

## Santan Landscaping and Mitigation Community Working Group

### August 14, 2001 Approved Minutes

#### Attendees

Melissa Apergis for Michael Apergis  
Mark Kwiat  
Cathy Latona  
Cathy Lopez  
Nan Dawson  
Marshall Green  
Kimberly Pugh  
Mark Bauman  
George Pettit  
Maggie Cathey  
Richard Andrews

#### Absent

Scott Morrison (proxy given to Richard Andrews)  
Michael Apergis (proxy given to Melissa Apergis)

#### SRP Attendees

Michelle Colores  
Julie Nine

#### Others

Suzanne Hartnett, Ten Eyck  
Mary Orton, The Mary Orton Company  
Dave Wilson, Ten Eyck  
Jim Nolan  
Janee Johnston  
Lauren Reber  
Charity McDaniel  
Saretta Parrault  
John Hale  
Becky Cooseboom  
Nicki Roberts

The sixth meeting of the CWG was conducted on the evening of August 14, 2001 in the Gilbert Municipal Building.

#### Welcome

Mary welcomed CWG members, and indicated that she had received a telephone call from Richard, who would be late. She welcomed Melissa Apergis, who was attending for Michael. She also announced that Richard would hold Scott's proxy for this meeting.

#### Agenda

The CWG members reviewed the agenda and the following changes were made:

- Postponed the discussion of stack treatment options to September 8
- Added SRP administrative items

A member asked that Greenfield Lakes be added for consideration for offsite mitigation

#### SRP Administrative Items

Michelle informed the group that the newsletter "Energy News" had been sent to approximately 95,000 residents within a five-mile radius of the Santan plant. This issue publicizes the purpose and meetings of the CWG, and tells the public where to find the minutes on the website. She provided extra copies for anyone who was interested.

She also mentioned that the process has begun to remove diesel fuel from the site and should be completed by the end of next week. Several members of the CWG wanted to know if oil was being removed from all tanks and which tanks had oil. Michelle will ask Randy Dietrich to answer these questions at the next meeting.

Michelle also mentioned that in order to raise awareness of the expansion during the final permitting and design stages of the project, SRP would be posting two signs, similar to the signs in the transmission corridor, announcing the expansion and providing a contact at SRP.

### Minutes

The July 17 minutes were approved without objection with the following changes:

- Add Paul Hollar as an attendee under "Other."
- Change the word "she" to "Cathy Lopez" in the last paragraph on page 3.

A discussion was held regarding the issues and concerns list that was developed during the July 17 meeting. Several members were under the impression that all 42 items would be discussed by the CWG, but there was not agreement that this was actually discussed during that meeting. The members agreed that they did wish to discuss each item in the future, but to leave the discussion as written in the July 17 minutes.

Several members of the group did not receive the July 28 minutes. Mary will resend a clean version of the minutes and the approval will be postponed to the next meeting.

A member asked if she could send comments on the minutes to Mary and have her forward the suggestions to other members of the CWG. Mary invited anyone on the CWG to do this, or to send comments directly to the other members.

### Ground Rules

The ground rules were approved as distributed, with the changes approved on July 28.

### Median Landscaping and Sidewalks for Warner Road Improvements

Rick Allred, Town Engineer, provided a copy of the proposed plan for the median on Warner Road. He indicated it follows the street theme for Warner Road, with Chinese pistache and sweet acacia trees. The plan shows the south sidewalk to be immediately behind the curb. In response to a question, Rick stated that if the tree line were to be protected, the sidewalk would need to be there, or moved onto SRP property. One member suggested that the sidewalk be moved onto SRP property.

A member said she thought this median was going to be treated as a "special" area and not just a standard median design. Rick indicated the plan is different in that it shows 24" box trees (instead of 15") and has more groundcover. The discussion continued with the following points being presented:

- Want the design developed in a way to take the eye off the stack; e.g., palm trees in downtown Phoenix.
- Want to match the north and south sides of Warner to the median where possible.
- Flowers and color are also preferred; e.g., Gilbert Road north of Guadalupe, where there is a lot in the median including palm trees.
- Keep the eyes low (off stacks) by keeping the landscaping low. Lindsey Road from Guadalupe to Baseline is good example of low flowering shrubs.
- Suggested a flower bed in the median.
- Keep in mind driving is different from walking – low is okay.
- Focus on keeping attention low – make sure flowers are year-round if possible.
- Want to wait for plant palette on north and south sides of Warner.
- Keeping plant palette consistent with the area is a nice idea.
- Median should be consistent with mitigation.
- Alternative to decorative pavement – rock and agave, e.g., Val Vista & Superstition Freeway.
- Add more ground cover.
- Use median on Val Vista south of RR tracks for mitigation.
- Possibly add additional planting in Val Vista median north of RR to match Warner.
- Add “Specialty” median on Val Vista from Warner to Elliott.
- Need to be aware of traffic guidelines as they relate to plant material in medians.

Several members asked George if the Town could wait to choose the landscaping palette until the design of the north and south sides of Warner is complete. He agreed to do so, and the group expressed its appreciation. Dave pointed out that palms would be significantly more costly than a 24” box tree and may have different irrigation requirements. Several members indicated that cost should have no impact on their decisions.

The group agreed to work on their mitigation plans for Warner Road first, so the Town can establish a median design that complements the road mitigation. The members also want to provide their comments to the Town for the area south of the RR tracks on Val Vista, so the median there can also be treated as a “special” design, to match what is happening on Warner.

#### Trail Discussion

The CWG considered the question of whether or not the proposed trails in the conceptual plan should remain on the SRP property south of Warner, and if so, how to address the concerns of Finley Farms South. Marshall explained that Finley Farms South feels that if the trails are built on the SRP property, there will be more human and horse traffic in the transmission line corridor, which is private property owned by the HOA. The HOA feels that the proposed trail is an undue burden on the residents of Finley Farms South, due to the increased liability and maintenance costs for the HOA. While he doesn't oppose the trail south of Warner, he suggested that there should be a

barrier to block the corridor north of Warner unless and until those issues are addressed.

George reviewed the plans of the trail proposed by the original CWG group. A member asked if other subdivisions have expressed the same concerns over trails as Finley Farms South. George said the current trail system goes through 35 communities, and he is not aware of any concerns expressed by other HOAs. Another member said he lives in an area with trails and has not heard any concerns.

George also indicated that the Town Attorney has advised him that the state statute on recreational trails would prevent users from successfully suing on public property. Marshall pointed out that the area in question is not public property, but rather private property, so the state statute does not apply in this case. He said that this issue would not be resolved in the next three to four months.

Michelle indicated that SRP is obligated by its Intergovernmental Agreement (IGA) with the Town to build the trail on SRP property. In order for the trails not to be built, the Town would have to agree to release SRP from the IGA obligation. Other than that, SRP had no opinion, and it is up to the CWG. A member asked if IGA has been extended. George stated that it had not been extended.

Other comments and questions by CWG members included the following:

- I don't mind using the corridor north of Warner, but I don't feel the south portion is necessary if the issues north of Warner are not addressed.
- We shouldn't build on SRP property if there are no plans to go north of Warner.
- Is a berm possible along the eastern edge of the property? (Dave indicated that there is not much room on that side, and power line sag is a concern. If a berm is not possible, this member wants the group to consider adding a sound and security wall along the eastern boundary or possibly extending the residents' back fence to 10 feet.)
- I'm not sure there should be a trail, but there should be a sound wall.
- We need a sound and security wall; however, it doesn't make sense to do the trail if it doesn't extend to the north or south.
- We should make substantial improvements to the bridge that leads to Crossroads Park in Cottonwood Crossing and move the trail to the canal.
- I would not support moving trail traffic through Cottonwood Crossing.
- I like the trail on SRP property. However, we do need a barrier to keep people from Finley Farms, or some sort of turn-around or sign saying the trail ends at Warner, to direct traffic east and west on Warner.
- There is no need for a trail on SRP land.
- I support the trail but we need to address the Finley Farms issues.
- I'm concerned about horse traffic and children on Warner Road.
- The trail should be pedestrian only, no horses, to lessen the impact of the trail and to eliminate the problem of horses on Warner.
- The trail should be equestrian only, no people, to lessen the chance of vandalism.

- I'm indifferent about the trail.

George distributed copies of the approved trail system plan and said he is obligated to support the trail to abide with the Town's general plan. He pointed out that the trail system was developed with much public input.

