Houghton Area Master Plan (HAMP)
Citizen's Review Committee
Meeting Summary of August 12, 2003

CRC members attending: Dale Calvert, Sarah Craighead, Sheila Enos, Margaret Fowler, John Grabo, Margie Hildebrand, Curtis Lueck, Suzanne Miles, Tony Novelli, Frank Salbego, Thomas Sayler-Brown, Jeff Simms, Michael Tone, Ken Abrahams, Sandie Jacobson, Linda Morales, Peggy Nolty, Suzanne Bott.

CRC members absent: John Macko, Peter Backus, Brent Davis, Mark Frederickson, Carl Maass, Ray Schneider, Roy Schoonover, James/Betty Shinn, Frank Wilczek, Lex McGraw, Cathy Rex, Phil Swaim.

Technical Advisory Team members attending: Mark Crum.

Interested Parties attending: Marcus Sorgatz, Michelle Wright, Marcia Bauman, Rick Norworthy, Jorge Ortiz.

Opening

Facilitator Freda Johnson opened the meeting at 6:09 PM. She led a round of introductions, and then reviewed the ground rules. She invited guests to fill out "Observer Comment Forms" distributed at the meeting. She then asked for comments or corrections to the July meeting summary. By general agreement, the summary was accepted as distributed. .

Presentation by Michael Wyneken on an Overview of the HAMP project.

Michael presented a handout of a draft of the project overview. He explained that several factors had created a delay in the original project timeline. There has been staff turnover and re-organization, and consultants and resources had just recently been obtained. The original project deadlines still apply, as listed in the Overview, but the CRC work will be condensed.

Michael presented the role of the CRC. As described in the handout: "The role of the CRC is to review the information presented them by the staff and provide comment. The comments will be taken under advisement by the staff and analyzed within the context of the General Plan and the overall purpose of the HAMP."

Michael explained that the membership structure of the CRC, as determined by Mayor and Council, was that of registered Neighborhood Associations, appointees from Wards, and individuals and professionals who represent a broad spectrum of issues and interests in the city. Attempting to change this structure would require approval from Mayor and Council, and would take staff time and resources away from the project, so he does not recommend it. However for the purpose of including input from guests attending the CRC meetings, he has provided a pink sign-up sheet. People on this sheet will be

provided all previous information and future mailings that the CRC has received, in a binder. In addition, those who sign up as "Interested Parties" will be included in CRC activities and discussions.

As delineated on the timeline handout, Michael briefly described the phases of concurrent or overlapping areas of work. He proposed that there be a hiatus from meetings until November. During this time the staff and the Technical Advisory Team will prepare information on drainage, roadways, and the parks, recreation and open space component. After CRC review and comment, there are several processes , including public hearings before the Planning Commission and Mayor and Council –prior to final approval by Mayor and Council.

Ken Abrams asked what role the CRC has in alternative land use plans? Michael responded that when the staff has drainage diagrams, and the framework of buildable area, it was possible the CRC could develop some alternative roadway and park plans. Michael expressed some concern about whether this could be done in a large group – perhaps smaller groups could work on focus areas.

Margie Hildebrand asked if the HAMP was taking into account pygmy owl and archeological site considerations. Michael responded that the plan did not extend to that level. Future developers will be required to address those issues, as they propose development.

A CRC member asked about the land auction status. Michael responded that that is a separate process and he asked Greg Keller to update the CRC. Greg Keller from the State Land Dept (SLD) stated that the parcel includes approximately1500 acres, and is located east of Houghton Road and north of Valencia Road. The parcel is still scheduled for auction in the current fiscal year, which ends June 30, 2004. - The State Land Commissioner will have final say on any issues related to the auction.

Tony Novelli asked about the profit motive in land sale, and stated that delaying the sale until HAMP was complete would seem appropriate. Greg responded that the SLD was attempting to balance the Land Department's fiduciary duty to the Trust, and The City's master planning effort.

Ken Abrahams asked whether the Desert Village concept was a requirement. Michael responded that it was, because it is part of the General Plan adopted by Mayor and Council, and ratified by the voters.

