



City of Phoenix
PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT

To: Mayor and City Council Members

Date: December 17, 2025

From: Joshua Bednarek *JB*
Planning and Development Director

Subject: ITEM 76 ON THE DECEMBER 17, 2025, FORMAL AGENDA – PUBLIC HEARING AND ORDINANCE ADOPTION - REZONING APPLICATION Z-139-24-1 (NORTHPARK PUD) - SOUTHWEST CORNER OF I-17 AND LOOP 303 (ORDINANCE G-7463)

Item 76, Rezoning Case No. Z-139-24-1, is a request to rezone 6,381.49 acres located at the southwest corner of I-17 and Loop 303 from S-1 (Ranch or Farm Residence) to PUD (Planned Unit Development) for the NorthPark PUD to allow a master planned community including open space, residential, mixed use, commercial, commerce park, and industrial.

The Planning Commission heard this request on December 4, 2025, and recommended approval, per the staff memo dated December 4, 2025, by a vote of 8-0-1.

After hearing community concerns about permitted uses in the Innovation Corridor Land Use District (LUD), staff recommends modifying Stipulation No. 1.n to clarify and limit the “basic compounding of raw materials” use exclusively to semiconductor manufacturing.

Staff recommends Stipulation No. 1.ss be modified to update the comparative standards table to reflect changes to the development standards due to the modified stipulations from the Planning Commission recommendation.

Staff recommends Stipulation No. 1.tt be added to maximize the screening and landscape buffer along the western property line of Master Development Parcel 2 and the adjacent regional park.

Following the Planning Commission hearing, staff received multiple community inquiries concerning this request. Attached are copies of the responses.

The modified stipulations are listed below in **BOLD AND CAPITAL** letters.

Staff recommends approval, subject to the following stipulations:

1. An updated Development Narrative for the NorthPark PUD reflecting the changes approved through this request shall be submitted to the Planning and Development Department within 30 days of City Council approval of this request. The updated Development Narrative shall be consistent with the Development Narrative date stamped November 6, 2025, as modified by the following stipulations:
 - a. Front cover: Revise the submittal date information on the bottom to add the following: City Council adopted: [Add adoption date].
 - b. Page 24, Section 3 Process and Procedures, 3.4.b MDP and Functional Segment Master Plans, second paragraph (before flow chart), revise as follows: As each subsequent MDP and functional segment plan is completed or amended, overall conceptual master plans shall be updated accordingly. Each portion of functional segment or MDP plan can revise the prior approved plan.
 - c. Page 28, Section 4 Land Use Plan, 4.4 Land Use Districts, Table 3: MDP Land Use Allocation Table (gross acres): Update the Community Open Space and Traditional Neighborhood entries under MDP.5 to reflect the Parks/Open Space – Privately Owned parcel south of Dixileta Drive and west of 51st Avenue, as depicted on Exhibit 5: Proposed General Plan Land Use Map, designated as Community Open Space, and update corresponding numbers in the total acreage row and the total site column.
 - d. Page 29, Section 4 Land Use Plan, Exhibit 8A: Land Use Districts: Add the area designated as Parks/Open Space – Privately Owned south of Dixileta Drive and west of 51st Avenue, as depicted on Exhibit 5: Proposed General Plan Land Use Map, as Community Open Space.
 - e. Page 33, Section 4 Land Use Plan, Exhibit 8C: Community Open Space (COS): Update exhibit and table to include the area designated as Parks/Open Space – Privately Owned south of Dixileta Drive and west of 51st Avenue, as depicted on Exhibit 5: Proposed General Plan Land Use Map.
 - f. Page 35, Section 4 Land Use Plan, Exhibit 8E: Traditional Neighborhood (TN): Update exhibit and table to remove the area designated as Parks/Open Space – Privately Owned south of Dixileta Drive and west of 51st Avenue, as depicted on Exhibit 5: Proposed General Plan Land Use Map.
 - g. Page 45, Section 4 Land Use Plan, Exhibit 10: Master Trails Plan: Update as follows:
 - i. Locate the NorthVista Multi-Modal Corridor and Loop 303 Pedestrian and Bike Bridge on the east side of the wash.

- ii. Add a minor public trailhead on the east side of 67th Avenue, south of Dixileta Drive and north of the enhanced pedestrian and bike crossing along the CAP Canal.
 - iii. Update legend to include labels which differentiate which color (light blue or dark blue) is indicative of the sidewalk and the raised and protected bike lane.
 - iv. Update legend to change "6-foot Protected Bike Lane (Both Sides)" to "6-foot Separated and Elevated Bike Lane (Both Sides)"
- h. Page 46, Section 4 Land Use Plan, 4.7.b Trails and Paths, Shared-Use Paths and Multi-Use Trails, second paragraph, 1st sentence, revise and add the following: Shared-Use Paths will be a minimum 10-foot concrete within a 20-foot public Sidewalk Easement (S.W.E) where adjacent to roads, or a 25-foot Public Trail Easement where adjacent to open space or wash corridors. Where a Shared-Use Path is within right-of-way, the 20-foot public Sidewalk Easement (S.W.E) width shall be ultimately reviewed and approved by the Street Transportation Department and Planning and Development Department during review of the applicable master development parcel master plan review.
- i. Page 46, Section 4 Land Use Plan, 4.7.b Trails And Paths, Shared-Use Paths and Multi-Use Trails, second paragraph, add as last sentence: Where a Multi-Use Trail crosses arterial or collector roadways at non-signalized intersections, alternative crossing types such as grade-separated crossings, HAWK crossings or other appropriate crossing types utilized by the City of Phoenix shall be constructed, as required by the Street Transportation Department and the Planning and Development Department.
- j. Page 46, Section 4 Land Use Plan, 4.7.b Trails and Paths, NorthPark Loop, second paragraph, second sentence, revise to: Where the NorthPark Loop crosses arterial or collector roadways at non-signalized intersections, alternative crossing types such as grade-separated crossings, HAWK crossings of other appropriate crossing types utilized by the City of Phoenix shall be constructed, as required by the Street Transportation Department and the Planning and Development Department.

