



## City of Phoenix

PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT

**To:** Alan Stephenson  
Deputy City Manager

**Date:** December 5, 2022

**From:** Joshua Bednarek <sup>JB</sup>  
Acting Planning and Development Assistant Director, Planning Division

**Subject:** REQUEST FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION TO ITEM 84 ON THE  
DECEMBER 7, 2022 FORMAL AGENDA – PUBLIC HEARING AND  
RESOLUTION ADOPTION – GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT - GPA-DSTV-3-22-  
2 - MAYO BOULEVARD BETWEEN 40TH STREET AND THE LOOP 101  
FREEWAY, AND TATUM BOULEVARD BETWEEN DEER VALLEY DRIVE AND  
MAYO BOULEVARD (RESOLUTION 22087)

This memo provides additional information for the Council to consider for Item 84, on the December 7, 2022 formal agenda, General Plan Amendment - GPA-DSTV-3-22-2 - Mayo Boulevard between 40th Street and the Loop 101 Freeway, and Tatum Boulevard between Deer Valley Drive and Mayo Boulevard.

The additional information includes summaries of the Desert View Village Planning Committee recommendation from the October 11, 2022 & November 29, 2022 meetings along with the Planning Commission's summary from the December 1, 2022 hearing and additional community correspondence.

Approved:

  
Alan Stephenson, Deputy City Manager

Enclosures:

Desert View VPC Info  
Desert View VPC Recommendation  
Planning Commission Summary  
Community Correspondence





## Village Planning Committee Meeting Summary GPA-DSTV-3-22-2 INFORMATION ONLY

<b>Date of VPC Meeting</b>	October 11, 2022
<b>Location</b>	Mayo Boulevard between 40th Street and the Loop 101 Freeway; and Tatum Boulevard between Deer Valley Drive and Mayo Boulevard
<b>Request</b>	Minor General Plan Amendment to amend the Street Classification Map by removing the Mayo Boulevard alignment between 40th Street and the Loop 101 Freeway and changing the designation of Tatum Boulevard between Deer Valley Drive and Mayo Boulevard from Major Arterial Cross Section A to Major Arterial Cross Section Z-A

### VPC DISCUSSION:

*No members of the public registered to speak on this item.*

*Committee Members Warren and Younger joined the meeting during this item, bringing quorum to 14 members.*

**Anthony Grande**, staff, provided a background summary and described the changes proposed to the Street Classification Map.

**Carolyn Oberholtzer**, representing the Arizona State Land Department with Bergin, Frakes, Smalley and Oberholtzer, PLLC, provided an introduction to the proposal, noting that the Arizona State Land Department has been working with the City on regional transportation planning efforts in this area and the item for discussion tonight is related to an amendment to the Street Classification Map.

**Mike James**, representative with CivTech, stated that the section of Mayo Boulevard in question is referencing a bridge that would pass over the freeway. **Mr. James** provided background information, stating that the team had conducted traffic studies, reviewing existing and proposed land uses, to determine traffic conditions in the future and is looked at the most appropriate transportation improvements for the future conditions. He provided an overview of the scenario with the Mayo flyover and the scenario without the Mayo flyover, comparing the traffic issues with each. Finally, **Mr. James**



summarized the street improvements that would be done in the future without the Mayo flyover, including the addition of a northbound lane on Tatum Boulevard, requiring the cross section change.

#### QUESTIONS FROM COMMITTEE

**Committee Member Dickson** stated that the existing entitlements in the area would allow significant new development and generate traffic and that with the existing traffic issues, he has concerns about removing one of the outlets for the traffic flow. **Mr. James** stated that traffic would use Black Mountain Boulevard and Tatum Boulevard and that there are street improvements yet to be built in the area. **Mr. Dickson** stated that he doesn't think the traffic flow will work.

**Vice Chair Lagrave** suggested increasing traffic flow on 56th Street, rather than Tatum Boulevard because there are issues with traffic at the intersection of Tatum Boulevard and Deer Valley Drive.

**Mr. Dickson** reiterated concerns about removing the section of Mayo Boulevard in question, noting that there are not enough streets today in Desert Ridge.

**Committee Member Kirkilas** asked for clarification about the Mayo flyover and the proposed change. **Mr. Dickson** provided background and clarification. **Mr. James** stated that there is significant infrastructure that is planned but not built yet today. **Mr. Dickson** stated that the multifamily zoning in the area around the section of Mayo Boulevard in question should be reduced in order to accommodate the removal of Mayo Boulevard.

**Committee Member Nowell** asked about the portion of Tatum Boulevard north of Dynamite Boulevard. **Mr. James** noted that it was beyond the study area for this study. **Mr. Nowell** added that Tatum Boulevard north of Dynamite Boulevard was not supposed to be six lanes, per a previous study. **Vice Chair Lagrave** agreed and added additional background.

**Committee Member Younger** stated that this proposal could be shortsighted because there are still more developments coming to this area and traffic will get worse.