Suzanne Bott asked about the other parcel of land being bought by Wolfswinkel. That parcel includes approximately 1100 acres, and is located west of Houghton between Valencia and Irvington Roads. Greg Keller responded that the sale is still in litigation and it is impossible to predict anything. He agreed to provide a monthly update on this.

Michael returned to his presentation and briefly explained how buildable area is identified through floodplain mapping, drainage analysis, etc. Ken Abrahams commented

that this is a complex drainage system. Michael agreed. The system includes wide and shallow washes and some sheet flow areas.

Joanne Hershenhorn was introduced as the staff hydrologist. She confirmed that drainage and floodplain issues need to be examined first, then roadway alignments can be identified. This will provide information about the buildable area and open space. Stormwater detention is a major aspect; also where can waterways be kept natural and where they need to be channelized. She will be working with Transportation Stormwater staff and a consultant to develop cost estimates and alternatives.

A visitor had a question for Joanne about 404 jurisdictional issues (pollutants and dredge/fill) in the drainage analysis. She responded that this level of detail comes later. [CPTF Staff would like to follow up on this. The federal Clean Water Act (CWA) requires that permits be obtained from the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers for all construction activities that will occur in the Nation's waters. Section 404 of the CWA requires that permits be issued for the discharge of dredged or fill material into the "waters of the United States." When a development proposal is submitted for review, the Development Standards and Policies (specifically, the Floodplain Management Ordinance) require that the developer obtain all necessary permits, including a Section 404 permit if construction activities will result in the placement of dredged or fill materials into the "waters of the United States." This type of review is site-specific and the permit application must be based on specific details of the site development proposal.]

Jeff Simms had a question about water recharge in the project area. Joanne responded that this study would not be addressing water supply issues.
Tony Novelli stated that not dealing with it now seems to be avoiding responsibility. He stated that we have the ability and technology to incorporate recharge into the plans now. Joanne responded that most significant recharge happens in major water courses. [CPTF staff would like to follow up on this. Based on further discussions after the meeting, the was clarified to be water harvesting. The City currently handles water harvesting as a site-specific Development Standard. Development proposals are reviewed for compliance with this provision of the Land Use Code (LUC). The LUC requires that "Grading, hydrology and landscape plans are to be integrated to make maximum use of site storm water runoff for supplemental on-site irrigation purposes. The landscape plan shall indicate use of all runoff, from individual catch basins around single trees to basins accepting flow from entire vehicular use area or roof area." In addition, the City recently completed a Water Harvesting Guidance Manual (June 2003). This Manual has not been brought before Mayor and Council yet, so it is considered to be in draft form. It is envisioned that after adoption, the Development Standards will be revised to incorporate the information in the Water Harvesting Manual.]

Ken Abrahams asked whether this would be a Master Planned Community, and whether the CRC could take field trips to see examples in the Phoenix area. Michael responded that staff resources for field trips are not at this time, and that the need was to focus on local examples.

Tony Novelli asked about the final product, and whether the process was flexible. Michael responded that as land is sold in the HAMP area, a refining process will happen through the capital improvements process, and the development review process.

Tony asked further if the CRC is supposed to be a "safety buffer" review process, and a negotiation process. Michael responded yes and no – that the HAMP policies would be applied to developments. The HAMP, once adopted, will become a specific (area) plan for the HAMP area. The HAMP Process is similar to other area plan processes, although the area is much larger than most.

Frank Salbego stated that he is hearing questions pertaining to earlier meeting topics, and asked that the presentation by Michael continue.

Michael Tone asked if HAMP will replace current plans for the area? Michael W. stated yes. Michael T. asked what happens if the CRC has disagreements with staff recommendations. Can the CRC have a minority opinion? Michael W confirmed that the staff will produce the plan and the CRC's role is to comment, but that he hopes most issues can be resolved or worked through. Members of the CRC who strongly disagree can approach the Mayor and Council as individuals. [CPTF staff would like to provide additional comment on this issue. If there is an unresolvable difference of opinion between staff and numerous CRC members on an issue, or issues, and if there is CRC consensus that the "dissenting" position should be included in the staff communications to the Planning Commission and the Mayor and Council, then they will be included. If the difference of opinion is held only by one or two individuals, without CRC consensus, then those individuals will be free to address the Planning Commission and the Mayor and Council as individuals, and their individual opinions will not be included in staff communications. Many issues that came up at the August meeting have been raised before, and the staff has responded in writing. Attached to this summary are staff responses, from March, to many common questions.]