- k. Page 47, Section 4 Land Use Plan, 4.7.b Trails and Paths, CAP Trail, add as last sentence: Where the cap trail crosses an arterial roadway at non-signalized intersections, alternative crossing types such as grade-separated crossings, HAWK crossings or other appropriate crossing types utilized by the City of Phoenix shall be constructed, as required by the Street Transportation Department, the Planning and Development Department, and the Central Arizona Project.
- l. Page 47, Section 4 Land Use Plan, 4.7.b Trails and Paths, NorthVista Multi-Modal Corridor: Delete end of first sentence "and coupled with the Community Park property".
- m. Page 58 Section 5 List of Uses, 5.2 Permitted Uses, 5.2.d Traditional Neighborhood (TN): Move "6. Privately owned or operated parks, playgrounds and other recreational uses" below the list of Local Services use restrictions. Renumber local services use restrictions from "a" to "b".
- n. Page 63, Section 5 List of Uses, 5.2 Permitted Uses, 5.2.i Innovation Corridor (IC), item **2 AND 2.a**: Revise ~~percentage to 60%~~. **LANGUAGE TO: BASIC COMPOUNDING AND PROCESSING OF RAW MATERIALS FOR SEMICONDUCTOR MANUFACTURING, EXCEPT FOOD AND AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTS. THE END PRODUCT CONSISTS OF MATERIALS FOR LATER PROCESSING OR FABRICATION INTO A FINISHED PRODUCT TO BE USED BY THE ULTIMATE PURCHASER. DELETE ITEM 2.A IN ITS ENTIRETY AND RENUMBER REMAINING ITEMS.**
- o. Page 63, Section 5 List of Uses, 5.2 Permitted Uses, 5.2.i Innovation Corridor (IC), item 2.c: Revise to: Such uses shall require a minimum property setback of 50 feet from the Loop 303 freeway, 51st Avenue, 43rd Avenue, and Dixileta Drive.
- p. Page 67, Section 5 List of Uses, 5.3 Accessory Uses, 5.3.d Innovation Corridor (IC): Delete item 1 in its entirety and renumber remaining items.
- q. Page 67, Section 5 List of Uses, 5.3 Accessory Uses, 5.3.d Innovation Corridor (IC), item 3.a.i: Revise to: Such uses are not permitted east of 43rd Avenue.
- r. Page 67, Section 5 List of Uses, 5.3 Accessory Uses, 5.3.d Innovation Corridor (IC), item 3.a.ii: Revise to: Such uses shall require a minimum property setback of 50 feet from the Loop 303 freeway, 51st Avenue, 43rd Avenue, and Dixileta Drive.
- s. Page 67, Section 5 List of Uses, 5.3 Accessory Uses, 5.3.d Innovation Corridor (IC), item 3.a.iii: Revise to: Such uses shall be screened from public streets by a decorative solid fence or wall.

- t. Page 67, Section 5 List of Uses, 5.3 Accessory Uses, 5.3.d Innovation Corridor (IC), item 3.b.ii and item 3.b.iii: Delete these items and renumber all remaining items.
- u. Page 67, Section 5 List of Uses, 5.3 Accessory Uses, 5.3.d Innovation Corridor (IC), item 3.b.iv: Revise to: Such uses shall be setback a minimum of 50 feet from property lines.
- v. Page 67, Section 5 List of Uses, 5.3 Accessory Uses, 5.3.d Innovation Corridor (IC), item 3.b.v: Revise to: Such uses shall be screened from public streets by a decorative solid fence or wall.
- w. Page 77, Section 6 Development Standards, 6.1 Development Standards of General Applicability, 6.1.f Development Standards: Innovation Corridor, Maximum Building Height: Revise to: 56 and 4 stories; Heights up to 110 feet shall be permitted when located a minimum of 500 feet from Dixileta Drive; Non-habitable mechanical equipment and structures that may include, but are not limited to, elements such as air separators, exhaust pipes, and gas processing equipment are permitted up to 225 feet in height for a maximum of 25% of the roof area.
- x. Page 82, Section 6 Development Standards, 6.4 Elevated and Protected Bike Lanes and Streetscape Zone, second paragraph, first sentence, revise to: The circulation network, with the primary objective of managing vehicle movement within and through the community, will also prioritize alternative transportation options by including separated and elevated bicycle lanes, detached sidewalks, and thoughtful integration with the comprehensive trail and path network within the overall community.
- y. Page 82, Section 6 Development Standards, 6.4 Elevated and Protected Bike Lanes and Streetscape Zone, second paragraph, last sentence, revise to: All street sections included in this PUD are conceptual and subject to change, exclusive of the inclusion of the elevated and separated bike lanes.
- z. Page 82, Section 6 Development Standards, 6.4 Elevated and Protected Bike Lanes and Streetscape Zone, 6.4.a Arterial Streets, Arterial Street Landscape Setback, Trail and Path Requirements, second sentence, revise to: This may overlap with any required M.U.T.E./S.U.P.E./P.U.E.s
- aa. Page 86, Section 6 Development Standards, Table 7 Streetscape, Both Sides of All Arterial Streets (Dixileta Drive, 43rd Avenue, 51st Avenue, 67th Avenue), 1. Bike Lanes, subsection d., revise to: Separated from back of curb by a minimum 8-foot-wide landscape strip

- bb. Page 86, Section 6 Development Standards, Table 7 Streetscape, Both Sides of All Arterial Streets (Dixileta Drive, 43rd Avenue, 51st Avenue, 67th Avenue), 3. Detached Sidewalks, revise title to: Detached Sidewalks (where SUP is designated and provided in place of a sidewalk, no additional sidewalk is required, but the SUP shall also be subject to these standards):
- cc. Page 86, Section 6 Development Standards, Table 7 Streetscape, Both Sides of All Arterial Streets (Dixileta Drive, 43rd Avenue, 51st Avenue, 67th Avenue), 3. Detached Sidewalks, subsection a., revise to: Minimum Width: 6 feet; Shared-Use Path 10 feet.
- dd. Page 86, Section 6 Development Standards, Table 7 Streetscape, Both Sides of All Arterial Streets (Dixileta Drive, 43rd Avenue, 51st Avenue, 67th Avenue), 3. Detached Sidewalks, subsection b., revise to: Landscape Strip Width (located between back of bike lane and sidewalk/SUP): Minimum 5 feet
- ee. Page 87, Section 6 Development Standards, Table 7 Streetscape, Both Sides of All Collector Streets, 1. Bike Lanes, subsection d., revise to: Separated from back of curb by a minimum 7-foot-wide landscape strip.
- ff. Page 87, Section 6 Development Standards, Table 7 Streetscape, Both Sides of All Collector Streets, 3. Detached Sidewalks, subsection b., revise to: Landscape Strip Width (located between back of bike lane and sidewalk): Minimum 5 feet
- gg. Page 89, Section 6 Development Standards, 6.6 Fences and Walls, b. Residential Development, item i: Delete and renumber remaining items.
- hh. Page 91, Section 6 Development Standards, 6.7 Amenities, b. NorthVista Multi-Modal Corridor to Loop 303 Crossing, first sentence: Update "MDP.2" with "MDP.1".
- ii. Page 93, Section 6 Development Standards, 6.9 Hillside Development: Delete the third sentence.
- jj. Page 105, Section 7 Design Guidelines, 7.3 North Black Canyon Overlay District (NBCOD) Design Guideline Conformance, 7.3.a Modified Design Guidelines, II. Design guidelines common to all development areas (residential and commercial), E. Streetscape, update item 1 to: 51st Avenue, 43rd Avenue and Dixileta Road are planned as major arterial streets requiring a minimum 140 feet of right-of-way for 6 lanes, with elevated and separated bicycle lanes and a sidewalk set back from the curb. 67th Avenue shall be designed to include similar improvements within a minimum 130 feet of right-of-way. Public trails and shared-use paths are identified on Exhibit 10: Master Trails Plan, of the PUD.