**Chair Bowser** noted that the flyover was discussed at the previous meeting in relation to the proposed Desert Ridge Specific Plan amendment, but there was no discussion of removing the Mayo flyover. **Chair Bowser** added that he recognizes the cost of constructing the bridge would be very high.

**Mr. Nowell** asked about the additional lane proposed on Tatum Boulevard and whether there was room for the expansion. **Mr. James** replied that the expansion would be to the east.

**Committee Member Powell** stated that businesses would be impacted by an eastward expansion of Tatum Boulevard for the portion north of the freeway. **Mr. James** replied that the current plan is only to improve the portion south of the freeway.

**Vice Chair Lagrave** stated that 56th street is the proper location to do the improvement.



**Committee Member Kollar** asked about the origin and destination of the traffic that would use the Mayo flyover if it were built. **Mr. James** stated that they have traffic models and that regional traffic generally flows between Cave Creek Road and the Loop 101. He further noted that the study took into account all future development with entitlements and that the network will be built out as development occurs. **Mr. Kollar** stated that it would be helpful to see the study itself.

**Mr. Powell** asked about the cost of constructing the Mayo flyover. **Mr. James** replied that it would be approximately 47 million dollars.

**Mr. Kirkilas** asked if the Mayo flyover was a promise made at a previous time. **Chair Bowser** stated that the flyover is shown on the Street Classification Map, which provides guidance for what needs to be developed in the future.

**Mr. Dickson** reviewed the number of units proposed at the southwest corner of Tatum Boulevard and Deer Valley Drive and expressed concern about how the traffic flow will work.

**Mr. Nowell** asked about the approximate cost of the three mitigation points identified in the study.

**Chair Bowser** noted that there would be a different trip generation rate for multifamily and single-family, which would affect the traffic at peak times. **Mr. Dickson** stated that he still didn't think the numbers would work with the removal of the Mayo flyover.

**Mr. James** noted that the approximate cost of the three mitigation points would be 3.03 million dollars.

**Committee Member Santoro** asked about the initial reason for looking at removing the Mayo flyover. **Mr. James** stated that they have been looking at this since 2020 to see what are the best and most efficient infrastructure investments that can be made. **Ms. Santoro** stated that it doesn't make sense to remove the flyover after approving new development of a corporate campus last month.

#### PUBLIC COMMENTS

None.

#### STAFF COMMENTS:

None.



## **Village Planning Committee Meeting Summary**

### **GPA-DSTV-3-22-2**

<b>Date of VPC Meeting</b>	November 29, 2022
<b>Location</b>	Mayo Boulevard between 40th Street and the Loop 101 Freeway; and Tatum Boulevard between Deer Valley Drive and Mayo Boulevard
<b>Request</b>	Minor General Plan Amendment to amend the Street Classification Map by removing the Mayo Boulevard alignment between 40th Street and the Loop 101 Freeway and changing the designation of Tatum Boulevard between Deer Valley Drive and Mayo Boulevard from Major Arterial Cross Section A to Major Arterial Cross Section Z-A
<b>VPC Recommendation</b>	Denial
<b>VPC Vote</b>	11-2

#### **VPC DISCUSSION:**

*No members of the public registered to speak on this item.  
Committee Members Doug Dickson and Cynthia Dean joined the meeting during this item, bringing quorum to 13 members.*

#### **STAFF PRESENTATION**

**Joshua Bednarek**, Acting Assistant Director with the Planning and Development Department provided a background summary and described the changes proposed to the Street Classification Map. Mr. Bednarek shared that removal of the Mayo Flyover will be mitigated through an Intergovernmental Agreement (IGA) that will be heard by the City Council on December 7. Mr. Bednarek stated that the IGA mitigations are targeted street improvements as well as dedication of funds for larger regional improvements. Mr. Bednarek shared the Desert Ridge Specific Plan development parcel map, highlighting improvements proposed for Superblock 12, Superblock 4L, Superblock 9.CP.2, Superblock 6, and Paradise Ridge Parcel MF3. Mr. Bednarek shared community input, staff findings, the staff recommendation of approval and next steps for the case.

#### **APPLICANT PRESENTATION**



**Carolyn Oberholtzer**, representing the Arizona State Land Department (ALSD) with Bergin, Frakes, Smalley and Oberholtzer, PLLC, introduced herself, Mark Edelman with the Arizona State Land Department, and Mike James with CivTech and then provided an overview of the request. Ms. Oberholtzer shared that the IGA ensures an additional \$42 million of identified transportation investments from the ASLD and additional specific improvements and responsibilities by the City of Phoenix.

