

**I-8 AND I-10 HIDDEN VALLEY TRANSPORTATION FRAMEWORK STUDY
Draft Final Report
Comment/Resolution Tables**

Chapter 3

Source	Location	Comment	Disposition
City of Maricopa	Page 3-9, paragraphs 7 and 8; also 3-102, 3.9.6	Santa Cruz Wash flows north, not southeast. Text on Santa Cruz & Vekol washes "needs work." Santa Rosa Wash?	Mention Santa Rosa Wash in text. Say that all three washes (Santa Rosa, Santa Cruz and Vekol) flow south to north. Show washes correctly in Figs. 3-7 and 3-8.
	Page 3-34, 3.2.7; also 3-113	"Maricopa Parks Trails open space"—text refers to Maricopa County.	Add Maricopa city Parks & Trails Plan.
	Page 3-39, Table 3.5	PM 2.5	Add that the area is in conformity for PM 2.5.
	Page 3-45, 3.2.11	Address Maricopa Airport.	Comply.
	Page 3-53, paragraph 5	The third sentence of paragraph 5 is incorrect. The largest commercial development in Maricopa (with Wal-Mart) is at Maricopa-CG Hwy. & Porter Rd.	Fix.
	Page 3-64, Table 3.9	Fix format.	Comply.
	Page 3-78, SR-238	Add Ralston Road to unsignalized intersections.	Comply.
	Page 3-79, paragraph 2	Change Maricopa SATS to RTP	Comply.
	Page 3-80, SR-347, list of intersections	Maricopa-CG Hwy. is signalized. Add signal(s) at Alterra & W. Honeycutt Ave. Correct spelling of "Harrah's."	List signalized and unsignalized intersections on SR-347; correct spelling.
	Page 3-83, paragraph 1	Check functional class of M-CG Hwy. Change SATS to RTP.	Comply. This road is a rural minor arterial.
	Page 3-83, list of intersections	SR-347 and N. Porter Road are signalized.	List signalized and unsignalized intersections on M-CG Hwy.
	Page 3-83, Access Management	Change SATS to RTP; update per RTP.	Comply; use access management standards in RTP table.
	Page 3-86, Pinal Co func. class definitions	RSRSM?	Use classifications from RSRSM (for Pinal Co.) and RTP (for Maricopa).
	Page 3-91, table source	Change from Maricopa SATS to RTP.	Comply.
	3-101, traffic count table	We can send updated traffic counts.	No change; all counts are from 2006 or earlier.
3-110	Amtrak?	Mentioned in chapter.	
Dianne Kresich, ADOT-MPD	Cover page	The title was to change from a "roadway" to a "transportation" study. Why has this not happened?	Title changed. (Same comment from Public Transportation Division.)

Page 3-73	Mention that FHWA designated I-10 as a "Corridor of the Future."	Comply.
Access management section	State at the beginning that ADOT is developing an Access Management Program (not a plan) that will provide guidance for all state highways. The paper presently mentions this in a sporadic and inconsistent manner.	Summarized under related studies.
Population projections	Are the figures supported by CAAG, Pinal County, and other jurisdictions? State that CAAG is conducting a population projections study for Pinal County and that current projections are tentative.	First sentence—yes. Second sentence—comply.
Page 3-79, SR 303	(Dianne provided information from Tim Tait on the current state of ADOT planning.)	Noted—no change.
Page 3-79, SR 303	For this route and <u>for all state highways mentioned</u> , it should be noted that only ADOT can determine alignments. Developer studies, local studies, SATS, etc., do not serve this function. They can only make suggestions for further study. Please consider using the term "suggested" rather than "proposed" to describe highways that ADOT has not programmed.	No change, per direction from MAG.
Page 3-80	The Goodyear study is not a "plan for improvement" for SR 303. It is a suggestion for further study.	Clarify.
Pages 3-84, 85, 113	The Casa Grande SATS suggested further study of both the Montgomery and Val Vista "expressways." The SATS states this. Even if the city built its own expressway with no ADOT funding, no alignment is set.	Clarify.
Page 3-85 and elsewhere	Need clarification on TIs. Please state that no changes to any TIs on interstates can be made without ADOT and FHWA approval. The SATS can issue a suggestion or desire for such changes, but has no authority to propose them, as stated in the SATS itself.	Comply.
Page 3-115	The Pinal County Corridor Definition Study was completed in September 2006.	Add.

