MEETING MINUTES

Economic Development Advisory Board
Mesa Center for Higher Education
First Floor Conference Room
245 W. 2nd Street
Mesa, AZ 85201

Date: July 9, 2014 **Time:** 7:30 A.M.

MEMBERS PRESENT
James Christensen
Tony Ham
Jeff Pitcher
Steve Shope
Laura Snow
Jo Wilson

EX-OFFICIO
Mayor Alex Finter (excused)
Chris Brady (excused)
Rich Adams
Brian Campbell
Jeff Crockett
Sally Harrison

STAFF PRESENT
Bill Jabjiniak
Andrew Clegg
Kenneth Chapa
Karen McNulty

MEMBERS ABSENT
Mitzi Montoya (excused)

GUESTS

---

1. **Chair's Call to Order**

   Chair Laura Snow called the July 9, 2014, meeting of the Economic Development Advisory Board to order at 7:35 A.M. at the Mesa Center for Higher Education, First Floor Conference Room, 245 W. 2nd Street, Mesa, AZ 85201.

2. **Items from Citizens Present**

   None.

3. **Approval of Minutes from June 3, 2014**

   Chair Laura Snow called for a motion to approve the minutes from the meeting held on **June 3, 2014**.

   MOTION: Jo Wilson moved the minutes from June 3, 2014, be approved as presented.
   SECOND: Steve Shope
   DECISION: Passed unanimously.

4. **Discuss and possibly take action on General Plan Major Amendment application:**
   - GP Major 14-01 – Longbow located at the NWC of McDowell Road and Higley Road

   Bill Jabjiniak set the background prior to the discussions on GP Major 14-01 and GP Major 14-02. Over the last year,the Boar d discussed the fact that we would like to see EDAB play a bigger role as it relates to Economic Development projects along the way. As these two particular General Plan amendments came forward the Planning staff asked for EDAB's input. It was a general outreach. The official 60-day public comment period runs from Monday, June 9, 2014 through August 4, 2014. What is immediately important is to view the presentation, gather a consensus, make a recommendation and pen a letter of support or non-support. This is a chance to give input on Economic Development Projects. What is also important is that your voice is being heard.

   Kenneth Chapa, Project Manager, Office of Economic Development provided a presentation to review the application provided to the Board for review. The request is to amend the existing 305 acres, located to the east of the Boeing plant and the northeast of Falcon Field (to the south across McDowell Road is the Apache

Wells neighborhood), land use designation from Business Park (BP) and Community Commercial (CC) to Mixed Use/Residential (MU/R).

This proposal is in conflict with the General Plan as the property is located in one of the four identified growth areas.Re sidential development is discouraged in these areas as it impacts the ability to attract high quality-high value employers.

Question – Brian Campbell inquired if the entire 305 acre parcel is included in the MU/R application or just a portion?

Response – Ken Chapa advised the entire 305 acre parcel is included in the MU/R application.

Question – Steve Shope inquired how this impacts the noise abatement issues for Falcon Field.

Response – Ken Chapa advised that currently there is an FAA regulation that prohibits residential from being constructed within the 65 day/nights noise contour of the airport. A portion of the southwest parcel fits within this contour.

Comment – Bill Jabjiniak noted the application, as written, includes the entire parcel as MU/R.

Question – Steve Shope inquired if this application would conflict with federal law.

Response – Ken Chapa advised he did not see anything specifically regarding the flight patterns in the application; however, there was specific language from the FAA regarding noise contours.

Question – Laura Snow inquired if the noise complaints that currently exist are within or outside the noise contours?

Response – Bill Jabjiniak advised the current complaints are coming from all areas around Falcon Field.

Question – Brian Campbell inquired if there are any studies supporting the need for more residential housing in this area?

Response – Ken Chapa advised he did not see supporting documents for more residential housing in the application.

Question – Rich Adams inquired if there are any potential employers that may have stated the reason for not selecting Mesa was due to lack of workforce housing?

Response – Bill Jabjiniak advised there have not been discussions regarding lack of workforce housing with any of the employers. Discussions are focused more on quality workforce versus workforce housing.

