



LAND REUSE STRATEGY

Phoenix Sky Harbor International Airport
Land Use Strategy (LRS)
Central Area Community Meeting
February 9, 2016, 6:00 PM - 8:30 PM
HOPE VI Emmett McLoughlin Community Training & Education Center
Meeting Summary

A community meeting was held February 9 as part of the PHX Land Reuse Strategy. The meeting consisted of a presentation by members of the Land Reuse Strategy project team, with a Question & Answer session following for meeting attendees.

Presentation

Welcome & Opening Comments

Trina Harrison, City of Phoenix Aviation Department (AVN Rep. Harrison) welcomed attendees and began the meeting by giving a short overview of what the meeting would cover, including why the Land Reuse Strategy is being prepared, a brief history of what led to the project, defining objectives and providing an overview of steps involved in the process. *AVN Rep. Harrison* also showed a map which showed all of the project area.

In 2002, the City of Phoenix City Council approved the Community Noise Reduction Program (CNRP) which produced the Voluntary Acquisition and Relocation Services Program (VARs), the Residential Sound Mitigation Services, and Sound Insulation and Mitigation Services. The Sound Mitigation programs have both ended and the VARs program is in the final stages. This land that the Airport acquired through the VARs Program is the reason for the Land Reuse Strategy, which includes 743 parcels within the program boundary that the Airport now owns.

Michael Hotaling, C&S Companies (Consultant Rep. Hotaling) began by thanking everyone for their participation. He first addressed why the City of Phoenix (COP) was undertaking the Land Reuse Strategy. One reason is as an obligation to the regulations set forth by the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA). Because the COP purchased the land with FAA money, they are required to go through a Land Reuse process to develop a long-term strategy. *Consultant Rep. Hotaling* also mentioned other benefits to the project including economic development to the project areas.

Land Reuse Strategy Overview

Consultant Rep. Hotaling stated that there are two major components to the Land Reuse Strategy. One of those is to take a detailed inventory of all of the Airport parcels and document all information. Once you have completed that inventory, the second component is to develop a long-term strategy.

The study breaks down into four major elements:

- Community Engagement – This will be accomplished through a variety of different ways, including technology, interpersonal communication, community leaders, and project committees. The four major stakeholder groups of the project are the community, which is the center of the entire project, the Roundtable Groups, the Advisory Group, and the Project Management Committee.
- Inventory – *Mark Johnson, Ricondo & Associates (Consultant Rep. Johnson)* reported that the project team is nearing the completion of the inventory process. The goal is to have a report to project staff by the end of February. The purpose of the inventory is to document the current status of the properties which includes looking at the city's planning documents, any environmental constraints there may be, documenting what utilities are available, and examining any historical and cultural resources. *Consultant Rep. Hotaling* added that the goal of the project was to make sure the outcome does not conflict with outcomes and any other work of other processes and community projects which have already taken place.
- Market Analysis – *Barbie Schalmo, C&S Companies (Consultant Rep. Schalmo)* explained that they would be looking at how the local market will influence and impact this project area. This will be done in the following ways:
 - Potential Land Uses
 - Preliminary Market Analysis – This will be done by looking at what they think will happen in the next ten years. They will also use benchmarking to look at other communities and see how they have utilized nontraditional community development.
 - Demand Allocation Strategy – This will look at how the parcels will play into the local market.
 - Implementation Models – This will explore what options there are.
 - Retention/Disposition Strategy – This will look at the results and start to determine the best options available.
- Strategy Development – *Consultant Rep. Hotaling* stated that the final component of the project is the Strategy Development. Before this plan will be put into action, a draft strategy will be developed which will be reviewed by all stakeholders and city staff, then by the Phoenix Aviation Advisory Board, and then submitted to the FAA for review. A final strategy can then be published.

Consultant Rep. Hotaling reviewed the study timeline. He stated that it is a lengthy process but it is lengthy for a purpose. There needs to be adequate time to consider all elements of the process which is a continuous process.

Consultant Rep. Hotaling went on to say that there is another follow-up piece which is the Airport Compatible Land Redevelopment Program. The City of Phoenix took part in an FAA Pilot Program which provides a grant to the city for plan implementation. Phoenix is one of only two airports in the country to take advantage of the FAA opportunity.

A *meeting attendee* asked for clarification that the city has already applied for and been awarded the grant. *Consultant Rep. Hotaling* responded that yes, the city has already been awarded the grant money which will allow the process to move along once the plan is ready for implementation.