ADOT Roadway Pre-design	Page 3-73	"ADOT is studying the area west of I-10 along I-8 for a potential interchange." Is ADOT studying the location of a TI at Henness Road or is it a private developer?	Clarify.
	Page 3-74, I-10 Plans for Improvement	Fourth sentence: the schedule needs to be updated (see Mike Kies). Fifth sentence: change "environmental study" to Environmental Assessment.	Comply.
	Page 3-75, SR 85 Location of Future TIs, last sentence	Change "SR 85 becomes a freeway" to "traffic projections warrant and when funding is secured by private developers."	Comply.
	Page 3-76, Table 3.10 (now 3.11)	Add MP 120.84, Maricopa Road, At-Grande Intersection/Future Interchange Location.	Comply.
	Page 3-76, Plans for Improvement, second sentence	Change to "A new four-lane divided roadway will be constructed from MP 120.84 to MP 123. Business 8 will be improved to a four-lane arterial from Maricopa Road to the Gila Bend TI on I-8."	Comply.
	Page 3-81, Plans for Improvement	Maricopa/ADOT completed a "feasibility report" for a UP grade crossing.	Clarify.
	Page 3-132	Update I-10 project schedule.	Comply.
	Page 3-133	Update SMF project schedule (draft EIS not released fall 2007).	Comply.
	Page 3-135	Update SR 347 Feasibility Study (completed).	Comply.
	Page 3-137	MAG I-10/HVRFs—completed summer 2007?	Change to correct date.
	Pages 3-139 and 140	Refer to N-S as a "Location/Design Concept and Environmental Study." The study will extend to I-10 in the south. RFQ will be December 2007.	Comply.
Statewide Project Management— editorial comments	Page 3-76, Table 3.10 (now 3.11)	Should be MC-85 in one description; Access Management Plan—scheduled for completion in 2007 (to be completed in a few days?); ADOT Gila Bend to I-8 study is underway (Tim Wilson).	Comply.
	Pages 3-17 and 3-80 (Figure 3-31)	The disclaimer implies Goodyear's "Proposed SR 303" is only an alignment issue from SR-801 to I-8. In fact ADOT can't support the extension of a State Route without action of the Board.	Clarify.
	Page 3-94, Table 3.18	Rural Principal Arterial is not limited for Interstate Travel.	Clarify.

SPM—general comments	N/A	The framework should include the street transportation, mass transit and other modes of transportation, not just the highways. For example, what functional classification are municipalities considering for Riggs Road?	Mass transit is included. Local street transportation below the arterial class is beyond the scope of this study.
	N/A	System level planning coordination with resource agencies such as Sonoran Desert National Monument and GRIC is very important to transportation planning. What are their current plans?	This coordination occurred throughout the study and the recommended framework reflects input from resource agencies.
Public Transportation Division	N/A	Nothing significant appears to be shown about rail facilities except for some grade crossings. This is surprising because the UP mainline transports tons (literally) of goods across the study area, and there is Amtrak service.	UP freight and Amtrak service are now included.
	N/A	Speaking of Amtrak, the paper does not include any transportation besides roadways and private vehicles. There is no reference to existing transit services, studies or conditions: rail and bus (public and private), social services (mainly dial-a-ride), and connector services from Ajo and Gila Bend to Phoenix. Will that be covered elsewhere?	Add.
	N/A	There are existing studies concerning transit (Maricopa), and studies conducted in the recent past for the connector services. In addition, we are currently engaged in a transit study in the GRIC. Include them in the list of relevant studies.	Add.
	N/A	There seems to be a complete ignoring of tribal issues in this existing conditions report.	Tribal issues and studies are included.
Tim Oliver, MCDOT	Page 3-48, Table 3.7	Is the percent of residents with a disability correct?	Change to correct percent.
	3-56	Does the "Phoenix Regional Airport" refer to the jetport study from ten years ago?	No, it refers to an existing airport. No change.
	3-56, "Unincorporated Maricopa & Pinal County"	Separate GRIC into its own subhead. What about Ak-Chin?	Add subsections on GRIC and Ak-Chin.