Michael W. continued with his presentation. He proposed possible longer meetings in fall and winter to deal with the large amount of information that will be forthcoming.

Ken Abrahams asked about developing a matrix of priorities in the CRC. Michael responded that staff will provide the CRC with additional guidance related to the Desert Village concept and the level of detail anticipated for the HAMP. A guest asked about a work breakdown schedule. Michael responded that other than the engineering type tasks, the other policy issues change too frequently or are too dependent on others to be broken down in detail.

Ken Abrahams asked if the CRC could see other master plans in detail. Michael responded that staff have been in contact with planners in Peoria, but their General Plan is different, and that more than half of the May CRC meeting was devoted to discussing master plans from the Phoenix area. The CRC was provided copies of those master plans

by Gregg Keller. In addition, Gregg explained in detail the SLD planning process for Trust lands, and he provided copies of the SLD conceptual plan for the HAMP area..

Michael Tone pointed out that the July and August meetings had been cancelled by staff, although the CRC held the July time for outside presentations, and now September and October were also cancelled. He wanted to know how much input the CRC will be able to give in such a short time left. He asked if it would be possible for the CRC to meet on its own in the interim. Michael responded that the information being devloped for the CRC will form the basis for the planning.

Ken Abrahams asked if an email listserve existed or could be created for the CRC. Michael responded that an earlier decision by the City, based on equity issues, was to not provide a listserve, because some members do not have email; In addition, he added that he believe it is important that all business be conducted at the meetings, so that all CRC members and interested parties can participate and benefit.

Dale Calvert stated he believe there was no point in the CRC meeting on its own until the staff has provided the plans for the CRC to comment on, and that he foresaw very intense work from November through January.

Margie Hildebrand expressed frustration that the CRC would mainly focus on the Desert Village concept, and she would prefer a bigger role. Michael stated the Desert Village is the basis for the planning in the HAMP area.

Jeff Simms expressed agreement with the idea of the CRC meeting in the interim, to get to know each other and understand individual priorities.

Ken Abrams agreed and pointed out that in order to be a good reviewer, a member needs to know about marketplace requirements – what homebuyers want.

Suzanne Bott agreed on interim meetings, and was interested in doing field trips.

Frank Salbego asked if the CRC could be informed about who is bidding or planning to bid on state land parcels. Greg responded that that information is not known until the day of the auction. Greg added that consensus of this group is important.

John Grabo mentioned the availability of videos of best practices, and that this would contribute to being a good reviewer.

Margie Hildebrand asked if HAMP would apply to parcels that are auctioned off. Michael responded that they would if the HAMP has been approved by the Mayor and Council prior to the submittal of a development plan .

Michael W. returned to his presentation and finished by introducing members of his staff who were present: Roger Howlett, Maria Gayosso de Bends, Mary Szczepanski, Barbara

Hayes, Joanne Hershenhorn, Elizabeth Livingston and Gary Oaks. Sarah More, Rafael Sebba and Nicole Ewing were introduced but were not present.

Call to the audience

Freda asked for questions or comments from the audience. A guest replied that she had felt ignored although she'd had her hand up several times. Another guest replied that she hadn't gotten the information she had requested at the last meeting, and wanted to know how she would be notified if the CRC meets independently. Freda confirmed with Michael that notebooks would be delivered within a week to all interested parties.

Suzanne Bott asked if someone would volunteer to lead the next meeting. Freda asked if the CRC was asking staff to be responsible for room arrangements, and whether the CRC wanted Michael to attend. It was agreed that the meeting would be open to anyone.

The meeting was adjourned at 8:07 p.m.