**Mike James**, representative with CivTech, introduced himself and provided background on the request. Mr. James indicated that CivTech was hired to initiate traffic studies to consider alternatives for the Mayo Flyover. Mr. James shared the strategy for considering alternatives, including looking at future land uses for 2030 and 2040 and the anticipated transportation network for those model years. Mr. James indicated that CivTech looked at what was most cost-effective, improving travel times, economic development opportunities, and minimizing impacts to sensitive land uses. Mr. James shared that the updated Traffic Impact Study from 2022 focused on 2040 with the anticipated new population and employment. Mr. James explained that the existing network in Desert Ridge is not adequate for the growth and entitlements that are coming. Mr. James then shared IGA funding improvements tied to specific parcel sales and sales within Superblock 6 and the Paradise Ridge parcel, which are focused on getting connections and capacity across the canal to mitigate bottlenecks at important connections going north/south across the Loop 101 freeway. Mr. James shared they found there was a lot of demand for north/south movement both to the freeway and north/south trips. Mr. James then shared the evaluation and findings on the Mayo Flyover scenario, which showed that similar traffic mitigation would be needed which would be more costly. Mr. James shared comparisons of mitigation needed with the No Flyover scenario versus the Flyover scenario. Mr. James then shared priority improvements and regional improvements for the network. Mr. James shared specific transportation improvements in the IGA, including half-street improvements, additional lane improvements, intersection improvements, regional funding contributions, and regionally funded buildouts. Mr. James added that the IGA also has responsibilities for the City of Phoenix, including median improvements along Tatum Boulevard from Pinnacle Peak Road to Deer Valley Drive. Mr. James shared the cross sections, showing the additional 11 feet needed between Mayo Boulevard and the Loop 101, with the designation on the map also going further north of the Loop 101. Mr. James concluded that for mitigation purposes, a fourth lane is needed south of the freeway down to Mayo Boulevard.

#### QUESTIONS FROM COMMITTEE

**Chair Bowser** stated that the bigger picture of regional funding paints a complete picture and that it makes a lot more sense seeing the regional improvements rather than just the elimination of the flyover.

**Vice Chair Lagrave** asked that since widening of Tatum Boulevard will be on hold until a later date, if there was a way to tie in prioritization of improvements to 56th Street north of the Loop 101, in conjunction with the improvements for 48th Street, so that it can connect to Dynamite Boulevard in order to mitigate traffic along Tatum Boulevard toward the Loop 101 freeway.

**Ms. Oberholtzer** deferred the question to staff.



**Mr. Bednarek** responded that it would depend on auctions associated with land for Azara and clarified that this would not be the last time that the City would be looking at the street network in this area. Mr. Bednarek stated that the City will continue to partner with ASLD and will be looking at subsequent studies and potentially subsequent updates to the Street Classification Map. Mr. Bednarek stated that the request is to focus on modification of the Mayo Boulevard alignment coupled with mitigation measures in the immediate area, as well as some regional mitigation. Mr. Bednarek clarified he is not in a position to say whether or not that could be done at some point, but that they will be continued to be analyzed as the area develops. Mr. Bednarek stated that he cannot think of a way to tie in anything related to 56th Street based on how the request was advertised and the scope of the project.

**Ms. Oberholtzer** added that the amendment is necessary because they are adjusting placement of lines on the map. Ms. Oberholtzer indicated that 56th Street exists on the map and will be tied to the timing of the development on other potential agreements.

**Mr. Bednarek** concurred, reiterating that 56th Street will be built out when the properties around it are developed.

**Vice Chair Lagrave** stated that when they did the East Sonoran Parkway alignment, it did not connect to the agreed upon streets and rather had a dead-end on Cave Creek Road, which has created a mess with traffic. Vice Chair Lagrave expressed concerns with the same issue occurring with this proposal. Vice Chair Lagrave asked if it could be eliminated from the General Plan Amendment request.

**Mr. Bednarek** clarified that Vice Chair Lagrave would like to eliminate the widened cross section on Tatum Boulevard.

**Vice Chair Lagrave** responded affirmatively, clarifying it would only be from Loop 101 to Deer Valley Road. Vice Chair Lagrave stated that vehicles would have to cut across four lanes of traffic, rather than three lanes, to turn left onto Deer Valley Road.

**Mr. Bednarek** deferred the question to Chris Kowalsky, Deputy Director of the Street Transportation Department.

**Chris Kowalsky**, Deputy Director of the Street Transportation Department, responded that the analysis and findings only found a fourth lane was needed south of Loop 101 to Mayo Boulevard, but not north of the Loop 101. Mr. Kowalsky clarified that Cross Section Z-A is a special section which could have an additional right turn lane or right turn pocket above the 140-foot cross section. Mr. Kowalsky stated that there is no recommendation for a north fourth lane, but there is a possibility that in the future there will be a southbound right turn lane. Mr. Kowalsky gave an example of Deer Valley Drive to the Loop 101, stating that there may be an opportunity in the future to work with ADOT on a dual right turn lane to turn onto the westbound Loop 101, which would be a larger cross section than the typical six lane arterial cross section.

**Vice Chair Lagrave** stated he would be comfortable with that, but the General Plan Amendment indicates to add a fourth northbound lane.