- kk. Page 106, Section 7 Design Guidelines, 7.3 North Black Canyon Overlay District (NBCOD) Design Guideline Conformance, 7.3.a Modified Design Guidelines, II. Design guidelines common to all development areas (residential and commercial), E. Streetscape, update item 10 to: Public multi-use trails or shared-use paths are identified and are to be provided in conformance with Exhibit 10: Master Trails Plan of the PUD, in addition to the required sidewalk (except where shared-use paths are provided in lieu of a sidewalk), with the exact alignment to be approved by the City. Additional public shared-use paths or trails may be established along collector roadways through the master planning and administration processes in Section 3.4 of this narrative.
- ll. Page 107, Section 7 Design Guidelines, 7.4 NorthPark Design Guidelines, a. Arterial Road Bridge Crossings, add item at the end numbered viii, as follows: All arterial road bridge crossings shall comply with City of Phoenix adopted standards and as approved by the Street Transportation Department.
- mm. Page 113, Section 7 Design Guidelines, 7.4 NorthPark Design Guidelines, b. Site Design/Development, v. Trails/Paths, 1. Multi-Use Trails, Shared-Use Paths, and Pedestrian Walkways, Subsection b., revise to: All Shared-Use Paths (SUPs) shall be located within minimum 20-foot-wide sidewalk easements (S/W E) and Multi-Use Trails(MUTs) shall be located within minimum 30-foot-wide Multi-Use Trail Easements (MUTEs), in accordance with the MAG supplemental detail, and as approved or modified by the Street Transportation Department and the Planning and Development Department.
- nn. Page 114, Section 7 Design Guidelines, 7.4 NorthPark Design Guidelines, b. Site Design/Development, v. Trails/Paths, 1. Multi-Use Trails, Shared-Use Paths, and Pedestrian Walkways, subsection i., revise to: Where SUP and MUT alignments cross streets, entryways, or commercial driveways, the use of bollards or other similar elements shall be provided to ensure for safe crossing zones. No bollards may be located within public right-of-way and shall meet ADA accessibility standards.
- oo. Page 115, Section 7 Design Guidelines, 7.4 NorthPark Design Guidelines, b. Site Design/Development, v. Trails/Paths, 1. Multi-Use Trails, Shared-Use Paths, and Pedestrian Walkways, subsection o., revise to: Where primary pedestrian pathways cross drive aisles, parking areas, or streets, they shall be constructed of stamped or colored concrete, brick, pavers, or an alternative decorative material that visually contrasts the parking aisle, drive aisle, or street surface, as reviewed and approved by the Street Transportation Department and the Planning and Development Department.

- pp. Page 115, Section 7 Design Guidelines, 7.4 Northpark Design Guidelines, b. Site Design/Development, v. Trails/Paths, 2. NorthPark Loop, Exhibit 13: NorthPark Loop: Locate NorthVista Multi-Modal Corridor on the east side of the wash.
- qq. Page 116, Section 7 Design Guidelines, 7.4 NorthPark Design Guidelines, b. Site Design/Development, v. Trails/Paths, 2. NorthPark Loop, subsection g., revise to: Where the Loop crosses streets, entryways, or commercial driveways, the use of bollards or other similar elements shall be provided to ensure for safe crossing zones. Path alignment may also jog in order to slow speeds and ensure pedestrians and bicyclists look towards vehicle traffic prior to crossing. No bollards may be located within public right-of-way and shall meet Ada accessibility standards.
- rr. Page 118, Section 7 Design Guidelines, 7.4 Northpark Design Guidelines, b. Site Design/Development, vi. Parking/Circulation, 3. Access/Circulation, c. Traffic Calming, subsection i., revise to: Traffic calming measures shall be provided on private property at entries and exits along arterial and collector streets to slow down vehicular speeds as they approach sidewalks, pathways, and trails.
- ss. **APPENDIX D: COMPARATIVE DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS TABLES AND Appendix E: Other Master Plans: Update the COMPARATIVE DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS TABLES, Master Development & Phasing Plan and the Master Open Space, Pedestrian, Bicycle & Trails Plan per the stipulations above.**
- tt. **PAGE 67, SECTION 5 LIST OF USES, 5.3 ACCESSORY USES, 5.3.D INNOVATION CORRIDOR (IC), ITEM 3.A, ADD THE FOLLOWING: V. SUCH USES SHALL MAXIMIZE THE SCREENING AND LANDSCAPE BUFFER ALONG THE WESTERN PROPERTY LINE OF MASTER DEVELOPMENT PARCEL 2 FROM ADJACENT REGIONAL PARK, AS APPROVED BY THE PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT.**

2. Overall PUD, Conceptual Master Development Parcel (CMDP), plans for the entire NorthPark PUD, per the requirements of the Planned Community District (PCD) per Section 636 of the Phoenix Zoning Ordinance as it relates to the NorthPark scale community serving infrastructure, shall be submitted to the City for review and approval prior to submitting Planned Community District (PCD) or Functional Segment (FS) master plans for any MDP, except for MDP.2. Submitted PCD or FS master plans must be in general conformance with the CMDP and approved before submitting any Preliminary Site Plans, for land within that MDP, as approved by the Planning and Development Department. The PCD and/or FS master plans shall meet the full requirements of Section 636 regarding master plans and must be in general conformance with the CMDP. Some MDPs will require review with and/or approval by other departments or agencies as applicable for those specific plans or MDP areas. The CMDP may be updated to reflect more refined PCD or FS master plans of the various MDP areas as the area develops.
 - a. The Master Development Plan shall also include a tracking table for the following items:
 - i. Locations, minimum acreages, and maximum acreages of the local services use within the Foothills Residential, Traditional Neighborhood, and Neighborhood Village Land Use Districts (LUDs).
 - ii. The minimum number of units for the Lifestyle Mixed-Use (LMU) and Freeway Mixed-Use (FMU) LUDs, and the minimum square footage of commercial uses in the LMU LUD and FMU LUD.
 - iii. The minimum area required for vertical mixed-use (residential and commercial) in the LMU LUD and FMU LUD.
 - b. The locations of the public bicycle repair stations ("fix it stations") shall be identified on all master plans, as required by the PUD.
 - c. The locations of the proposed Sonoran Preserve and preserved natural wash/floodplain corridors, shall be identified on the master plans, as required by the PUD.
 - d. The locations of the public regional park and public community park shall be identified on the master plans.
 - e. The locations of neighborhood parks shall be identified on MDP master plans and pocket parks shall be identified on Functional Segment master plans.
 - f. Locations of Monarch Butterfly gardens, as required by the PUD, shall be identified and provided within each MDP.

- g. For MDPs that include school sites for reservation for the Deer Valley Unified School District (DVUSD), the locations of the three school sites, in locations and acreage to be approved or modified by DVUSD, shall be identified and shown on the CMDP and then refined on the PCD or FS master plans.
 - h. Location of a fire/mini police station, in a location and acreage to be approved or modified by the Fire Department and Police Department, shall be identified and shown on the CMDP and then refined on the PCD or FS master plans.
 - i. Gateway monuments and project gateway design for entrances into the NorthPark community shall be identified on the PCD or FS master plans, as required by the PUD.
3. A Master Streets Plan shall be submitted and approved for the overall North Park PUD prior to, or concurrent with the initial Conceptual Master Development Parcel (CMDP) submission, excluding MDP.2. No preliminary approval of plans shall be granted within an MDP without an approved MDP Traffic Impact Analysis and associated MDP and/or PCD or FS Master Street Plans.

