



NOTES

Transportation Development Impact Fee Study Stakeholder Meeting #3

Date: 02/17/2021

Time: 1:00 pm

1. Attendees:

- Martin Lucero (City of Surprise Lead/Transportation Planning)
- Lloyd Abrams (City of Surprise Community Development)
- Stacie Cameron (City of Surprise Finance)
- Brandi Flores (City of Surprise Finance)
- Kristin Tytler (City of Surprise Public Works)
- Dana Owsiany (City of Surprise Engineering)
- Eric Boyles (City of Surprise Procurement)
- Ben Griffin (TischlerBise)
- Michael Grandy (Kimley-Horn)
- Lynndsay O'Neill (Maricopa County Department of Transportation)
- Keith Morphis (Maricopa County Department of Transportation)
- Jackson Moll (Home Builders Association of Central Arizona)
- Chris Anaridian (Bergin, Frakes, Smalley & Oberholtzer)
- Jeffrey Blilie (Beus Gilbert McGroder)
- Chris Webb (Rose Law Group)
- Tom Abraham (Fulton Homes)
- Hans Koppenhoefer (Courtland Homes)
- Stefanie Cerie (HomeSmart)
- Liz Recchia (WeSERV)

2. Infrastructure Improvements Plan (IIP) Options

- Ben presented three potential options for revising the draft IIP that was advertised 12/2/20:
 - i. Plan-based with ultimate improvements but at fewer locations than the draft advertised IIP
 - ii. Incremental expansion to add the inside two lanes and raised medians on Parkways and Major Arterials
 - iii. Plan-based with focus on non-developable land (State Trust, Flood Control, Bureau of Reclamation) and regional crossings (canal and drainageway bridges, at-grade railroad)
- These three revised IIP options were developed in response to comments from stakeholders that the draft advertised IIP created

“winners and losers” as there’s overlap between the half street requirements and the IIP.

- The third option, the plan-based IIP with a focus on non-developable land and regional crossings, was identified by the City as the most viable option of those presented. Michael presented a map showing the locations of non-developable land and regional crossings.

3. Consolidation of Development Impact Fee Service Areas

- Michael explained that the draft advertised IIP service areas followed the boundaries of the City’s Special Planning Areas (SPAs) 1, 2, 3, and the southern portion of SPA 4 (known as 4A). With some improvements being right on the boundary of those SPAs or on one side of the SPA boundary but mostly benefiting those on the other side of the SPA boundary, it was decided that a consolidation of service areas was warranted. Three new service areas were created as follows:
 - i. South: SPA 1 + south SPA 3
 - ii. North: SPA 2 + SPA 4A
 - iii. West: SPA 3 - south SPA 3

4. Priority Improvements in Each Service Area

- Michael presented the proposed priority improvements in each of the service areas, which can be summarized as being:
 - i. South: Regional crossings, non-developable land, Jackrabbit Trail and connections to the east
 - ii. North: Pat Tillman Blvd, 139th Ave, Happy Valley Rd, Lone Mountain Rd, 187th Ave, regional crossings, and non-developable land
 - iii. West: Deer Valley Rd, non-developable land, and regional crossings
- Michael presented tables showing the proposed improvements in each service area and their associated cost. Michael also presented a map of the proposed revised IIP.

5. Revised IIP

- Ben reviewed the preliminary gross fees for the South (\$5,061), North (\$5,429), and West (\$6,877) impact fee service areas.



6. Next Steps

- Ben reviewed the next steps in the project schedule, which include a public hearing on the land use assumptions and draft IIP in Spring 2021. Adoption of the IIP and associated impact fees is anticipated to take place in Summer and Fall 2021 such that the impact fees can go into effect in Winter 2021.

7. Stakeholder Roundtable Discussion

- Martin thanked the stakeholders for their attendance and indicated that the stakeholder presentation would be posted on the project website for easy access by stakeholders for review. Lloyd requested that all comments be provided to the City no later than 2/22/21.
- Initial comments provided by stakeholders included the following:
 - Jackson and Chris A. both mentioned that they didn't see how improving Jackrabbit Parkway south of Bell Road would benefit the portion of the South service area east of the Beardsley Canal/McMicken Dam.
 - Chris A. mentioned that, in his view, the Arizona State Land Department (ASLD) is basically a developer, and that having roads built that provide access to their properties increases the value of those properties. Including projects in the IIP that benefit ASLD is not equitable for the rest of the development community.
 - *Question:* Jackson and Chris A. asked if proposed improvements along State Land, or that would primarily benefit State Land, should be considered eligible for the IIP because State law says the improvements have to be under the jurisdiction of the City and provide regional benefit. *Response:* The City will check with Legal staff regarding if improvements outside City limits can be included in the IIP.
 - *Question:* Hans asked when the draft IIP report would be available. *Response:* The plan is to provide the draft IIP by 3/1/21 as long as there are no comments that require adjustments to the IIP.
 - *Question:* Jackson asked what components were included in the impact fee. *Response:* The impact fee includes design, construction, and construction administration costs associated with improvements that increase capacity.
 - *Question:* Hans asked how reimbursement will happen for previously paid in-lieu fees. *Response:* Reimbursement will

be addressed in accordance with State statutes that apply regarding when the fees were paid.

- *Question:* Jackson asked if the City has talked to ASLD about sequencing of development of State Land. *Response:* The City has talked with ASLD. They have not provided any firm plans for development, but there are likely three areas where the potential is high for new development: SPA 2, SPA 3 North, and SPA 3 South.
- *Question:* Chris A. asked if any State Land has been annexed by the City. *Response:* There are some State Land parcels that have been annexed north of Sun Valley Parkway, along parts of Deer Valley Road, and along Happy Valley Road.
- *Question:* Chris A. asked if the City has done infrastructure improvement projects on State Land as part of a pre-annexation agreement. *Response:* No, but the City has required developments to acquire roadway right-of-way/easement through State Land if needed to provide adequate site access (e.g., Rancho Ricardo).
- *Question:* Are improvements on Deer Valley Road needed from a capacity standpoint? *Response:* Close to US 60, yes, Deer Valley Road improvements are needed from a capacity standpoint. Further west, improvements to Deer Valley Road are needed more from a connectivity and redundancy standpoint than from a capacity standpoint.
- *Question:* Does the City have to own the land on which improvements are being shown in the IIP and for which impact fees will be utilized? *Response:* The City does have to have jurisdiction over the land where IIP improvements are proposed, but it is not always clear what “jurisdiction” means.
- *Question:* The proposed impact fees are higher than the typical \$1,000-\$3,000 range seen from other agencies. Are these gross fees, with offsets still needed on top of that? *Response:* No additional offsets are anticipated.