Comment – Tony Ham noted the application is for Mixed Use/Residential for the entire site, we know that in the flight path we cannot do that. We cannot go forward with the entire 305 acres to be used as Mixed Use/Residential.

Response – Bill Jabjiniak advised that EDAB are not the technical planners, but are to offer input from an Economic Development perspective. The planners have to take that piece out of it. EDAB has been asked to provide public comment based on what was submitted, not what could be or what has to change. The Planning staff focused on the technical side. EDAB is to focus on an Economic Development perspective; what do we have for employment opportunities, where are we going to put employees and future employers going forward. This is on a big scale. EDAB is aware of what complaints exist regarding Falcon Field, we have read what's in the news, and we have heard other presentations. Mr. Jabjiniak advised the charge to EDAB is to give input to the Planning Board,Co uncil and the Mayor.

Question – Steve Shope inquired if Boeing has made an official position on this application?

Response – Bill Jabjiniak advised the applicant has met with Boeing; however, Mr. Jabjiniak has not yet seen an official position from Boeing.

Laura Snow reviewed the concerns voiced from the Board:

- Setting precedence by changing the land use that would permit the residential encroachment onto the business center.
- Possible noise complaints
- No supporting documentation for the demand for workforce housing

Comment – Jeff Crockett expressed gratitude that the Economic Development Advisory Board is being recognized and visible to provide input on applications. Mr. Crockett expressed concerns regarding housing in future potential employment centers, current and potential additional noise complaint effects on the airport, and understanding the landowner's position to put this parcel to use.

Comment – Rich Adams expressed concerns regarding housing in airport areas, preserving the economic opportunities the airport presents,an d expressed understanding for landowner's position to put this parcel to use.

Question – Bill Jabjiniak inquired if the Falcon Sub-Area Plan has been addressed?

Response – Ken Chapa advised there are some references in his memo being prepared that reinforces much of the information put forth in the 2025 General Plan as well as reinforcing Falcon Field as an employment center and discouraging residential use.

Comment – Bill Jabjiniak noted the Falcon Sub Area Plan was done years ago. What is important is there was a major focus around the Falcon Field area. That continues today, which is the reason the Mayor has appointed a Falcon Strategic Visioning Commission to make sure that economic engines continue. It is all a part of the General Plan and the Falcon Sub-Plan; there is still a lot of emphasis in and around this area. This is a major piece of the puzzle. There is economic activity in other parts of the City; now we are working to drive more to the Falcon Field area. The market has changed in the past few years; office market has dried up in some areas, floor plates and prices have changed. This is an opportunity to make our position known.

Comment – Tony Ham expressed concern regarding the Falcon Field and Boeing airports, the future of economic opportunities, and the landowner's position to put the parcel to use.

MOTION: Steve Shope moved to authorize Chair Laura Snow to submit a letter to the Planning and Zoning Board on behalf of the Economic Development Advisory Board stating the Board's position to not support the application for the following reasons:

1) Encroachment on the Falcon Field and Boeing airports as economic drivers within the City.
2) Potential for noise complaints that may constrict activity at the airports.
3) Lack of demonstration and support for the need of workforce housing.
4) Loss of valuable commercial property in a viable economic development area.
5) Reference the conflicts with the Falcon Area Plan or the existing General Plan.
6) Offer to work with the property owner to identify different approaches to successfully develop the property.

SECOND: Jo Wilson
DECISION: Passed unanimously.

5. **<u>Discuss and possibly take action on General Plan Major Amendment application:</u>**
   - GP Major 14-02 – Mesa 38 located at the NWC of Crismon Road and US60

Kenneth Chapa, Project Manager, Office of Economic Development,pr ovided a presentation regarding the request to amend the existing Land Use Designation from Business Park (BP) to Medium Density Residential 6 – 10 dwelling units per acre (MDR6-10) on 25+ acres and Community Commercial (CC) on 13+ acres.