In addition to the Master Street Plan requirements set forth in the North Park PUD, the following information shall also be required:

- a. A separate signing and striping plan shall be reviewed and approved by the Street Transportation Department for the separated and elevated bicycle facilities, as required by Section 6, Table 7 of the PUD.
 - b. Protected bicycle intersection designs shall be incorporated within each MDP and guided by NACTO national standards, as approved by the Street Transportation Department.
 - c. A Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA) shall be approved for any new submission or modification to the overall North Park PUD, Master Development Parcel, or Functional Segment Master Plan along with corresponding updated Master Streets Plans.
 - d. Where an arterial or collector street crosses a wash or floodplain corridor, a 100-year storm dry crossing shall be constructed per the City of Phoenix storm water design manual, as approved by the Planning and Development Department.
4. A Master Trails Plan shall be submitted and approved to the Planning and Development and Street Transportation Departments for the overall North Park PUD prior to, or concurrent with the initial Conceptual Master Development Parcel submission, excluding MDP.2. The Master Trails Plan shall incorporate the following elements:

- a. All trails and paths identified on Exhibit 10: Master Trails Plan shall be publicly accessible through public access easement dedications.
 - b. Multi-Use Trails, Shared-Use Path, and NorthPark Loop crossings at arterial and collector streets that are away from signalized intersection shall be identified and above or below grade crossings, HAWKS or similar pedestrian activated crossings shall be assigned and constructed, as approved by the Street Transportation Department.
 - c. Standard details shall be provided for the NorthPark Loop, including connections that cross wash corridors, as approved by the Planning and Development Department.
 - d. Locations of neighborhood and singletrack trails, as required by the PUD, shall be identified and provided on Functional Segment master plans.
 - e. Location of the NorthVista Multi-Modal Path Corridor within MDP.1, generally located east of 43rd Avenue and north of Dixileta Drive, connecting to the future pedestrian/bicycle bridge over the Loop 303 freeway, shall be identified on the MDP master plans, as required by the PUD, and shall be provided along the western edge of the 100-year floodplain corridor, outside of the floodplain boundary.
 - f. Location of a minor trailhead east of 67th Avenue, south of Dixileta Drive.
5. This parcel is in a Special Flood Hazard Area (SFHA) called Zone A, Zone AE, and Zone AE floodway, on panels 1255L, 0840L, and 0845L of Flood Insurance Rate Maps (FIRM) with an effective date of October 16, 2013 and 1260M revised on September 18, 2020. The following requirements shall apply, as approved by the Planning and Development Department.
 - a. The Architect and Engineer are required to show the floodplain boundary limits on the Site Plan and Grading and Drainage Plan and ensure that impacts to the proposed facilities are adequately addressed, following National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP) Regulations (44 CFR Paragraph 60.3). This includes, but is not limited to, provisions in the latest versions of the Floodplain Ordinance of the Phoenix City Code.
 - b. A copy of the Grading and Drainage Plan shall be submitted to the Floodplain Management section of the Street Transportation Department for review and approval of floodplain requirements.
 - c. The developer shall provide a FEMA approved CLOMR-F or CLOMR prior to issuance of a Grading and Drainage permit.

- d. A LOMR application shall be submitted to the Floodplain Management section of the Street Transportation Department for review and approval prior to issuance of vertical construction permits.
 - e. The developer shall provide a FEMA approved LOMR-F or LOMR prior to issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy.
- 6. The developer shall reserve approximately 7 acres, generally located at the northwest corner of 51st Avenue and Dixileta Drive, for a future fire/mini police station, as approved or modified by the Fire Department, Police Department, and the Planning and Development Department. The final acreage and configuration of the property to be reserved, along with the timing of the conveyance, shall be mutually agreed upon by the developer, the Fire Department, the Police Department, and the Planning and Development Department.
- 7. The developer shall reserve approximately 4 acres of the Community Open Space Land Use District, generally located east of 43rd Avenue and north of Dixileta Drive, generally shown on Exhibit 8C: Community Open Space of the PUD Development Narrative date stamped November 6, 2025, to the City of Phoenix for a future public library, as approved or modified by the Library Department and the Planning and Development Department. The final acreage and configuration of the property to be conveyed, along with timing of the conveyance, shall be mutually agreed upon by the developer, the Library Department, and the Planning and Development Department.
- 8. The area designated as Parks/Open Space – Privately Owned, generally located west of the southwest corner of 51st Avenue and Dixileta Drive, as generally depicted on Exhibit 5: Proposed General Plan Land Use Map of the PUD Development Narrative date stamped November 6, 2025, shall be preserved as permanent undisturbed open space and shall be privately maintained. The area may include passive recreational features such as trails, seating nodes, or other elements, provided such improvements are consistent with the intent to maintain the area as undisturbed open space, as approved by the Planning and Development Department.
- 9. The developer shall convey approximately 2,100 acres, generally shown on Exhibit 8B: Natural Open Space of the PUD Development Narrative date stamped November 6, 2025, to the City of Phoenix for inclusion in the Sonoran Preserve, as approved or modified by the Parks and Recreation Department and the Planning and Development Department. The final acreage and configuration of the property to be conveyed, along with timing of the conveyance, shall be mutually agreed upon by the developer, the Parks and Recreation Department, and the Planning and Development Department.

10. The developer shall convey approximately 208 acres, generally shown on Exhibit 8C: Community Open Space of the PUD Development Narrative date stamped November 6, 2025, to the City of Phoenix for a future public regional park and community park, as approved or modified by the Parks and Recreation Department and the Planning and Development Department. The final acreage and configuration of the property to be conveyed, along with the timing of the conveyance, shall be mutually agreed upon by the developer, the Parks and Recreation Department, and the Planning and Development Department.
11. The developer shall convey approximately 3 acres with less than 10% slope for each minor trailhead generally shown on Exhibit 10: Master Trails Plan of the PUD Development Narrative date stamped November 6, 2025, for future minor trailheads, as approved or modified by the Parks and Recreation Department and the Planning and Development Department. The final acreage and configuration of the property to be conveyed, along with the timing of the conveyance, shall be mutually agreed upon by the developer, the Parks and Recreation Department, and the Planning and Development Department.
12. The developer shall convey approximately 5 acres with less than 10% slope for the major trailhead generally shown on Exhibit 10: Master Trails Plan of the PUD Development Narrative date stamped November 6, 2025, for a future major trailhead, as approved or modified by the Parks and Recreation Department and the Planning and Development Department. The final acreage and configuration of the property to be conveyed, along with the timing of the conveyance, shall be mutually agreed upon by the developer, the Parks and Recreation Department, and the Planning and Development Department.
13. At the time of conveyance of land for the major trailhead generally shown on Exhibit 10: Master Trails Plan of the PUD Development Narrative date stamped November 6, 2025, the major trailhead acreage shall be large enough to accommodate a minimum of 200 parking spaces and other amenities (restrooms, ramadas, pedestrian connections, etc.), as approved or modified by the Parks and Recreation Department and the Planning and Development Department.