**Mr. Kowalsky** clarified that the fourth northbound lane would be from Mayo Boulevard up to the eastbound on-ramp to the Loop 101 and clarified that is the only fourth lane segment being recommended.

**Mr. Nowell** agreed with Vice Chair Lagrave, stating that the request does not address Tatum Boulevard north of the Loop 101 between Deer Valley Road. Mr. Nowell stated that without the flyover as-is, he would only see more traffic coming southbound on Tatum Boulevard from Deer Valley Road and northbound in the evening when traffic congestion is already very bad.

**Vice Chair Lagrave** concurred, stating that is why he favors extending 56th Street.

**Mr. Nowell** concurred, stating that the only traffic control on 56th Street currently is a stop sign, and that it takes a while to take a left turn onto Pinnacle Peak Road due to the traffic. Mr. Nowell believed that extending 56th Street will help to alleviate some of the traffic congestion.

**Rick Powell** agreed, stating he does not believe the Committee should approve a General Plan Amendment that considers adding anything to Tatum Boulevard northbound from the Loop 101 to Deer Valley Road. Mr. Powell indicated that the bigger issue of the request is removing the Mayo Flyover. Mr. Powell believed that there would never be another northbound connection at the Mayo Flyover or anywhere nearby if it is removed. Mr. Powell did not like the idea of committing for all time in the future of not having a bridge over the Loop 101 when there are so few other north/south connections. Mr. Powell did not believe the Committee should approve the General Plan Amendment until there is more knowledge on what will happen with 56th Street and 64th Street. Mr. Powell wondered who paid for the bridge on 64th Street and indicated he would like to see concrete pouring on 64th Street before getting rid of the possible future north/south connection.

**Doug Dickson** concurred, clarifying those that have spoken have been on the Committee much longer than those that were not speaking. Mr. Dickson indicated that they are very familiar with this area of Desert Ridge, and agreed that half of the proposal is good, while the other half would cause even more traffic congestion. Mr. Dickson believed that the request should be addressing expanding access through Desert Ridge rather than eliminating the flyover. Mr. Dickson stated that the existing infrastructure is not adequate for current growth let alone future growth. Mr. Dickson echoed that removing the Mayo Flyover would mean that there is one less north/south access that they do not have, and it will go away forever. Mr. Dickson noted that the Village Planning Committees all got together and most of them voted that the number one spot of future growth in Phoenix will be in Desert Ridge. Mr. Dickson believed that they should find a way to fund the Mayo Flyover and make it work, like Black Mountain Boulevard.

**Reggie Younger Jr.** agreed, stating that eliminating the flyover would be a mistake. Mr. Younger reiterated that there will be a lot more traffic in Desert Ridge as a lot more homes are built. Mr. Younger added that he had driven by 56th Street along Pinnacle Peak Road and noticed a long line of vehicles trying to make both a left and right turn onto Pinnacle Peak Road.



**Vice Chair Lagrave** understood that the flyover was costly and stated that a viable alternative could be supported. Vice Chair Lagrave appreciated the improvements being made but indicated that extending 56th Street to Dynamite Boulevard would only be three miles of road which would not cost much, especially compared to the cost of the flyover. Vice Chair Lagrave stated that doing this would greatly reduce traffic on Tatum Boulevard and will give another access point to nearby developments. Mr. Lagrave reiterated that a viable alternative is needed if removing the flyover.

**Jill Hankins** stated she is concerned with removing the flyover. Ms. Hankins believed there was a missed opportunity with connecting Rose Garden Lane to Mayo Boulevard. Ms. Hankins stated her primary objective for being on this Committee is to ensure the walkability and bike-ability of Desert Ridge and Desert View Village. Ms. Hankins indicated that the Loop 101, Pinnacle Peak Road, and Tatum Boulevard are barriers to pedestrians and bikes. Ms. Hankins asked how the plan incorporates a walkable and bikeable community. Ms. Hankins stated that Desert Ridge is now bisected by a six-lane road and by Tatum Boulevard, which are dangerous for bicyclists.

**Mr. Nowell** added that while 56th Street should be improved, he believes Pinnacle Peak Road will also need to be addressed since it is only one lane in each direction near 56th Street. Mr. Nowell asked if there is a timeframe when the improvements in the IGA will be made.

**Ms. Oberholtzer** responded that the improvements will be tied to auctions, which will tie the bidders to timeframes for improvements to be completed.

**Mr. Nowell** thanked Ms. Oberholtzer and stated that the timeframe is unknown at this point.

**Ms. Oberholtzer** responded that there are scheduled auctions and applicants for a most of the area in the near term and not in the distant future.

