

**MAG INTERSTATE 10-HASSAYAMPA VALLEY ROADWAY FRAMEWORK STUDY**

**Comment/Resolution Tables**

*See also meeting notes: Funding Partners, SRT, Forums, Community Open House*

**Chapter 2**

<b>Source</b>	<b>Location</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Resolution</b>
Dianne Kresich, ADOT	N/A	<p>I found [the environmental scan] to be a solid collection of information, but one that focused on the socioeconomic and land use aspects of the environment. While I noticed that the working paper did contain a lengthy table of species in the area, I was also expecting to see various flora, fauna, archaeological, etc. information depicted in map form. The reason I say this is after two workshops with resource agencies, FHWA, Defenders of Wildlife, and such, I was given the impression that compliance with "6001" highly encouraged this kind of presentation.</p> <p>Since you have met with resource agencies regarding this study, I am curious as to whether they gave their blessing to your approach. I am looking to Hassayampa as an example of what we might do here at ADOT to comply with 6001.</p>	<p>The environmental scan of such a broad study area cannot deal with all of these topics in detail. Further, public disclosure of protected archaeological sites is prohibited. Although this study was not intended specifically to comply with the 6001 process, MAG hopes that the information mapped in the environmental scan will make a useful contribution thereto.</p>
Randy Overmyer, City of Surprise	Page 5, para. 1	“Onsite ground truthing...environmental considerations, <u>and should be done at the Corridor Improvement Study and DCR levels.</u> ”	Added text as requested
	Page 6	Major watercourses--Add Trilby Wash and the Beardsley Canal.	Complied
	Page 8	Recreational opportunities—Reference Surprise Alternate Modes Plan (ped/trails) now being updated.	Complied
	Page 18, para. 2	THREE vehicle proving grounds! Add Volvo NEC Pinnacle Peak Rd/211 <sup>th</sup> .	Complied
	Page 19	Public utilities—The APS lines also go e/w ½ mile south of Deer Valley Rd.	Already shown in Figure 2-14
	Page 20	City of Surprise—Land east of 255 <sup>th</sup> , not 267 <sup>th</sup> . Much of the land north of AUS-60 is ranching or undeveloped (none was/is agricultural). “South of US-60, north and west of the McMicken Dam the area is a combination of open space, flood retention and undeveloped land...” Luke Aux 1 is at Happy Valley and 219 <sup>th</sup> .	Complied

	Page 22	Add Grand Avenue/211 <sup>th</sup> as a major activity center, with intermodal freight, commerce, employment and educational facilities.	Complied
Suparna Dasgupta, Town of Buckeye	Page 21	Under Existing Land Use—Town of Buckeye: At the end of the second sentence, please add, “However, there are a large number of community master plans that are approved in this area (north of I-10).”	Complied
	Page 24	Benessere is not an approved Master Plan—only an approved Area Plan, so “proposed.”	Complied
	Page 25	Desert Creek, is a proposed, not an approved Master Plan. Henry Park, not Ranch. Montierre is approved. Revise “Tartesso Amendment 1” to say “Tartesso East Amendment #2—Approved”; acreage is 7,258, density 26,223, commercial acreage 548. Revise “Tartesso West” to say “Tartesso West Amendment #1—Approved”; acreage 5,396, commercial acreage 207. Sienna Hills formerly known as Tesota Hills.	Complied, except acreages not changed—all acreages were accurate as of 8/15/06 and have been in a continual state of flux.
	General	We would need to verify all the CMP data (average density etc.) because at a glance on Tartesso, it’s not accurately reflecting the information. I hope we can get you updated information on the CMP data sheet before you publish the final document.	No change—planned acreages are constantly changing and all are accurate based on best available sources, as of 8/15/06. Response e-mailed to Suparna.
Bill Vachon, FHWA	Page 6	“Central Arizona Water Conservation District”—check wording.	Wording is correct
	Page 6	Minor edits	Complied
	Page 20 (air quality)	Please verify these terms are correct and this is the best way to discuss this issue (this has negative connotations and could be taken out of context).	Text checked and revised by consultant air quality specialist.
		For my info are there state air quality standards?	They are the same as federal and the text now says this.

### Chapter 3

Source	Comment	Resolution
Dave Wolfson, MCDOT (through Tim Oliver)	I see a laundry list of Good Goals and Objectives. Evaluation criteria and performance measures need to be selected on the bases of how reliably quantifiable they are and how sensitive among the alternatives they are at the pivot point.	At this level of analysis, many criteria are not quantifiable. We will remove or replace criteria that are poor discriminators.