14. All multi-use trails (MUTs), shared-use paths (SUPs), and the NorthPark Loop, as depicted on Exhibit 10: Master Trails Plan of the PUD Development Narrative hearing draft date stamped November 6, 2025, shall be constructed outside of proposed Sonoran Preserve lands. Prior to final site plan approval of any development east of 51st Avenue and south of Dixileta Drive, the proposed NorthPark Loop bisecting the Preserve from east to west, south of Mount Ochoa, shall be constructed by the developer as part of the overall development, in accordance with the requirements in the PUD, as approved or modified by the Parks and Recreation Department and the Planning and Development Department. Upon completion of the NorthPark Loop through the Preserve and Parks and Recreation Department ownership of the land, the Parks and Recreation Department will take over maintenance of that portion of the NorthPark Loop that lies within the Preserve within this one area south of Mount Ochoa.
15. The proposed arterial streets (43rd Avenue, 51st Avenue, 67th Avenue, and Dixileta Drive) shall accommodate transit. Bus pads, conforming with City of Phoenix Standard Detail P1260, shall be located every one-quarter mile on both directions of the proposed streets. At intersections, there shall be bus bays that conform with Standard Detail P1256. The pads and bays shall be located from intersections according to Standard Detail P1258 **OR AS APPROVED BY THE PUBLIC TRANSIT DEPARTMENT**.
16. The overall North Park PUD Master Street Plan shall identify and assign 25% private contribution, not to exceed \$2,500,000, as determined by the Street Transportation Department, for the total cost of the multi-modal bridge crossing over the Loop 303 freeway from the NorthVista Multi-Modal Path Corridor, as identified in the PUD. The City acknowledges this contribution may be made by a special taxing district, if approved by the City Council.
17. A minimum of 140 feet of right-of-way shall be dedicated for the full width of 43rd Avenue from the Loop 303 freeway interchange to Dixileta Drive. 43rd Avenue shall be assigned and constructed as required per the approved Master Development Parcel (MDP) Master Street Plans and accepted MDP Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA), as approved by the Street Transportation Department and the Planning and Development Department.
18. A minimum of 140 feet of right-of-way shall be dedicated for the full width of 51st Avenue from the Loop 303 freeway interchange to the existing Stetson Valley Parkway, south of the Central Arizona Project (CAP) canal. 51st Avenue shall be assigned and constructed per the approved Conceptual Master Development Parcel (CMDP) Master Street Plans and the accepted MDP Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA), and in compliance with CAP requirements. The PCD or FS Master Street Plans and TIA's for each MDP shall establish assignment of MDP funding and/or construction of improvements over the CAP canal, as approved by the Street Transportation Department and the Planning and Development Department.

19. A minimum of 130 feet of right-of-way shall be dedicated for the full width of 67th Avenue/Pyramid Peak Parkway from the Loop 303 freeway interchange to the existing 67th Avenue, south of the Central Arizona Project (CAP) canal. 67th Avenue/Pyramid Peak Parkway shall be constructed per the approved Conceptual Master Development Parcel (CMDP) Master Street Plans and the accepted MDP Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA), and in compliance with CAP requirements. The PCD or FS Master Street Plans and TIA's for each MDP shall establish assignment of MDP funding and/or construction of improvements over the CAP canal, as approved by the Street Transportation Department and the Planning and Development Department.
20. A minimum of 140 feet of right-of-way shall be dedicated for the full width of Dixileta Drive from the Interstate 17 interchange to the 67th Avenue/Pyramid Peak Parkway. Dixileta Drive shall be constructed per the approved Conceptual Master Development Parcel (CMDP) Master Street Plans and the accepted MDP Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA), as approved by the Street Transportation Department and the Planning and Development Department.
21. The overall North Park PUD Conceptual Master Street Plan and subsequent PCD or FS Master Street Plan(s) shall identify and assign all modifications and improvements required for the Dixileta and I-17 traffic interchange, as approved by the Arizona Department of Transportation and the Street Transportation Department.
22. The overall North Park PUD Conceptual Master Street Plan and subsequent PCD or FS Master Street Plan(s) shall identify and assign all modifications and improvements required for the 67th Avenue and Loop 303 traffic interchange, as approved by the Arizona Department of Transportation and the Street Transportation Department.
23. Master Development Parcel 2 shall direct large truck traffic to the 303 Freeway through on-site access control restrictions to discourage south bound access onto 51st Avenue.
24. Future PCD or FS Master Development Plans shall identify and assign a traffic signal to be designed, fully funded, and constructed at the intersection of Stetson Valley Parkway and Inspiration Mountain Parkway/Cortopassi Pass, as approved by the Street Transportation Department.
25. Future PCD or FS Master Development Plans shall identify and assign a traffic signal to be designed, fully funded, and constructed at the intersection of Stetson Valley Parkway and Inspiration Mountain Parkway(north)/Tombstone Trail, as approved by the Street Transportation Department. A pedestrian signalized crossing (e.g. HAWK) may be considered as an interim condition prior to full signalization of the intersection being warranted.

26. All mitigation improvements shall be constructed and/or funded as identified in the accepted PUD, and subsequent Conceptual Master Development Plan and PCD or FS Segment Traffic Impact Analyses.
27. All streets within and adjacent to the development shall be constructed with paving, curb, gutter, sidewalk, curb ramps, streetlights, median islands, landscaping and other incidentals, as per plans approved by the Planning and Development Department. All improvements shall comply with all ADA accessibility standards.
28. Prior to the submittal of PCD or FS master plans for Master Development Parcels 1, 3 and 6, as depicted on Exhibit 7: Master Development Parcel Map of the PUD Development Narrative hearing draft date stamped November 6, 2025, the applicant shall engage with the Deer Valley Unified School District regarding the plan of development.
29. A minimum of three public school sites at locations acceptable to the school district and the Street Transportation Department shall be reserved for one year from the date of approval of the PCD or FS master plans; for a maximum 80-acre high school site in Master Development Parcel 1, for a maximum 20-acre K-8 site in Master Development Parcel 3, and for a maximum 20-acre K-8 site in Master Development Parcel 6, as approved by the Planning and Development Department and Deer Valley Unified School District.
30. If determined necessary by the Phoenix Archaeology Office, the applicant shall conduct Phase I data testing and submit an archaeological survey report of the development area for review and approval by the City Archaeologist prior to clearing and grubbing, landscape salvage, and/or grading approval.
31. If Phase I data testing is required, and if, upon review of the results from the Phase I data testing, the City Archaeologist, in consultation with a qualified archaeologist, determines such data recovery excavations are necessary, the applicant shall conduct Phase II archaeological data recovery excavations.
32. In the event archaeological materials are encountered during construction, the developer shall immediately cease all ground-disturbing activities within a 33-foot radius of the discovery, notify the City Archaeologist, and allow time for the Archaeology Office to properly assess the materials.
33. Prior to final site plan approval, the landowner shall execute a Proposition 207 waiver of claims form. The waiver shall be recorded with the Maricopa County Recorder's Office and delivered to the City to be included in the rezoning application file for record.

Approved:



Alan Stephenson
Deputy City Manager

12/17/25
Date

Attachment:

Staff responses to community inquiries

From: Racelle Escolar
Sent: Wednesday, December 17, 2025 1:00 PM
To: 'Amanda McGowan'
Cc: Sarah Stockham; Tricia Gomes; Adrian G Zambrano
Subject: RE: TSMC Response- Discharge & Air Pollution Data- Northpark

Importance: High

Hi Amanda,

Sorry for the delay. The below information responds to the 16 questions in your email below. Staff provided the answers under the categories below.