**Mr. Nowell** asked how closely tied are the mitigation efforts timewise with removal of the flyover.

**Ms. Oberholtzer** responded that the IGA implements an accelerated program. Ms. Oberholtzer added that the focus is not on improvements that are already planned or are already committed to by other projects, but rather on accelerating certain improvements that are both triggered by the removal of the flyover and priority improvements for the community, such as the half-street improvement of Deer Valley Road between 40th Street and Tatum Boulevard. Ms. Oberholtzer clarified that the IGA provides for a reallocation of costs that will bring equivalent traffic circulation as the flyover. Ms. Oberholtzer added that Mayo Boulevard would connect to the Fireside community, where there are two schools, and would trigger a massive reconstruction of the intersection at Black Mountain Boulevard, in addition to other improvements. Ms. Oberholtzer concluded that with the impacts of those connections, that is how they arrived at the IGA list of improvements. Ms. Oberholtzer hoped the improvements would be more impactful to the community on a faster path than with the flyover.

**Mark Edelman**, representative with the Arizona State Land Department, added that all the proposed improvements are tied to parcels that currently have applications, except

for Superblock 6. Mr. Edelman stated that the auctions will likely occur within a year and then development would likely occur within another year to year and a half.

**Gary Kirkilas** asked if removal of the flyover is because of the cost or if there is something else planned on the property where the flyover would be built.

**Ms. Oberholtzer** responded that the factors going into the removal of the flyover are also considering the impacts to the adjacent parcels. Ms. Oberholtzer continued that the properties that would be adjacent to the flyover would likely not benefit from it. Ms. Oberholtzer reiterated that considering impact to the surrounding area, and not just cost alone, was all part of the cost-benefit analysis.

**Mr. Kirkilas** reiterated that the flyover is both cost prohibitive and would negatively impact potential buildable sites.

**Ms. Oberholtzer** responded affirmatively.

**Mr. Kirkilas** asked if the traffic studies are based off future projected zoning of land or based on current zoning.

**Ms. Oberholtzer** responded that the ultimate zoning is a part of it and deferred to Mr. James on the model.

**Mr. James** stated that the zoning along Mayo Boulevard was updated to the level of development that was being seen over the last 10 years. Mr. James added that new entitlements and development plans that were coming into the City of Phoenix around the Mayo Hospital from this year were also factored in.

**Ms. Oberholtzer** stated that as the traffic study was developed, there was a lot of back and forth with the City, and that the City wanted CivTech to make aggressive assumptions about future development to be comfortable with recommending approval on this request.

**Mr. James** concurred, adding that regional trips are trips that start and end outside of the Desert Ridge area, including to the Loop 101, Desert Ridge Marketplace, the Desert Ridge Corporate Center, and the employment centers. Mr. James stated that they will be working with the City and ASLD on future studies to look at where the best opportunity for those regional trips is.

**Mr. Powell** asked what the median modification consists of along Tatum Boulevard between Deer Valley Road to Pinnacle Peak Road.

**Mr. Kowalsky** responded that Tatum Boulevard is not built to its ultimate cross section yet, and that the median has always been designated to be narrow to add the additional third lane on each direction. Mr. Kowalsky stated that the outside lanes were built first and capacity was added as needed until the median is narrow enough to add additional lanes.

**Mr. Powell** stated that concerned him and believed it was an invitation to more traffic along Tatum Boulevard. Mr. Powell asked if there is an applicant that wants to buy Superblock 9, which would have been eaten up by the flyover.



**Mr. Edelman** responded that there is not an applicant for the entirety of Superblock 9, but there is an applicant for a portion of Superblock 9.

**Mr. Powell** asked if that applicant wanted the land where the flyover would sit on.

**Mr. Edelman** responded that they do not.

**Vice Chair Lagrave** stated that it seems this request is being rushed and that it is more important to do it right then do it fast. Vice Chair Lagrave stated that the modifications are good but are not enough and reiterated that an access point needs to be added to remove traffic from Tatum Boulevard.

**Jason Israel** asked what the cost difference is between building the flyover and not building it.

**Ms. Oberholtzer** responded that the cost of the flyover comes with the cost of the flyover as well as the resulting mitigation, and the no flyover option is the sum of the improvements related to that. Ms. Oberholtzer deferred the question to Mr. James.

**Mr. James** responded that if the flyover was built, it would cost approximately \$7 million for mitigation and \$47 million for the actual flyover, with a total of \$54 million. Mr. James stated that the no flyover option would cost around \$3 million for mitigation and \$42 million for regional improvements.

**Mr. Israel** asked for clarification on if it would be \$51 million more to do the flyover.

**Mr. James** responded affirmatively.

**Mr. Nowell** stated that these questions were asked at the last meeting and that he remembers the numbers being \$47 million for the flyover and at that meeting there were only three mitigation points discussed with a total of \$3.03 million. Mr. Nowell asked for confirmation if the number now for regional improvements is \$42 million.

**Ms. Oberholtzer** responded affirmatively, stating that the regionally funded buildout improvements include the \$6 million assigned to future superblocks and \$36 million associated with those options. Ms. Oberholtzer clarified that the only she recalls was missing was the \$7 million for additional mitigation items.

