

---

**MEMORANDUM**  
**Site Plan Amendment**

**To:** Chad Mendell, Stantec  
**From:** Jose A. Macias, Senior Planner  
Development Services Department, Planning & Zoning  
**Re:** SPA24-09-01 MS PHX83 Building Site Plan Amendment  
**Date:** October 7, 2024

Mr. Mendell,

Please see the review comments from the El Mirage Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) for the site plan amendment request. These comments shall be addressed as instructed or with the submittal of the construction documents.

BUILDING & SAFETY – Brigham Bennett, Building Official

1. No comments.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT – Tom Doyle, Economic Development Manager

2. No comments.

ENGINEERING – Bryce Christo, Asst. City Engineer

3. See attached memorandum.

FIRE DEPARTMENT – Jason Napier, Fire Marshall

4. No comments.

PLANNING & ZONING – Jose A. Macias, Senior Planner

5. See the attached review comments for Luke Air Force Base.

POLICE DEPARTMENT – Chris Culp, Police Sergeant

6. No comments.

PUBLIC WORKS – Scott Ketchmark, Public Works Utilities Superintendent

7. No comment.

If you have any questions, or concerns regarding the TAC comments and like a follow-up meeting or call, please don't hesitate to contact my office.

---

## MEMORANDUM

TO: Jose Macias, Planner & GIS  
FROM: Bryce Christo, Assistant City Engineer  
SUBJECT: PHX83 Site Plan Application Review  
DATE: 09-25-24

Below are the Engineering Division's comments for the above referenced submittal prepared in September 2024. **These items will have to be addressed prior to the Planning and Zoning Meeting.**

### Project Narrative

1. A Project Narrative consistent with the requirements outlined in the Pre-Application Meeting document shall be submitted. The requirements include:
  - Application request
  - Location and description
  - Historical data
  - Aerial Map
  - Operational aspects of use
  - Proposed building/structure heights
  - Proposed infrastructure.
  - Any proposed phasing
  - Other pertinent information deemed necessary by planning staff (hazardous materials, number of employees, etc.)

### Context Plan

2. Show the existing and proposed zoning
3. Provide color photographs of the subject site and surrounding improvements and show photo reference numbers on the context plan.

**The below items will have to be addressed during the Construction Plan Submittal.**

### Site Plan

4. Provide the location of the project by street address.
5. Provide topographic contours at a minimum interval of two feet.
6. Label and dimension sidewalks, drive aisles, etc.
7. Show any fences and/or walls.
8. Show location of exterior refuse collection areas.

9. Update the plans to remove “Future Butler Drive”, the “Future Retention Basins”, the 40 foot right of way dedication and any other items that may have been changed per recent land transactions.
10. The Site Pond Table does not match the information shown in Table 4 of the Drainage Report for the South Pond and PHX86 Pond. Revise as necessary.
11. There shall be at least two feet of level ground between any wall or vertical obstruction and the top of any side slope grading.
12. There shall be a separate water service for domestic, irrigation and fire. The minimum domestic and irrigation service size shall be 1-inch. The minimum fire service size shall be 6-inches.
13. The minimum sanitary sewer service size shall be 6-inches.
14. Separation between sewer, water and other utilities shall be per MAG standards and City Detail 402.
15. Show all exterior lighting.
16. Plans shall include applicable City Notes. Call out MAG, City, etc. details to be used. Use the latest version of the City’s Design and Development Standards Manual (DDSM) as a guide during the design.

#### Exterior Elevations

17. No comments.

#### Preliminary Landscape Plans

18. The locations of the fire hydrants called out on the Planting Plan do not appear to match the locations shown on the Site Plan.
19. Irrigation plans will be required.

#### Deed/Title Report

20. No comments.

#### Stormwater Management Report

21. PHX83 does not appear to be included in either Table 2 or Table 4. The majority of the information in this report seems to be exactly the same as PHX82. Is this accurate?
22. Paragraph 1 of Page 7 states “PHX82 design has no impact on the PHX86 pond...”. This may be accurate but should this note PHX83 instead of PHX82?
23. Appendix D – Geotechnical Reports for PHX82 and PHX83 have not been provided. The City does not require the Geotechnical Reports to be included in the Drainage Report.

#### Preliminary Sewer Report

24. The PHX80 Campus is now within EPCOR’s Sewer Service Area and EPCOR will need to review and approve this report.
25. Introduction Summary - Revise “City of Goodyear” to “City of El Mirage”.
26. Appendix A and B were not provided.