Wastewater & PFAS Monitoring

1. Will the City require PFAS monitoring for industrial users discharging to the POTW, consistent with EPA's December 2022 guidance encouraging pretreatment authorities to use existing Clean Water Act authority to require this testing?
2. If not, what is the rationale for declining to require PFAS monitoring when EPA guidance permits and recommends it?
3. Will the City require the facility to conduct influent, effluent, and sludge testing to identify PFAS or PFAS precursors entering the wastewater system?
4. If PFAS are detected, what mechanisms or controls are in place to prevent contaminated wastewater or biosolids from entering the environment?

Response: The Memorandum referenced "provides guidance to states...for addressing PFAS discharges when they are authorized to administer the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permitting program and/or pretreatment program and states that EPA will work with the state-authorized permitting authorities to restrict the discharge of PFAS at their sources." The City is not aware of the EPA working with the state of Arizona to restrict or identify PFAS in wastewater discharges. Until the state of Arizona implements legal requirements, the City cannot require monitoring for industrial users. ADEQ's regulatory authority is also limited by statute to be no more stringent than the corresponding federal law.

The State of Arizona issued an AZPDES permit to the City in 2023, and the EPA issued a NPDES permit to the City in 2024, neither permit authorizes PFAS monitoring for industrial discharges. There are no wastewater limits established by the State or EPA for PFAS. As a result, the City does not have authority to require PFAS monitoring for industrial dischargers.

The City only has authority to require TSMC to monitor their industrial discharges into the City's wastewater system for specific local limits and federal mandated parameters. Should rules or regulations be enacted addressing PFA's, the City would enforce as applicable. The City does and will continue to work with the EPA and State regarding the safety of the public and the environment and TSMC will be required to comply with current and future requirements regarding discharge. The City test water leaving wastewater treatment plants and the water meets all federal requirements for safe water discharge into aquifers and river corridors.

Chemical Inventory & Spill/Accident Risk

5. Has the City conducted (or will it require) a hazard analysis for the large volumes of hydrofluoric acid, nitric acid, sulfuric acid, glycol ethers, diesel, and other hazardous chemicals currently stored onsite and anticipated with expansion?

Response: Facilities that store, use, handle, or manufacture hazardous materials are regulated by the Phoenix Fire Code and applicable national standards. The quantities and types of chemicals on site determine the requirements for both operational and construction permits. When tanks, process piping, machinery, and equipment utilizing these materials are anticipated or planned, Fire Prevention conducts permitting and plan review to ensure:

- Chemical quantities do not exceed the maximum allowable amounts established by the Fire Code.
- Equipment, piping, and storage methods are compatible with the specific materials being conveyed or stored.
- Required safety features, such as gas detection, ventilation, fire detection, and fire suppression, are appropriately designed and installed. Part of the Phoenix Fire Code requirements for fire safety systems is continuous monitoring that initiates the deployment of emergency response resources upon activation.
- Emergency procedures and safeguards are in place, including appropriate signage, access, and emergency shutdown capabilities.
- Coordination occurs with the Fire Department’s operational response teams to ensure they have full awareness of facility layout, chemical locations, and any special response considerations.

Regarding the quantities of material on site, the Fire Code establishes both indoor and outdoor maximum allowable quantities based on each chemical’s hazard characteristics. Storage configuration, utilization, secondary containment, vessel size, and vessel design are all regulated by these standards and verified through the permitting and inspection processes.

Additionally, the TSMC facility, including all future phases and additions, is part of the Hazardous Materials Annual Assessment Program. Fire inspectors will remain engaged not only during construction but also as the buildings, equipment, vessels, and processes continue to become operational. Their ongoing role is to verify that life-safety systems, material quantities, emergency procedures, and hazardous material handling continue to comply with the Phoenix Fire Code, while maintaining ongoing coordination with Fire Operations to support safe and effective emergency response.

Large volumes of chemicals (typically more than 10,000 pounds, but may be depending upon the chemicals—see the EPA List of Lists ([consolidated-list-of-lists-updated-april-2025.pdf](https://www.epa.gov/epcra/consolidated-list-of-lists-updated-april-2025.pdf)) must be disclosed through Tier II reporting based on the Emergency Planning and Community Right to Know Act (EPCRA) (<https://www.epa.gov/epcra>) to ADEQ. Some chemicals that exceed 1,320 gallons are subject to Spill Prevention Control and Countermeasure (SPCC: <https://www.epa.gov/oil-spills-prevention-and-preparedness-regulations>) planning requirements.

Underground tanks storing diesel would be regulated with the Underground Storage Tanks (UST) division at ADEQ (<https://azdeq.gov/USTProgram>) which has detailed regulations regarding spill protection and maintenance, in addition to which ADEQ conducts regular inspections at UST sites.

Overall, the regulation and storage of chemicals is regulated by the EPA and ADEQ, except as it relates to the Fire Department as discussed above. TSMC is required to comply with all applicable federal and state laws regarding the use of chemicals.

6. What release modeling radius is used for chemicals such as hydrofluoric acid, and will those models be made public? The Center for Environmental Oversight has already stated in writing that such analysis is appropriate for a project of this scale. Hydrofluoric acid (HF) is one of the most dangerous industrial chemicals in use today. A single semiconductor fab can store multiple 7,000–8,000-gallon tanks of HF and related chemicals- far more than an average industrial facility.

Response: When responding to chemical releases, the Phoenix Fire Department uses Palmtop Emergency Action for Chemicals (PEAC) software for release modeling. All documentation produced using this software during emergency response becomes a department record.

Tier II reports and any associated Facility Emergency Response Plans can be obtained via a public records request through ADEQ (<https://azdeq.gov/records>).

7. Will expansion necessitate updated emergency response plans, and will those plans be coordinated with local fire agencies and accessible to residents?

Response: Any change to established emergency procedures or materials/systems could trigger the need for reevaluation and updating as required by the Fire Code’s permitting and inspection requirements.

Any chemicals stored in quantities subject to Tier II reporting must updated annually, and ADEQ does coordinate the Tier II system with local fire agencies. Tier II reports and any associated Facility Emergency Response Plans can be obtained via a public records request through ADEQ (<https://azdeq.gov/records>).

Air Quality & Emissions

8. Will the City require cumulative air-quality modeling for the expanded operations, given the number of thermal oxidizers, diesel generators, cooling towers, and VOC-containing storage tanks?

9. How will the City ensure that increased VOCs, NO_x, SO₂, particulate matter, and other emissions do not negatively impact nearby neighborhoods- particularly in a region already facing significant air-quality challenges?
10. What perimeter or ambient monitoring (continuous or periodic) will be required to ensure compliance and detect offsite impacts?

These questions should be referred to the Maricopa County Air Quality Division who is local regulator for air quality. [Air Quality | Maricopa County, AZ](#).

Water Supply & Usage

11. A city employee indicated an estimated discharge of approximately 4 million gallons per day from existing operations. What is the projected increase in water usage and wastewater discharge associated with the expansion?

Response. As part of the permitting process, the Developer will be required to submit water and wastewater masterplans, which will quantify the water and wastewater demands and identify infrastructure requirements for service.