**Mr. Nowell** asked if the costs were pretty much the same.

**Ms. Oberholtzer** responded that the flyover would still result in more cost.

**Mr. Israel** asked by how much.

**Ms. Oberholtzer** responded that it would be about an \$11 million difference. Ms. Oberholtzer asked Mr. James if that was correct.

**Mr. James** responded affirmatively, adding that the question is where the right place for putting a lot of those regional trips is.



**Mr. Israel** stated that it is about an \$8 million - \$10 million difference.

**Ms. Oberholtzer** added that the challenge is how to fund the flyover since the parcels that would benefit from it and contribute to it are limited.

**Mr. Israel** shared that his understanding is that the \$ 45 million will be generated from revenue collected from future land sales, which was then inputted into the model. **Ms. Oberholtzer** replied that was correct.

**Vice Chair Lagrave** added that the Azara project (bordered by Pinnacle Peak Road, Cave Creek Road, Scottsdale Road and Jomax Road) is to be built from the south, and it will take a long time to reach its northern border so funding the north-south access soon will not happen. Vice Chair Lagrave then asked for clarification on the lane width for Tatum Boulevard, stating that the graph shows six lanes, however another graph showed it as being four lanes, five at the intersection of Deer Valley.

**Mr. James** replied that the 2040 model showed six lanes, and asked staff to speak to the proposed median modifications.

**Mr. Kowalsky** replied that Street Classification Map as adopted shows Tatum Boulevard as a future six-lane section, and while it is not constructed to that at this time, ultimately it is going to be six lanes. Mr. Kowalsky added that the timing of that will be determined by the City and the Capital Improvement Program, and through the IGA the City has accepted that modification as part of the mitigation efforts within the area.

**Chair Bowser** shared that a 56th Street connection to Dynamite Boulevard would be outstanding, if it was developer-paid the cost to the City would be zero, and that while the Mayo flyover would be nice, it connects an east-west street which dies out in front of Pinnacle High School, which might help local traffic but might not impact regional traffic, and that it is very costly. Chair Bowser added that more capacity north-south is critical and suggested that the non-signalized median openings along Tatum Boulevard are challenging, the eventual outer lanes at Cave Creek Road at the CAP bridge might be challenging as well because it is a bottleneck location, and another opportunity is connecting Black Mountain Boulevard to 40th Street, and then 40th Street to Jomax Road, up to the Sonoran Parkway which might come about sooner than 56th Street as development north of Pinnacle Peak begins, which will also be driven by water and sewer infrastructure.

**Mr. Kowalsky** added that they are in active discussions with the developer to widen the Cave Creek Road CAP canal bridge crossing, and they are close to finalizing an agreement.

**Mr. Bednarek** concluded by thanking the committee for their discussion, sharing that a lot of the street improvements are tied to development, and there is a level of certainty, speed and commitment to funding in this IGA which they did not have before. Mr. Bednarek added that one consideration could be to keep the conversation going and to make sure the committee's concerns are continued as a part of the conversation is to recommend approval with direction/modification to the case, such as direction to staff to investigate other ways to mitigate traffic in the area that are outside the scope of this request.

**Chair Bowser** recognized the commitment of the City, ASLD and their counsel on this item. Chair Bowser asked staff to confirm no members of the public registered to speak, and asked members of the public to indicate using the Raise Hand function if they want to speak. **Ms. Stockham**, staff, confirmed no hands were raised.

#### PUBLIC COMMENTS

None.

#### STAFF/REPRESENTATIVE RESPONSE

None.

#### FLOOR/PUBLIC DISCUSSION CLOSED: COMMITTEE DISCUSSION

**Vice Chair Lagrave** asked what the cost is for the overpass over the canal on Tatum, north of Union Hills, sharing that it was the least important improvement as it is not a bottleneck location now.

**Mr. James** shared that the estimated cost for widening the bridge is approximately \$ 19.3 million, and to replace the bridge is \$ 32 million.

#### MOTION:

**Vice Chair Lagrave** motioned to approve GPA-DSTV-3-22-2 per the staff recommendation with direction that the money allocated for the Tatum canal bridge crossing be diverted to extend 56th Street north to Dynamite Boulevard.

**Rick Nowell** asked if the condition that Vice Chair Lagrave made with his motion would be a stipulation.

**Chair Bowser** asked staff if stipulations can be made in relation to a General Plan Amendment. Ms. Stockham replied that they cannot, but the committee can provide direction in a motion.

**Rick Nowell** asked what the cost would be to extend 56th Street to Dynamite Boulevard.

**Joshua Bednarek** suggested that the direction could be modified to ask that the City coordinate with ASLD to find additional funding through future agreements to fund the construction of 56th Street, so it is not tied to a certain project, such as the Tatum canal bridge.