A *meeting attendee* asked if there was a general plan in place or if it was starting from scratch. *Consultant Rep. Hotaling* replied that there is no current plan and this series of meetings is the starting point.

Community Engagement Plan

Consultant Rep. Hotaling reviewed the Community Engagement Plan which helps guide the process and define the ways in which community engagement will take place. The full document will be posted on the project website.

Benchmarking Airports

Consultant Rep. Hotaling stated that we reviewed five other similar airports that have completed FAA-required land reuse studies. This benchmarking process provides opportunity for the project to learn from these other airports. The airports under review as part of the benchmarking task:

- Seattle/Tacoma International
- Atlanta Hartsfield – Jackson International
- Fort Lauderdale – Hollywood International
- Detroit Metropolitan – Wayne County
- Baltimore/Washington International

Question & Answer

Consultant Rep. Hotaling opened the meeting up to questions regarding the materials just presented.

A *meeting attendee* asked if the FAA has guidelines for what can and can't be done. *Consultant Rep. Hotaling* answered that they do have very specific guidelines and there are specific uses for the properties that are permissible and specific uses that are not. In all previous plans that have come before this one across the country, the FAA has not allowed residential to be introduced back into the project areas where residential housing was removed. However, the COP believes there is a reasonable case to be made in the north project area where the noise contours have changed.

A *meeting attendee* asked for clarification regarding the FAA recommending airports to look at. *Consultant Rep. Hotaling* replied that they had recommended five airports similar in size and nature and acquisition programs were similar in scale. *The attendee* asked why the FAA recommended those five airports. *Consultant Rep. Hotaling* replied that the airports are similar in scale and activity level. The airports also have some

residential density around the airport. However, Phoenix is unique in how dense the residential area is surrounding the airport and the types of land uses.

A meeting attendee asked who the consultants were for the project. *Consultant Rep. Hotaling* explained that there are six different companies represented in the project including C&S Companies, Ricondo & Associates, PSM², Urias Communications, Johnson & Neely Associates, and El Pueblo Productions. *The attendee* then asked what budget was spent on the consultants. *Consultant Rep. Hotaling* replied that it was a \$2 million budget that had been approved by the COP. *The attendee* asked what the source was of the \$2 million. *Consultant Rep. Hotaling* stated that the money comes from Passenger Facility Charges on airline tickets.

A meeting attendee offered the comment that their neighbor is a multi-generational resident and whatever they plan outcome may be, they don't want to feel unwanted within the new development. *Consultant Rep. Hotaling* responded that that is the main purpose of having these community meetings so as to understand the wants and needs of current residents.

A meeting attendee asked what could be found on the project website. *Consultant Rep. Hotaling* explained that you can find inventory documents, market analysis, and a project overview. He also stated that they could post FAA guidelines so that interested parties would not have to search for that information.

A meeting attendee asked for clarification regarding the \$5 million in grant money from the FAA. *Consultant Rep. Hotaling* explained that the grant money was from the FAA for the Airport Compatible Land Redevelopment Program implementation that would result from the outcome of the Land Reuse Strategy process. *The attendee* then asked if the Airport Compatible Land Redevelopment Program would cost \$5 million. *Consultant Rep. Hotaling* responded that no, he believed it would cost much more than that, but the \$5 million grant provides a starting point to begin implementing the program.

A meeting attendee asked what the default zoning is on the acquired parcels. *Consultant Rep. Hotaling* responded that some of the properties are single-family residential while most is light industrial.

A meeting attendee commented that the residential area is a paradox because the FAA is wanting to get rid of the residential in the area. *Consultant Rep. Hotaling* stated that yes, over time, the parcels would be converted to something besides residential. The outcome of this process will help decide what those other uses will be.

A meeting attendee asked if they could be provided with one contact for residents to call when they have a question. *Consultant Rep. Hotaling* responded that that one person was Trina Harrison and all her contact information could be found on the project materials. *The attendee* then commented that there had been a mention of deferring the use of the properties until the economy changed. They were not in favor of this because the city had done this in the past with another area and that area was still vacant and

undeveloped. *The attendee* then asked if it would be possible to go to the FAA and appeal the no residential decision since some noise levels were now deemed safe by the FAA. *Consultant Rep. Hotaling* replied that more of those questions would be answered throughout the process. However, he did want to remind people that at no other time in the country, has the FAA ever allowed residential to go back in. The noise contours are just one factor out of many that would determine that outcome.