12. How will this increased industrial demand affect local water availability and long-term planning?

Response. The City maintains a robust water portfolio, with water rights that exceed water demands. We have a “100-year designation of assured water supply” from the Arizona Department of Water Resources, the strongest standard for water supply reliability in the nation. To ensure these supplies remain resilient the City is investing in advanced water purification and continues to evaluate and develop alternative supplies. Additionally, developments exceeding 250,000 gallons per day of water demand are required to comply with the City’s large water user ordinance. And developments exceeding 500,000 gallons per day are subject to the large water user ordinance’s 30% water conservation and/or recycling requirements.

Waste Handling & Transportation

13. The finalized Traffic Impact Analysis contains no information on freight, hazardous materials transport, or semi-truck traffic associated with chemical deliveries and waste removal. How many additional truck trips are anticipated weekly?
14. Will there be changes to hazardous waste storage limits or routing of transport vehicles through residential areas? Will the City continue relying on voluntary routing preferences?

Response. Waste storage limits are specified in the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) regulations; in general, the more waste generated on a site, the more frequently it must be removed (for example, large quantity generators have a 90-day storage limit while small quantity generators have 180-day storage limit). These regulations are enforced in Arizona by the Arizona Department of Environmental Quality. The amount of hazardous waste disposed of from a facility is also reported to ADEQ and the EPA on a yearly basis (<https://enviro.epa.gov/envirofacts/rcrainfo/search>). EPA and Department of Transportation (DOT) regulate the transportation of hazardous waste with the goal of reducing the likelihood of spillage, and if an accident occurs, making sure adequate information is available regarding the hazards of the materials in transportation, but they do not regulate specific routing.

Community Transparency & Notification

15. Will the City commit to promptly notifying nearby neighborhoods of any accidental releases, exceedances, or operational issues that could affect public health?
16. Will residents have access to discharge monitoring reports, pretreatment data, and air emissions reports for the facility or will these be marked as trade secrets/confidential?

Releases to the environment (soil, air, or water) that exceed the threshold quantities for that chemical (amounts listed in the EPA consolidated list of lists) are required to be reported to the National Response Center (NRC: <https://nrc.uscg.mil/>). NRC also coordinates with ADEQ related to reports, ADEQ would be the regulator that would first be notified of any release that could affect public health and would provide necessary public notifications or work with the facility to ensure the facility makes necessary public notifications (<https://azdeq.gov/azserc>). TSMC must comply with all federal and state requirements on this issue and availability of that information is governed by those laws and agencies.

Sincerely,

Racelle Escolar, AICP
Principal Planner
Planning and Development Department
Long Range Planning
racelle.escolar@phoenix.gov (602) 534-2864



From: Amanda McGowan <amanda@stetsonvalleyoa.com>
Sent: Monday, November 24, 2025 11:01 PM
To: Adrian G Zambrano <adrian.zambrano@phoenix.gov>
Subject: Re: TSMC Response- Discharge & Air Pollution Data- Northpark

Hi Adrian,

Thank you again for your time and for facilitating a call with Water Services regarding community questions about industrial wastewater discharges. I appreciate the responsiveness and the willingness to discuss these issues.

During the call, Ms. Nunez confirmed that the City does not currently require TSMC to test for PFAS (“forever chemicals”) in their discharge, despite PFAS being well documented as widely used in semiconductor manufacturing. She also shared that the City believes it cannot require this testing because it is not federally mandated and there would be pushback.

For reference, I am attaching an EPA memorandum (December 2022) that clarifies that states and local pretreatment authorities do have the authority under existing Clean Water Act provisions to require PFAS monitoring, and that EPA explicitly recommends that POTWs and permit authorities begin such monitoring immediately using draft method 1633. EPA’s PFAS Roadmap explicitly identifies the semiconductor industry as a sector of concern.

I requested that Water Services provide written information to share with our community members, but was advised that a response may take weeks and could involve both internal review and coordination with TSMC. Unfortunately, this would likely occur after the Council’s vote on the proposed rezoning- well after it could meaningfully inform decision-making or public feedback.

Given that this rezoning would bring large-scale industrial uses significantly closer to existing homes and Sonoran Preserve land, community members are seeking basic clarity on issues essential to understanding potential public health and environmental impacts. The staff report notes the many environmental concerns the city has received but does not substantively address them.

Below are the key questions residents & our board hope the City can answer so that Council may make a fully informed determination.

Wastewater & PFAS Monitoring

1. Will the City require PFAS monitoring for industrial users discharging to the POTW, consistent with EPA's December 2022 guidance encouraging pretreatment authorities to use existing Clean Water Act authority to require this testing?
2. If not, what is the rationale for declining to require PFAS monitoring when EPA guidance permits and recommends it?
3. Will the City require the facility to conduct influent, effluent, and sludge testing to identify PFAS or PFAS precursors entering the wastewater system?
4. If PFAS are detected, what mechanisms or controls are in place to prevent contaminated wastewater or biosolids from entering the environment?

Chemical Inventory & Spill/Accident Risk

5. Has the City conducted (or will it require) a hazard analysis for the large volumes of hydrofluoric acid, nitric acid, sulfuric acid, glycol ethers, diesel, and other hazardous chemicals currently stored onsite and anticipated with expansion?
6. What release modeling radius is used for chemicals such as hydrofluoric acid, and will those models be made public? The Center for Environmental Oversight has already stated in writing that such analysis is appropriate for a project of this scale. Hydrofluoric acid (HF) is one of the most dangerous industrial chemicals in use today. A single semiconductor fab can store multiple 7,000–8,000 gallon tanks of HF and related chemicals- far more than an average industrial facility.
7. Will expansion necessitate updated emergency response plans, and will those plans be coordinated with local fire agencies and accessible to residents?

Air Quality & Emissions

8. Will the City require cumulative air-quality modeling for the expanded operations, given the number of thermal oxidizers, diesel generators, cooling towers, and VOC-containing storage tanks?
9. How will the City ensure that increased VOCs, NO_x, SO₂, particulate matter, and other emissions do not negatively impact nearby neighborhoods- particularly in a region already facing significant air-quality challenges?
10. What perimeter or ambient monitoring (continuous or periodic) will be required to ensure compliance and detect offsite impacts?

Water Supply & Usage

11. A city employee indicated an estimated discharge of approximately 4 million gallons per day from existing operations. What is the projected increase in water usage and wastewater discharge associated with the expansion?
12. How will this increased industrial demand affect local water availability and long-term planning?

Waste Handling & Transportation

13. The finalized Traffic Impact Analysis contains no information on freight, hazardous materials transport, or semi-truck traffic associated with chemical deliveries and waste removal. How many additional truck trips are anticipated weekly?
14. Will there be changes to hazardous waste storage limits or routing of transport vehicles through residential areas? Will the City continue relying on voluntary routing preferences?

Community Transparency & Notification

15. Will the City commit to promptly notifying nearby neighborhoods of any accidental releases, exceedances, or operational issues that could affect public health?
16. Will residents have access to discharge monitoring reports, pretreatment data, and air emissions reports for the facility or will these be marked as trade secrets/confidential?

Our community continues to express deep concern that the proposed rezoning represents rapid, large-scale industrial growth without a sufficient understanding of potential impacts, especially given the proximity to homes and to Sonoran Preserve land. We understand that certain operational details may traditionally arise later in the process; however, these questions go directly to the compatibility of the proposed land use- and therefore are essential for Council to understand before voting.