	Pages 3-86 and 3-87	Much of the information is redundant. The tables here are supposed to represent rural and urban requirements. Since the report focuses on arterial roads and above, please strip away all the collector and below information. Also drop the principal arterial listed on 3-86 that requires 150' of R/W or identify it as a rural cross-section, which it is. If you want to keep one of these tables, get rid of the one on 3-86 and make a note on the principal arterial R/W dimensions that the rural section requires another 20' (130' total) of R/W.	Make appropriate changes to the table.
--	---------------------	--	--

Chapter 4

Tim Oliver, MCDOT	N/A	There are some grammatical errors or extra words in the first couple of pages. Check the numbers in Table 4-2, especially for the 6-lane principal arterial. LOS D looks incorrect for sure.	Check and modify where appropriate.
Dianne Kresich, ADOT-MPD	N/A	The study should clearly describe the limitations of the travel demand model—limited input data, demographic issues, the concept of margin of error, hazards of drawing definitive conclusions. As I understand it, the MAG model is not equipped to evaluate alternatives in Pinal County within a small margin of error. The documentation should not shy away from stating this in fairly simple terms. This recognition serves as a segue to the engineering studies that would need to occur before these roads become a reality. Realistic expectations and honest descriptions of what we can and can't currently accomplish are generally appreciated by stakeholders.	MAG and consultant met with Keith and Dianne to discuss how to address these issues. See the specific comments below from Keith Killough.

Keith Killough, ADOT-MPD	N/A	The biggest concern is not technical, but in the assumptions of demographic growth for the Hidden Valley region that are neither practical nor sustainable given the Existing + Committed infrastructure. However, I realize that this cannot be addressed and resolved without a rigorous integrated transportation/land use model that is sensitive to travel behavior, market pricing and economics, and infrastructure capacity.	Noted. No change.
	Section 4.1	Is the MAG model “the federally recognized platform for transportation planning in the MAG region <i>and</i> Pinal County”?	It is not the federally recognized platform for Pinal County. Corrected.
	Section 4.2.1	Some clarification or modification of the narrative for consistency is needed referencing what model is being used in the narrative. The narrative indicates the MAG model was used, but also states that “an expanded and updated version of the Pinal County regional transportation model” was used. The text goes on to say that the “refined Pinal County model was integrated with the MAG model.”	Clarify to explain that the MAG model necessarily includes portions of Pinal County, and that the Pinal County portions had to be expanded, updated and enhanced to improve its reliability and performance for this project.
	Section 4.2.2	Did the model development activities include validation of the model employed (whether MAG model or integrated model)? Consistency with MAG’s regional modeling approach does not necessarily mean that the results in the Hidden Valley study area are valid and consistent with standard modeling practices. There is also no indication in previous MAG model work that any validation analysis extended into the Hidden Valley.	Add a table on validation. No other change necessary.
	Section 4.3.2	We suggest a rewording of the narrative to say that the analysis integrated or combined the zone systems, socioeconomic data and transportation networks of MAG and CAAG regions rather than any travel demand models were employed	Clarify text.

		In the discussion on the use of the Fratar method on Page 4-6, we are concerned with the use of the word “calibrate” which means that an estimate is being adjusted to some known empirical data – which is not the case here. We suggest rewording to say that the Fratar method was applied to extrapolate the trip table to the full build-out planning scenario using growth factors from 2030 and full buildout socioeconomic data. A similar statement more correctly describing what occurred is found in the last sentence of the paragraph, but should be more prominent earlier.	Clarify as appropriate.
	Section 4.6.1	We suggest that it would be more useful to indicate the number of lane-miles of new high-capacity travel lanes [that] are needed, not just the number of new lanes. This would facilitate more appropriate cost estimates.	Shown in Tables 4.7 and 4.9. Costs are estimated in Chapters 5 and 6.
	N/A	Our general concern centers on the use of the term “travel demand modeling” throughout the description of the analysis for this study. Travel demand modeling involves the trip generation, trip distribution and mode choice components of the modeling system to estimate the magnitude, destinations, and methods of tripmaking as they are affected by changes in the tripmakers, the transportation system, and travel purposes. Travel demand was not modeled, but was simulated by the use of Fratar-ed trip tables which adjust row and column totals to represent projected growth in the study area. This use of Fratar-ed trip tables in the Hidden Valley Study does not take into account the behavioral analysis steps typically associated with travel demand models. This method locks the 2030 travel patterns (primarily as bedroom communities of the MAG and PAG regions) into the future. As a result, the development of services and industries which would likely balance jobs and	Noted—comment reflects ADOT-MPD opinion. No change.