**Vice Chair Lagrave** amended the motioned to approve GPA-DSTV-3-22-2 per the staff recommendation with direction that the City coordinate with ASLD to find funding opportunities for the construction of 56th Street to Dynamite Boulevard, and that it be a priority before the canal bridge on Tatum.

**Rick Nowell** seconded the motion.

#### DISCUSSION:

**Rick Nowell** shared that widening the overpass over the canal is probably the last thing that will happen, and that if we do away with the flyover, it could be years before the extension of 56th Street was complete.



**Joshua Bednarek** shared that he understood Mr. Nowell's concerns, and that there is also an unknown of if the flyover will ever get built due to the challenges to auction the land associated with the flyover, and that given that uncertainty and the need to fund some of these improvements, this proposal and the IGA provides that certainty for the traffic mitigation improvements and will get them done faster.

**Jason Israel** shared that on the one hand there is the potential of the land sales happening with ASLD and funding these improvements and plans, so you could save \$ 8 million dollars now with the land sales or the funds could be saved at a later date if plans were to change with the auctions.

**Mr. Bednarek** asked Mr. Israel to clarify his statement.

**Mr. Israel** replied that there is potential interest in parcels to be auctioned now, which can fund the street improvements now with a shorter time frame and certainty, versus a longer time frame with a potential unknown regarding these improvements.

**Ms. Oberholtzer** shared that a real constraint with the flyover is the funding, because the properties that are impacted by it would not necessarily be benefitting from it, and this IGA apportions the improvements for auctions that are in the planning stages and secures the path forward for when the properties are auctioned, and for the flyover, there is no certainty that the flyover would ever happen.

**Jason Israel** asked if there is a real potential that funding may not be there.

**Ms. Oberholtzer** clarified that there is a real potential that the flyover will not be constructed because people will not bid on an auction for that parcel with the obligation to build the flyover because it does that benefit the surrounding parcels; the added cost to those land sales is cost prohibitive.

**Mr. Kirkilas** asked how the Black Mountain connection was funded, and if that is considered a flyover.

**Mr. Dickson** shared that funding came from state gas taxes and from grant money from the federal government due to the proximity to the federal cemetery and was about \$ 25 – 30 million dollars to construct. Mr. Dickson added that those conditions would not apply in this location.

**Rick Powell** appreciated the motion made by Vice Chair Lagrave to give the City of Phoenix guidance but shared concern that a recommendation of approval with minor attached guidance will be easy to ignore, and if they want to give the City of Phoenix guidance, the stronger message would be to recommend denial. Mr. Powell added while it looks like the grand bargain is to get Mayo Boulevard widened east to west from Tatum to 56th Street, it does not add to the north-south connectivity in the Village.

**Vice Chair Lagrave** replied that he made the motion to have this type of discussion, and that he might not vote for it.

VOTE:



**1-12;** motion to recommend approval of GPA-DSTV-3-22-2 per the staff recommendation with direction that the City coordinate with ASLD to find funding opportunities for the construction of 56th Street to Dynamite Boulevard, and that it be a priority before the canal bridge on Tatum does not pass with Committee Member Bowser in favor and Committee Members Barto, Dean, Dickson, Hankins, Israel, Kirkilas, Kollar, Nowell, Powell, Santoro, Younger and Lagrave opposed.

MOTION:

**Rick Powell** motioned to recommend denial of GPA-DSTV-3-22. **Rick Nowell** seconded the motion.

VOTE:

**11-2;** motion to recommend denial of GPA-DSTV-3-22-2 passes with Committee Members Barto, Dean, Dickson, Hankins, Israel, Kirkilas, Kollar, Nowell, Powell, Younger and Lagrave in favor with Committee Members Santoro and Bowser opposed.

**STAFF COMMENTS REGARDING VPC RECOMMENDATION:**

Staff has no comments.



REPORT OF PLANNING COMMISSION ACTION  
December 1, 2022

ITEM NO: 3	
	DISTRICT NO.: 2
SUBJECT:	
Application #:	GPA-DSTV-3-22-2 (Continued from November 3, 2022)
Location:	Mayo Boulevard between 40th Street and the Loop 101 Freeway; and Tatum Boulevard between Deer Valley Drive and Mayo Boulevard
Proposal:	Minor General Plan Amendment to amend the Street Classification Map by removing the Mayo Boulevard alignment between 40th Street and the Loop 101 Freeway and changing the designation of Tatum Boulevard between Deer Valley Drive and Mayo Boulevard from Major Arterial Cross Section A to Major Arterial Cross Section Z-A.
Applicant:	City of Phoenix, Planning Commission
Representative:	Arizona State Land Department

**ACTIONS:**

Staff Recommendation: Approval.

Village Planning Committee (VPC) Recommendation:

**Desert View** 10/11/2022 Information only.

**Desert View** 11/29/2022 Denial. Vote: 11-2.

Planning Commission Recommendation: Approval, per the staff recommendation with conditions.