Thank you again for engaging on this issue. I hope the City can provide clarity on these questions so that both Council and the community can fully understand the implications of this rezoning proposal for our community.

Sincerely,

-Amanda McGowan
SVOA Board President

From: Adrian G Zambrano <adrian.zambrano@phoenix.gov>
Sent: Thursday, November 20, 2025 10:44 AM
To: Amanda McGowan <amanda@stetsonvalleyoa.com>
Subject: RE: TSMC Response- Discharge & Air Pollution Data- Northpark

Hi Amanda,

The Water Services Department is reaching out to you regarding the discharge permit.

For air emissions, that would likely be with Maricopa County.

Best regards,

Adrian Zambrano (*he/him/his*)

Planner II - Village Planner



Phone: 602-534-6057

E-mail: adrian.zambrano@phoenix.gov
City of Phoenix

► Planning & Development Department

Planning Division, Long Range Planning

200 West Washington Street, 3rd Floor

Phoenix, AZ 85003

Mission: Planning, Development and Preservation for a Better Phoenix

From: Amanda McGowan <amanda@stetsonvalleyoa.com>
Sent: Wednesday, November 19, 2025 4:59 PM
To: Adrian G Zambrano <adrian.zambrano@phoenix.gov>
Subject: TSMC Response- Discharge & Air Pollution Data- Northpark

Hi Adrian,

TSMC referred us back you (and the county) with regard to the following:

"With regards to your first inquiry re water discharge and air emissions – we would point you to the City of Phoenix and Maricopa County. We hold permits with the City and the County which subject us to strict limits regarding discharge and emissions – and you can request this information from them as part of a public records request process."

I thought you had said they do not hold permits with the city regarding environmental issues? Does the city have data on their air emissions or water discharge contents? I am happy to put in a records request as they suggested to us, if needed. Thank you,

-Amanda McGowan

SVOA Board President

After Hours Emergency: 1.800.274.3165

StetsonValleyOA.com [stetsonvalleyoa.com]

From: Racelle Escolar
Sent: Wednesday, December 17, 2025 1:06 PM
To: 'Amanda McGowan'
Cc: Tricia Gomes; Sarah Stockham; Adrian G Zambrano
Subject: RE: Northpark Infrastructure Funding Questions

Importance: High

Hi Amanda,

Please see response to this email below:

I'd like to clarify that neither the 51st Avenue gravity sewer project nor the Happy Valley Road widening project were part of the original \$205 million infrastructure investment outlined in the Development Agreement with TSMC.

Regarding the 51st Avenue sewer project:

- It is **not a direct result** of TSMC's presence.
- However, because TSMC was the first entity to develop in the Biscuit Flat area it is benefitting from that installation.
- The 51st Avenue sewer installation project was part of the Water Departments 5-year Capital Improvement Program because it is a larger infrastructure improvement needed to support any new development within Biscuit Flats area.

As for the Happy Valley Road widening:

- This project has been included in the City's Capital Improvement Program (CIP) for many years.
- Its timing is coincidental and advantageous for the Biscuit Flat developments.
- Approximately 35% of the funding for Happy Valley road was provided by the Arizona Legislature in 2023, the rest of the funding was a mix regional and local funding.

Please let me know if you need additional details or supporting documentation.

Sincerely,

Racelle Escolar, AICP
Principal Planner
Planning and Development Department
Long Range Planning
racelle.escolar@phoenix.gov (602) 534-2864



From: Amanda McGowan <amanda@stetsonvalleyoa.com>

Sent: Saturday, December 6, 2025 3:11 PM

Subject: Northpark Infrastructure Funding Questions

CAUTION: This email originated outside of the City of Phoenix.

Do not click links or open attachments unless you know the sender and were expecting this email.

[Report Suspicious](#)

Hi Adrian/Racelle,

I am writing again to request clarification on whether the gravity sewer installed along 51st Avenue, through the center of Stetson Valley over the past year, was part of the original \$205 million infrastructure commitment of taxpayer funds made in support of TSMC, or whether this project was undertaken above and beyond that amount.

Additionally, now that the Traffic Impact Analysis Study has been accepted, it indicates that the taxpayer-funded widening of Happy Valley Road- which already underway- is also necessary to accommodate the proposed NorthPark development. Please clarify whether this roadway project is included within the same \$205 million infrastructure commitment to TSMC, or if it represents additional public expenditures beyond that figure.

Given the scale of these investments, taxpayers deserve clear and complete information regarding how public funds are being allocated to support private companies and whether infrastructure projects are directly tied to previously approved commitments or to projects before land rezoning or land sales have occurred.

For context, when I spoke with Ms. Nunez from the City of Phoenix, she indicated that she believed the sewer project was "more for TSMC than anything else", as the current infrastructure could not adequately handle their discharge. This makes it even more important to understand how these projects are being categorized and funded.

I appreciate your time and your commitment to transparency in the spending of taxpayer dollars- we have been awaiting answers to these questions for weeks. I also respectfully request that the responses to these questions be included in the NorthPark public case file so they are accessible to the community.

Thank you for your attention to this matter, and we look forward to your response.

Sincerely,

-Amanda McGowan

SVOA Board President

<https://www.stetsonvalleyoa.com/say-no-to-northpark/> [stetsonvalleyoa.com]

From: Racelle Escolar
Sent: Wednesday, December 17, 2025 11:54 AM
To: Jen Ross
Cc: Sarah Stockham; Adrian G Zambrano
Subject: RE: TSMC/North Park inquiry - Stetson Valley

Hi Jen,

Sorry for the delay and thank you for reaching out and sharing your concerns.

Stetson Valley Parkway was always planned and designed to be three lanes in each direction since the construction of the Stetson Valley Community. However, Stetson Valley Parkway is currently built with two lanes in each direction and a wide median to allow for future expansion, if needed. The Street Transportation Department will evaluate future lane needs based on traffic counts, which are collected through traffic studies submitted with specific development proposals. Any changes will be driven by actual traffic demand and reviewed as new developments are proposed.

With that said, concerns regarding the school crossing have been raised and studies provided by the developer recommend improvements for a safer crossing. In terms, of the construction timeline for development of the homes, the homebuilder anticipates that would start approximately 3-4 years if the request is approved by City Council. Please let me know if you have any additional questions.

Sincerely,

Racelle Escolar, AICP
Principal Planner
Planning and Development Department
Long Range Planning
racelle.escolar@phoenix.gov (602) 534-2864



From: Jen Ross <jenbird2014@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, December 12, 2025 9:46 AM
Subject: TSMC/North Park inquiry - Stetson Valley

Hello - happy Friday!

I'm curious what the plans are for the 6 lanes on Stetson Valley Parkway. Have you guys decided yet if it will remain at 4?

I'm really concerned about the kids who need to cross to go to Inspiration Mountain School.

Also, what is the timeframe for when the homes and roads will be built? I just need a ballpark. 2 months? 1 year? 5 years? We're trying to figure out when to sell our home. Let me know if any of you are interested and we'll be happy to sell this month. Stetson Valley is a great neighborhood currently.

I won't bother getting into all of the other issues because I know you have plenty of other residents emailing about that. ha!

Thanks for any insight you're able to provide.

Enjoy your weekend!

Jen