		<p>housing in the study area and significantly change travel patterns and behavior are not reflected .</p>	
		<p>The one element of the “model” used in this analysis is highway assignment. The Hidden Valley Study assigns the Fratar-ed trip table, representing Buildout demographics, to the Preliminary Conceptual Roadway Network and various other alternatives designed to accommodate the future demographic scenario. While this is a useful analysis to evaluate the impact of full Buildout, we feel it should be noted that this is a “worst-case” scenario. The probability of such a scenario occurring is contingent upon complementary infrastructure (schools, sewers, water) and services required to support it. This study simply performed stress tests of alternative roadway configurations without any consideration of the possible influence of the roadway configurations on latent or induced travel behavior, travel demand, travel patterns, or travel mode choices (including ridesharing) which would certainly occur at the levels of congestion projected.</p>	<p>Noted—comment reflects ADOT-MPD opinion. No change.</p>
		<p>It should be noted in the beginning of the narrative that the use of this study should be limited to the identification and reservation of future rights-of-way for transportation system enhancement. Clearly indicate that roadway alignments, functional classifications, lane configurations, and other transportation design elements are contingent upon further, more detailed planning, design and environmental studies.</p>	<p>Disclaimers are included at appropriate places in the report, notably Chapter 6.</p>
		<p>In future studies, additional value could be provided by analyzing time-phased future demographic growth estimates. This would enable an illustrative planned sequence of improvements and enhancements to be identified in response to the forecast transportation system deficiencies. Decision-makers would then have</p>	<p>Noted—no change.</p>

		<p>the ability to appropriate schedule and size improvements consistent with and in consideration of expected growth and other public infrastructure requirements. Certainly the full application of travel demand models is required to address the travel analysis omissions mentioned previously. An area projected to have such phenomenal growth would also benefit from the application of an integrated transportation and land use model to provide information identifying the most likely areas for development, and the magnitude of that development based on market forces, transportation accessibility, and development policies. The set of tools applied in this study does not reflect many considerations appropriate to such a challenging and developing study area.</p>	
Bob Hazlett, MAG	4.1	The last paragraph sounds too positive in why we did not model transit specifically. Would appreciate a “kinder” approach in describing this effort...more emphasis on the positive parts of the last sentence to the paragraph.	Make appropriate changes.
	4.2.1	Refrain from being melodramatic—remove terms like needed and critical when describing R/W, for example—let the facts speak for themselves. Comb the document for these references. If we need the adjective to make a legitimate point, fine; if it is used just to provide emphasis, then toss.	Comply.
	4.3.2, Construction of Trip Table	While we didn’t exactly follow the four-step modeling process at this pint, it’s important to note that the O-D table was built from a trip generation process—either using O’s and D’s from the Pinal County RSRM, or justifying results with pure trip generation efforts. Convey that in this paragraph. The stuff I stated in this past sentence can be used, maybe a bit toned up for more technical speak. I will work with Wilson; would like them to take the first shot.	Comply.

	4.4.2, RSRM plan	I don't think it's a plan; like Hidden Valley it's a study.	It is a plan.
	4.4.3, socioeconomic data	Will get a table together at the RAZ level for inclusion in the chapter.	Noted.
	4.5.1	LOS is technically not a concept since it has been used by transportation engineers and planners since the 1965 HCM. It can be classified as a "qualitative term"—also, be careful of using the word "adopting" when it comes to LOS. Adopting suggests that MAG and its funding partners have taken an official position on an LOS standard; as everyone knows this is not the case. "Selecting" comes to mind as an easier term, coupled with by the project team for this project, or something to that effect.	Change as appropriate.
	Figures 4-10 and 4-19	Please remove the TAZ connectors from maps.	Comply.

Chapter 5

Source	Location	Comment	Disposition
Tim Oliver, MCDOT	Table 5.2, "Parkway and Scenic Way Design Features"	Information is not clear. Third and fourth items are not true.	Change as appropriate.
	Figure 5-2 (Parkway Cross-Section)	Does not match the parkway design guidelines developed in Maricopa Co. Can be expanded to 8 lanes.	Change graphic to match. Say in text that parkway may be 8 lanes.
	Figure 5-3 (Parkway to Arterial Intersection)	Portions are incorrect. Pull the graphic out of the design guidelines?	Change per design guidelines.
	Section 5.3, paragraph 2	What does "equilibrate" mean in the second sentence?	Delete the last clause.
City of Maricopa	Page 5-19	Add commuter rail as an option for Maricopa	Comply.

Chapter 6

Source	Location	Comment	Disposition
Tim Oliver, MCDOT	Page 6-6, 6.1.2, paragraph 1, sentence 2	The second word (measure) should be plural.	Comply.
	Page 6-7, 6.1.3, paragraph 1, sentence 1	Add "also" after "while," remove words "higher speed" and replace with "mode."	Comply. Replace "higher-speed" with "modal."