Motion Discussion:

Commissioner Gaynor made a MOTION to approve GPA-DSTV-3-22-2, per the staff recommendation with a condition that the approval be coupled with the intergovernmental agreement and that staff meet with the Village Planning Committee members to follow-up on their concerns and further explain why the item should be approved.

Commissioner Gorraiz offered a friendly amendment to have the Arizona State Land Department, the City, and all those involved with the intergovernmental agreement (IGA) to work together to accomplish the goals of the City and the State Land Department, specifically with regard to the transportation needs of this area going forward.

Commissioner Gaynor agreed with the friendly amendment.

Commissioner Gorraiz SECONDED the motion.

Commissioner Boyd asked Commissioners Gaynor and Gorraiz what they expect out of staff's meeting between staff and the Village Planning Committee members.

Commissioner Gorraiz stated that his amendment was for the ongoing meeting and coordination of the IGA and the City. His understanding is that there will be a follow-up with the Village Planning Committee members by Mr. Bednarek, explaining to them what is going on and keeping them informed. He would like them to be brought up to speed regarding what is happening, as things change, and that they are made aware that their concerns are being addressed in the IGA.

Commissioner Gaynor agreed with Commissioner Gorraiz.

Commissioner Busching stated that she truly wants to be supportive of staff and what they want to accomplish, particularly because she knows that staff is working with the State Land Department, however, she is still very concerned about not having the minutes from the Village, and not having the IGA draft agreement. She feels like she is being asked to vote on this semi-blind and go completely on good faith. The fact that the Village voted overwhelmingly against it, and the Planning Commission has no documentation of why, except from the informational meeting, where they also expressed concerns back in October. We do not have any real documentation of what the concerns were, or how they are being addressed, so she is torn.

A roll call vote was held and the motion failed with a tie vote of 4-4. Commission members Howard, Mangum, Gaynor, and Gorraiz in favor; Boyd, Jaramillo, Perez, and Simon opposed; and Busching abstained.

There was additional discussion about making another motion and additional conditions to be added.

Deputy Director, Joshua Bednarek, further explained the proposal, the IGA and additional outreach to be completed.

Mr. Eric Froberg, the City Engineer, also provided some explanation on the IGA and explained that the Village Planning Committee member concerns will be addressed through the IGA.

Commissioner Boyd made a MOTION to reconsider the first motion.

Commissioner Simon SECONDED the motion.

The motion passed with a 7-2 vote with commission members Boyd and Perez opposed.

Commissioner Gaynor made a MOTION to approve GPA-DSTV-3-22-2, as previously motioned.

Commissioner Jaramillo SECONDED the motion.

The motion passed with a 7-2 vote with commission members Boyd and Perez opposed.

Motion details: Commissioner Gaynor made a MOTION to approve GPA-DSTV-3-22-2, per the staff recommendation with conditions that the approval be coupled with the intergovernmental agreement; that staff meet with the Village Planning Committee members to follow-up on their concerns and further explain why the item should be



approved; and to have the Arizona State Land Department, the City, and all those involved with the intergovernmental agreement to work together to accomplish the goals of the City and the State Land Department, specifically with regard to the transportation needs of this area going forward.

Maker: Gaynor  
Second: Jaramillo  
Vote: 7-2 (Boyd and Perez)  
Absent: None  
Opposition Present: No

Findings:

1. The proposed removal of a portion of Mayo Boulevard and designation of a portion of Tatum Boulevard as a Major Arterial Cross Section Z-A is compatible with the local street network and planned uses in the area.
2. The proposed modifications are consistent with the results of a traffic study conducted for the area, which found that the modifications will not negatively impact traffic on the street network.

This publication can be made available in alternate format upon request. Please contact Angie Holdsworth at (602) 329-5065, TTY use 7-1-1.



**Racelle Escolar**

---

**From:** Julia Levene <jlevene@associationplannerpartners.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, November 29, 2022 4:48 PM  
**To:** PDD Planning Commission  
**Subject:** Regarding amendment to the Mayo Blvd. Flyover plan.

To the planning commission:

We are highly in support and favor of passing the amendment that will alter the current plan to connect Tatum Blvd to Mayo Blvd. Connecting Tatum to Mayo Blvd would negatively impact the quiet family-oriented neighborhood environment that currently exists. Additional traffic through this route would also endanger the many students attending Pinnacle High School as well as Fireside Elementary. Homes were purchased in this area for the neighborhood environment that currently exists.

We are not in favor of connecting Tatum to Mayo Blvd; as a member of the planning commission, please support this amendment to alter the current plan to connect Tatum Blvd to Mayo Blvd. on behalf of all Fireside residents.

Sincerely,

Julia Levene

Go West Destinations, Inc.  
DBA: APP, Association Planner Partners  
3734 E. Ringtail Way  
Phoenix, AZ 85050  
Phone: 602 320-8323  
[www.associationplannerpartners.com](http://www.associationplannerpartners.com) [associationplannerpartners.com]