This conflicts specifically with the Mesa 2025 General Plan under objectives Land Use 4.1 and Land Use 5.1. These objectives provide guidelines that land adjacent to freeways and other large transportation areas should be used for large scale non-residential uses. There is a lack of and limited amount of developable and visible land adjacent to freeways in Mesa that is not residential. This property has direct access to a medical office

park and medical center that could help lure new businesses into the area that will need access to the medical center and offices. It could also help lure new businesses that would need direct access to the freeway without going through residential areas. In addition, the City would lose the opportunity to build high profile business park companies that would have visibility from the US60, as well as the opportunity to enhance the medical center.

Question – Steve Shope inquired as to the statement of the property owner.
Response – Ken Chapa advised that the property owner believes that there is an excess of business park space already in the area and the inability to move the property as a business park is an example of the land not being used properly.

Question – Jeff Pitcher inquired as to the split of the property for the residential and community commercial.
Response – Ken Chapa advised the property would be split as 13 acres of community commercial and 25 acres of residential.

Question – Jeff Pitcher inquired as to the uses of the commercial site.
Response – Ken Chapa advised the commercial site primarily will be retail, some service centers, with potential for some office space.

Question – Jeff Pitcher requested confirmation that the application would exchange high value business park employment use for retail and residential use.
Response - Ken Chapa confirmed.

Question – Brian Campbell inquired if IASIS has issued a position statement on 14-02.
Response – Bill Jabjiniak advised a statement has not yet been submitted. They have indicated they are in the process of writing a statement.

Question – Brian Campbell inquired if there is any noise abatement on that stretch of the US60.
Response – Ken Chapa advised there are none known.

Comment – Brian Campbell expressed concern regarding noise complaints from the US60 and the possibility of losing a valuable property for the healthcare initiative.

Question – Rich Adams inquired how many more parcels are left along the US60.
Response – Ken Chapa advised it is a rare commodity; there is less than a handful.

Comment – Jeff Crockett expressed concern in support of changing the designation of this property to residential.

Question – Rich Adams inquired as to the potential in terms of numbers of jobs that this parcel could produce.
Response – Bill Jabjiniak advised according to the applicant's estimate the number would be 637.

Comment – Laura Snow recapped the discussion and concerns:

- This parcel's adjacent location to the US60 - the visibility for potential businesses, the highway access and potential noise issues;
- Direct access to the medical campus;
- The role the healthcare initiative is playing with economic development within the City of Mesa;
- Potential with crossing business park traffic with residential traffic ; and
- Trade-off high value employment jobs that could fit in a business park environment compared to the trade-off of potentially lower level retail type jobs that would be in a business community commericial spot.

MOTION: Jo Wilson moved to authorize Chair Laura Snow to submit a letter to the Planning and Zoning Board on behalf of the Economic Development Advisory Board stating the Board's position to not support the application for the following reasons:

1. Given this parcel's adjacent location to the US60 - the visibility for potential businesses, the highway access and potential noise issues;
2. Direct access to the medical campus;

3. The role the healthcare initiative is playing with economic development within the City of Mesa;
4. Potential with crossing business park traffic with residential traffic; and
5. Trade-off high value employment jobs that could fit in a business park environment compared to the trade-off of potentially lower level retail type jobs that would be in a business community commercial spot.

SECOND: Steve Shope
DECISION: Passed unanimously.

6. Other Business

A. Next EDAB meeting - August 5.

B. Bill Jabjiniak encouraged the Board to stay engaged and participate with the upcoming meetings pertaining to these applications.

1. All comments are due to the City of Mesa Planning Division by August 4, 2014 by 5:00 P.M.
2. The Mesa Planning and Zoning Board will conduct a special meeting on the proposed amendment on August 27, 2014, at 5:30 P.M. at the City of Mesa Fire Station, 216 Community Room, 7966 E McDowell Rd, Mesa AZ 85207.
3. The Planning and Zoning Board will also hold a public hearing on September 17, 2014 in the Mesa City Council Chambers, located at 57 East First Street.
4. The Mesa City Council is tentatively scheduled to consider the proposed General Plan Amendments on October 20, 2014 at 5:45 P.M. in the Mesa City Council Chambers.

7. Adjournment

Chair Snow adjourned the Board meeting at 8:32 A.M.

Submitted By:

William J. Jabjiniak
Economic Development Department Director
(Prepared by Beth Ann Moore)