Mary confirmed that the group had a consensus that there should be a sound and security wall along the eastern boundary of the SRP property. The group was unable to come to a consensus on the trail. It was agreed to continue the discussion at the September 8 meeting.

#### Public Comment on the Trails

John Hale lives on Wanda Drive and strongly opposes the trail. He pointed out that trails are normally very wide, but this proposed trail is very narrow. In addition, it is feet from his home. John is also concerned about how children will get across the railroad tracks, and said it is dangerous for children, horses, and others. It does not make sense to build a trail near a railroad track and not plan for a safe access to the other side. He said it should end at the south end of the SRP property due to this railroad crossing. He is also concerned about potential vandalism and requested that the CWG consider protecting the homeowners by building a sound and security wall or berm. He mentioned the possibility of improving and using the bridge in Cottonwood Crossing to Crossroads Park for safer access.

Becky Cooseboom is another resident on Wanda Drive. She was displeased that the Town did not ask how she felt about having a trail behind her yard. She indicated that she could live with the trail, but wants her fence raised to 10 feet for sound and security protection. She indicated that she was pleased to have SRP as her neighbor.

Nicki Roberts lives in the County Island just south of the plant and supports the trail, because it is the only place for horses to ride in this area. Speeding cars and motorcycles make the canal unsafe for horse riders. She said it will be difficult to have a trail and exclude either pedestrians or equestrians, so there should be no trail, or it should be open to both.

#### Landscaping Plan Review by Ten Eyck

Dave reviewed a conceptual plan for the north side of the SRP property. His plan shows a 3:1 slope, with 97 feet from the back of the curb on Warner Road to the base of the north side of the berm. The width of the berm is 120 feet. The trees on the berm will be in the 15- to 20-foot range to start. He said these trees would grow to 45 feet. He suggested pines, mesquite, and palo verde, because they are broad, evergreen and fast-growing, and don't require a lot of manicuring.

He suggested several places for the fence, and the group agreed that it should be between the tree line and service road.

Comments from members included:

- A desire for 60" box trees to start. (Dave indicated that the smaller trees grow a better root system and are better able to access water. He also pointed out the difficulty of transporting large trees.)
- Embedding 5' boulders in a concrete masonry fence along the back of the berm for sound mitigation.
- Move the sidewalk behind the tree line. There is room to have a meandering sidewalk through the tree line and not endanger the current trees.
- Add a flagstone walkway near the northeast corner across Warner. Other members suggested cobblestone or slate. (Dave said this was not possible as it would not be ADA-compliant.)
- Several members expressed frustration because they thought the HRSGs would be screened immediately, instead of having to wait for tree growth. They asked about an 80-foot water feature to cover the HRSGs. Someone also suggested building the berm higher in front of the HSRGs. Dave said that he wouldn't suggest a water feature, but they are considering additional height for that part of the berm. He pointed out that other areas will have views of the HSRGs and the group shouldn't focus solely on Key Biscayne. Another member suggested having a water feature along all sides of the berm.

More comments followed regarding the possibility of finding 60"-72" box trees. Dave said the group should understand that there are budgetary limits, and to keep in mind that the offsite planting is also a concern. Several members reminded the group that per the ACC, there is no budget. Mary read the condition that indicates that the plans need to be consistent with the "reasonable needs of the Applicant," and asked the group for clarification. Several members pointed out that the indication that there is no budget is in the transcript, not in the conditions. Michelle said she does not recall the Siting Committee members stating there was no budget. She offered to pull the transcript and review it for a discussion at the next meeting.

#### Agenda for Next Meeting

The following items were agreed to for the next meeting on September 8:

- The meeting minutes for July 28 and August 14 will be reviewed and approved.
- The stack treatment options originally scheduled for today's meeting have been rescheduled for September 8.
- Continued review of the draft conceptual plan
  - Warner Road Median
  - Sidewalk options
  - Trails
  - Off-site issues
  - East side concepts
  - North side detail
- Fuel tank options

Next Meeting

The group agreed that the meeting after September 8 would be Saturday, September 22, from 8:00 a.m. to 12:00 noon.

Public comment

Mary asked for any comment from the public. There was none. The meeting adjourned.