A meeting attendee asked if there would be any zoning changes for existing businesses. *Consultant Rep. Hotaling* responded that they don't expect any but they do not know.

A meeting attendee asked what percentage of the central project area is controlled by the city. *Consultant Rep. Hotaling* replied that in the overall project area, it was about 20% city-owned. He responded that they did not accurately know that percentage for just the central area. *The attendee* commented that there could be a conflict of interest that a shift from residential to industrial would cause a positive outcome as it would increase the tax revenue to support the community.

A meeting attendee asked if the FAA's current position was to not have any residential in the area at all at the end of this process. *Consultant Rep. Hotaling* replied that no, that was not the intent. They were only concerned with the 743 parcels that were acquired with FAA money. *The attendee* asked if there were outside developers that came into the project area, would they be able to develop outside of FAA restrictions.

A meeting attendee commented that the ordinance that the city passed did not necessarily restrict residential from being built, but it did put in place certain sound mitigation criteria.

A meeting attendee asked for clarification regarding properties that are owned by the Airport and purchased through federal funds, and if there is a deed restricting preventing those parcels from ever being turned into residential. *Consultant Rep. Hotaling* responded that the FAA's documents on this are called Grant Assurances.

A meeting attendee commented that there is a significant amount of impact within the project areas so why are the meetings not being held within the project area. They commented that they did not see any incentives offered for the people still in the project areas and if you want to engage in community outreach, something should be done for the residents still living there. *Consultant Rep. Hotaling* commented that the project team is open to all suggestions for where to hold the community meetings and where would be the most convenient for community members. *The attendee* added that there had been community meetings held for the VARS Program that were in the project areas so they could just look at where those meetings had been held.

A meeting attendee commented that the Phoenix Elementary School District would be happy to talk to the project team about the possibility of holding a meeting at one of their facilities.

A meeting attendee asked if an existing residential property that is still zoned for residential, could be rehabilitated as residential. *Consultant Rep. Hotaling* replied that it is feasible if the rehabilitation complies with current building code requirements.

A meeting attendee commented that they would like to see a policy adoption to do no harm to existing residents. Also, they should engage the residents first before the city.

A meeting attendee stated that it was believed that the city would like to see a lot of economic development happen within the areas. If that happens, does the city have the ability to impose restrictions on development to encourage recruitment of employees from within the project areas? *Consultant Rep. Hotaling* replied that that specific issue is outside of this project, but would take into consideration for the future.

A meeting attendee asked if the city has a plan to reconcile the patchwork of zoning that is left in the areas. *Consultant Rep. Hotaling* replied that that issue would be better understood once the inventory portion of the project is completed. Once that information is known, a strategy will be developed to find a better way to deal with those issues.

A meeting attendee asked if the VARS Program was still available to residents. *Consultant Rep. Hotaling* responded that no, that program was closed.

A meeting attendee asked if the plan could include recommendations from other funding sources to help with implementing the process as well as helping with rehabilitation of existing residences to help them blend in with the new development. *Consultant Rep. Hotaling* replied that he would expect there to be other sources of funds introduced throughout the process.

A meeting attendee commented that there are 57 parcels from the Golden Gate program that have had no development done on them. Could those parcels be considered as part of the LRS process? *Consultant Rep. Hotaling* replied that as part of the inventory, if there is a meaningful use identified for those, they would be considered in the strategy.

A meeting attendee commented that required sound insulation work was not completed as promised and recommended that the city needs more active oversight to complete these jobs. *Consultant Rep. Hotaling* responded that he could not speak to the past, but the current team is extremely active and responsive to community needs.

A meeting attendee asked if it would be possible to identify the what ifs and domino effects of certain decisions of the proposed plan. *Consultant Rep. Hotaling* replied that the Market Analysis would identify many of those scenarios but at the same time, the strategy would need to be flexible to change over time as community changes happened.

A meeting attendee provided the comment that the sale of parcels would be preferable to the lease of those parcels because in a lease, parcels are not returned to the tax roll.

Closing

Consultant Rep. Hotaling closed the Question & Answer session of the meeting and informed attendees that staff would still be available to answer any questions. He also directed people to visit the project website where the [meeting's presentation](#) would also be available, and provide any feedback they might have. He thanked attendees for their participation and directed any additional input to be submitted to Trina Harrison:

Trina Harrison
PHX Land Reuse Strategy Project Manager
City of Phoenix, Aviation Department, Planning & Environmental
602-273-3476
trina.harrison@phoenix.gov