	Same paragraph	Remove the last two sentences on transit expenditures from Prop 400? Don't see where this info plays into the discussion.	Comply.
	Page 6-14, 6.2, paragraph 3	Rewrite second sentence to make it clearer that there are both 6- and 8-lane parkways (Table 6.4). The next sentences suggest interim facilities can be built for parkways and freeways. The design standards for the parkway recommend building from the outside in, starting with a 4-lane parkway. It's better to do this than build a traditional 4-lane arterial and try to convert it. ROW and access issues abound with some sort of interim facility. It's very dangerous to even suggest it. I recommend removing this language.	Comply.
	Pages 6-23, 6-27	Change Fig. 6-4 and 6-8 dimensions to match the parkway design guidelines.	Comply.
City of Maricopa	Page 6-1, 6.1.1	What about the Tempe/GRIC/Maricopa study? I can't afford for this study to preclude commuter rail, especially when MAG has agreed to study it.	Specify commuter rail as an option.
	Page 6-3, Table 6.1	Change second SR-238 to Smith Enke Road	Comply.
	Page 6-7, 6.1.3	Need consistency throughout.	Use the same language (re. potential commuter rail) for the Goodyear and SR-347 transit corridors.
Dianne Kresich, ADOT-MPD	Figure 6-1, Recommended Network	Why all the different line widths?	Their purpose is to make the map easier to read. No change.
		Arizona Parkway and Arizona Scenic Way: Colors too close.	The scenic ways are so labeled and serve a similar function to parkways. No change.
		Legend: "Proposed" Freight Railroad inconsistent with "Potential" Commuter Rail.	Change "Proposed" to "Potential" for "Freight Railroad" and "System Interchange."
		Legend: "Existing or Programmed System Interchange"—perhaps say "funded."	Change "Programmed" to "Funded."
		County line (gray dashed) not in legend.	Add county line to legend. Remove Hassayampa study area boundary from upper left of map.

		Remove Chui Chu, Cucklebur, Jackrabbit and Arizona City from lower right part of the map. They are distracting and unnecessary.	Comply.
		“Freeway Transit Corridor”—Why wide in legend? Why inconsistent with map?	Make the widths consistent.
		Why are we showing potential commuter rail outside the study area? Not showing other potential improvements outside study area.	We do show potential improvements from the Hassayampa study. The potential commuter rail is necessary to provide context. No change.
		The caveat box needs to be pumped up. See my suggestions.	The disclaimer has been thoroughly vetted. No change, with one exception noted next.
		Caveat box, second paragraph: Add rail.	Change paragraph to read: “Alignments for new freeway, highway, parkway, arterial, high occupancy vehicle, bridge, transit and rail facilities will be determined following the completion of appropriate corridor planning, design and environmental studies.”
		Caveat box: Do we need to add FTA for federally funded transit improvements? It’s FHWA’s counterpart. Also, do we need to add the RR as needing to approve freight improvements?	The disclaimer refers specifically to freeway interchanges. No change.
		Is this [the dashed gray line near the upper left corner] the county line? I thought it was farther west.	Remove this line, which is actually the Hassayampa study boundary.

Chapter 7

Source	Location	Comment	Disposition
City of Maricopa	Table 7.4, “County Sales Tax,” “Local Sales Tax” and “DIF” for Maricopa	The first two do not exist—they are county, not city, or is this supposed to be the ½ cent excise tax? DIF should be \$7.4 million.	Delete local sales tax. Change DIF as requested. Add a note that “County Sales Tax” refers to the city’s share of the ½ cent excise tax. Change Table 7.1 & text correspondingly.
	Table 7.4, “State Shared Revenue”	Maricopa VLT plus HURF is \$2,504,000.	Change “State Shared Revenue” to \$3 (million).

	Table 7.5, county sales tax & local sales tax	Remove the numbers shown for Maricopa.	See changes to Table 7.4.
	Table 7.18, transportation sales tax	Remove the square meaning "authorized and used."	Change to authorized but not used. Same for general sales tax.
	Table 7.19, State Shared Revenue	Should be \$2.5.	Comply.
	Table 7.19, Specialized Taxes	Should be \$8.	Comply.
	Table 7.19, General Taxes	Should be zero.	Comply.
	Table 7.21, Primary property taxes	Should be a square.	No change—Table 7.18 says this source is not used for transportation.
	Table 7.21, transp. sales tax	Should be a zero (numeral).	Change to authorized but not used.