#### Preliminary Water Report

27. The PHX80 Campus is now within EPCOR’s Water Service Area and EPCOR will need to review and approve this report.
28. The City of El Mirage (COEM) is still responsible for reviewing the fire protection of the site. The COEM Fire Department will need to review and approve this report.

29. The report refers to the 480,000 gallon tank multiple times as “existing”. This tank has not been designed or constructed. The design shall be submitted to the City for review and approval.
30. Table 1 – The numbers in the “Max Daily” column do not add up to the total shown. Please revise.
31. Existing Conditions – Paragraph 3 – The last sentence refers to the “City water main” but this main now belongs to EPCOR.
32. Proposed Conditions – Domestic Water – This section refers to PHX 82 but should this be PHX 83?
33. Hydraulic Calculations – It is noted that the site is allowed 75% reduction for full sprinklered buildings. This reduction will need to be approved by the Fire Department.

#### Traffic Impact Study

34. The report is labeled as “Draft”.
35. It is noted that the existing ADT and turning movements were obtained in August 2024. Dysart Road, Olive Avenue and the surrounding area were under construction at the time which could have provided much different results than when the corridors were operating under normal conditions. For example, left turns were not allowed for any approach at the Dysart/Olive and Dysart/Peoria intersections. It is recommended to use the 2021 volumes from PHX 82 and extrapolate them to 2024.
36. Figure 2-1
  - a. Dysart/Olive – The east leg should show one left, one thru and one right.
  - b. Dysart Northern (West) – The north leg should show three thru and one right.
37. Figures 2-2 & 2-3 – See Comment 35 above.
38. Table 2-2 – These numbers differ from the PHX 82 report. This may be due to the data coming from COEM which would only include crash data within El Mirage.
39. Section 2.3 – Are there any crash patterns or recommendations based on the information in this section?
40. It should be noted that the 2026 and 2031 numbers obtained from the PHX 82 report were actually for 2025 and 2030.
41. Table 4-2 & 4-4
  - c. NBL – For the Turn Pocket Length, provide the amount of queueing space available.
  - d. WBL – As part of the City’s Dysart Road and Olive Avenue project, this turning movement will have a 160 foot storage lane. Update the length accordingly.
  - e. EBR – Please note whether an increase in the right turn deceleration lane is required based on the increase in volume. The City’s Dysart Road and Olive Avenue project will provide a 150 foot storage lane.
42. Section 4.2 – This section stated “...left-turning traffic could use an alternate route to their destination by making a right-turn to reduce delay and queueing”. Are there any further mitigation recommendations? Are there any issues with the potential length of the queueing described in the report and how the existing site is currently set up? Would modifying the driveway to a right in/right out/left in alleviate any issues?
43. Section 4.3 – This section recommends the intersection be monitored regularly to determine the timing for the installation of a traffic signal. As noted in the Stipulation Letter for PHX 81 and PHX 82, a Development Agreement will need to be established between the City and Microsoft regarding a potential, future traffic signal at the Olive Avenue driveway.

### Miscellaneous

44. The PHX 80 Campus is now with EPCOR's Sewer and Water Service Area so the civil plans will need to be reviewed and approved by EPCOR.
45. Similar to previous phases of the PHX 80 Campus, the generator sound levels may not exceed the City of El Mirage guideline of 55 decibels (dB) between 10 pm and 6 am as measured at the property line of the source.
46. A Certificate of Occupancy cannot be provided for the PHX 83 building until the offsite sewer line and any related appurtenances are operational.
47. Plans and reports for the Fire Protection Tank and Pump House must be designed, approved, installed, accepted and constructed prior to the release of the Certificate of Occupancy for PHX 83. Additional approvals from MCESD may be required.
48. Any extensions or modifications to the onsite or offsite water and sewer systems may require an Approval to Construct (ATC) from the Maricopa County Environmental Services Department (MCESD). Copies of the Approvals of Construction (AOC) shall be submitted to the City prior to Certificate of Occupancy.
49. It is understood that the site may have future phases with unknown time frames on the upgrades. Each new phase will require a separate review by the City.
50. A Geotechnical Report will be required to provide on-site pavement sections.
51. A Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) will be required per the City's SWPPP Guidelines document.
52. A Haul Permit will be required if 500 cubic yards or more of material will be brought into or out of the site. This will require separate application, an exhibit showing the haul route and insurance from the company performing the haul. The fee is \$300.

The above comments are meant to be general in nature and are not considered to be all inclusive. Additional comments will arise during the formal permit submittal.