanding vs. action

- Promoting the understanding of how physical development affects the other things such as social equity etc.
- Skip the understanding because this group understands. We need to come up with the approaches that work best for everyone.
- Promoting understanding does not have an action orientation to it
- I would like to see action and assistance

Sharing strategies and approaches

- I agree with that but we are not set up that way
- I agree we are not set up to do and create a regional structure but we can share strategies and then maybe we can get those in the positions of power to act on that if we could agree on that then we would be way ahead
- We share ideas and strategies but we do not do true regional planning. Approaches and strategies insinuate that we have agreed on a regional approach but sharing information is valuable
- Sharing is important

Identify regional issues that we can plan together

- Sharing information is one thing but isn't the purpose to plan together? Educating ourselves should not be the focus. Presumably we are all educated to some level we should plan together
- We need to find the problems that can be solved more efficiently regionally to everybody's benefit. Identify those things that improve the ability to find better solutions and cooperate.

Coordinate our planning efforts/collaborate

- Maybe if we can't plan then we can work on coordinating our efforts
- Developer working the county to avoid impact fees maybe we could cooperate on issues like that
- Federal agencies should be involved as well as state agencies, other regional agencies, and MAG member agencies
- Collaboration with member agencies to achieve consensus – that seems to be the mission of this type of group. Indeed, there is no power here so we can talk amongst ourselves and work from there. Right now this is about as much as we can do, so let's get on with collaboration and work together and make some decisions about what we want to work on.

Focus on issues that we share

- Everything regional does not have an impact on every jurisdiction. Some things will affect some jurisdictions more than others.
- Possibly one of our focuses should be on something that we share

Successful model – repeat with regional transportation plan

- Let's look back to a model – the open spaces plan. A consultant team put together a plan cooperating with a variety of issues local input happened and then it went to regional council. Everybody likes open space even the development community was on line with it.
- The next big issue is the long range transportation plan we are going to be moving a lot more people around this valley this is going to get more difficult. This in particular crosses jurisdictional boundaries. People may not realize it but they are going from city to city
- We are the folks that need to be working on the transportation and land use issues. If we don't, who will?

Top down vs. bottom up

- What does regional council think?
- It seems as though the stakeholder group attempts to identify regional issues that can be addressed in order to generate ideas and, possibly, solutions that are then taken back to the individual jurisdictions and/or forwarded to the management and regional council. This seems to set the group up for a type of guessing game about the council's needs. As such, I would recommend using more of a top down approach whereby the regional council identifies the issues that they want our group to address. That way, we can be more productive in terms of working on issues and solutions that the regional council would be more willing to embrace, instead of us trying to set the agenda.
- State Growing Smarter Oversight Council has had some serious discussions regarding the lack of power. Maybe down the road there will be the political will to change it but it is a challenge. Working together is good.

4. City of Glendale General Plan Update

Jon Froke, Planning Director for the City of Glendale introduced Ron Short and Kate Langford to present the City of Glendale general plan entitled, *Glendale 2025: The Next Step*. A copy of the presentation is attached.

Questions/Comments

You are trying to get a better balance of land use by focusing on employment uses but what do you say to applicants who come in with the argument that employment uses are not financially feasible, the only way they can develop the property from a financial perspective is if they do residential development. They argue that if the City does not permit the residential then it amounts to a taking without compensation.

They are shown how important these areas are to the City as a whole. In a sense, we have learned from previous projects. Arrowhead ranch as an example, used to have employment associated with it but it was allowed to rezone and develop as mostly residential with some commercial uses. We need to be able to stand our ground for what we know is right for the City. Additionally, the amendment process identifies areas and sizes that trigger amendments. This guidance from the plan will be very helpful.

Do you allow any high-density development within this category?

Yes but the percentage is limited to and also Planned Area Developments (PADs) are allowing other uses but no more than 15% of the area can be used for housing.

Is there anything that limits what can go into these areas?

No.

Do you have any annexations policies?

We need to do cost benefit analysis to make sure that an annexation makes sense from a fiscal perspective. Our major concern right now is that we have a land use pattern that is compatible with Luke. We do not want to annex right now because frankly, we cannot afford it.

Until yesterday, annexations were handled by engineering. Now, our department will handle them. We are in the process of preparing a draft annexation policy to deal with the western area. I would also like to point out that the amendment section also addresses the availability of infrastructure.

What about Luke?

SB1525 lists the type of land use that would be appropriate for this area. It is about 15 square miles.

Ron Short finished the presentation by inviting the Planners Group to the groundbreaking for the new Coyotes arena on March 3 between 1-3pm.

5. **Next Meeting**

The next Planners Stakeholders Group meeting will be held on April 26, 2002 at 1pm.