	Subtle and inconsistent discrimination among most of the criteria is basically meaningless for two reasons: many are either covariant or very likely inconsistent; and the big gorilla – the cost side – is examined only in terms of orders of magnitude. Covariant factors are those that move together because of the same relationship with another variable; inconsistent factors are those that move in opposite directions for the same reason. (For example, VHT and VMT almost always change opposite among the usual variety of roadway alternatives.)	Removed two mobility criteria: overall efficiency of traffic flow and overall congestion.
	Also, the feedback between the transportation system and the character/location of development is I think likely to be given far too little attention in this very long-range study. Little or no modification of jurisdictional land use plans (or even DMPs) is considered.	MAG must take local land use plans as they are given. However, the modeling for this study will include an employment sensitivity run, to determine the impact of intensified employment on external trips.
	If this is truly to be in any way a min/max cost-benefit analysis, then some parameters (preferably important ones) have to be tightly constrained, e.g. cost or number of freeway lanes crossing the White Tanks screen-line.	This study will not perform a rigorous cost/benefit analysis.
	Since the study may become the justification for a big chunk and constraint of jurisdictions' capital program, it ought not to be just a typical put-on-the-shelf feel-good study. It's potentially a License to Sprawl and gift to development interests if done poorly, or a tool for rationalizing development, bulking up MSRPs, and minimizing major transportation system expenses if done well.	Comment noted. MAG is doing its best to make the study a useful tool to the region and its communities.
	Doing a meaningful study requires a tighter set of criteria and constraints in my opinion. It also needs a set of criteria and an analysis domain for crafting alternatives that are to be analyzed.	At this "50,000-foot" level of study, a more rigorous evaluation is not practical. The alternatives are based primarily on agency and stakeholder ideas. More detailed corridor and/or subarea studies will be required later.
Jim Nichols, City of Goodyear, Deputy City Manager	How about including a category about "impacts to buildings and landmarks of historical significance"?	May not be possible to evaluate at this level. More detailed studies will consider these in the future.
Bill Vachon, FHWA	Several items dealing with traffic are geared to improve PM concerns. Is there a reason only PM is defined here? Should it be to improve worst traffic conditions (AM and/or PM)?	The PM peak is traditionally used, as it generally has the highest traffic density. For comparative purposes, there is likely to be little difference between the two peaks.
	In the Access item for residences it indicated maximize residences within 2-miles of a freeway. Being close is good but either here	Falls under the Environmental Justice criterion

	or in the environmental section, what about a goal to minimize residences adjacent to any freeway?	
	Under planning consistency the remarks just say maximize consistency for the various items. To me this is a very vague outcome. If you maximize a bad item but it is consistent do you meet the objective?	Consistency with adopted plans is desirable in itself, if the roadway network is to meet community needs. The criterion is subjective, but ratings will be explained.
Randy Overmyer, City of Surprise	The second asterisk point dropped off page two.	These asterisks have since been deleted.
	The first row objective of “minimize daily VMT per lane mile in study area”...Is this too broad? We want to maximize the share of regional throughput assigned first to freeways, and then to parkways, in order to provide a higher quality of life to those using and residing along network facilities (including arterials) which are more local in nature. Perhaps what we are suggesting as an objective is “plan a roadway network with adequate capacity to assure that daily VMT per lane mile does not exceed established (HCM...AASHTO...MAG...pick your yardstick) standards.	The study team decided to keep this (changing “daily” to “PM peak” to match other criteria) because it addresses safety, and lower density per lane mile reduces the likelihood of collisions, whatever the type of facility.
Dianne Kresich, ADOT	Consider adding a cost-benefit measure.	Added cost per VMT
	Have you considered a criterion along the lines of “potential for private investment”?	To the extent we can evaluate it at this level, it is included in business access to freeways, consistency with public economic development planning, and consistency with private community planning.

#### Chapter 4

Source	Location	Comment	Resolution
Randy Overmyer, City of Surprise	Table 4.4	We are providing herewith some Surprise area ADT data to include.	Complied.
	Table 4.4	Suggest adding US-60 from SR-303L to SR-74.	Complied.
	Page 11	Typo, capitalize City of Surprise.	Complied.
	Page 12	Access Management Strategy: Add Surprise as ADOT partner—1/3 of [SR-74] corridor is ours.	Complied.
	Page 24	Surprise Transportation Plan—Add note that plan established the parkway concept as a key to addressing regional mobility.	Complied.
Robert Miller, ADOT	4.3.4, page 13	Location of Proposed TIs SR-85: It’s somewhat misleading to list MP 151 Baseline Rd as a TI. We should list only the five proposed TIs. If Baseline	Complied.

		is to be included have a separate paragraph giving Baseline as a major street having indirect access to future SR-85 via frontage roads.	
	4.6.2, #17, page 28	ADOT Statewide Access Management Study: This study will set guidelines and standards for <u>access</u> to all state highways	Complied.
Tim Oliver, MCDOT	Page 1, sec. 4.2.1	Could you please add what percentage of the roadways (non-ADOT) in the study area are under MCDOT control?	This percent is not known, but text was added to emphasize MCDOT's responsibilities for the roadway system throughout unincorporated Maricopa County.
	Page 1 & 2, sec. 4.2.1	Without seeing the figure, is this the existing or future functional classification? If existing, your source is fine. If it is expected to suggest what each roadway is currently planned as, you need to change your source. The cities, towns and county have documents that show what the future functional classification should be for the roadway network.	Complied.
	Page 2, same section	Paragraph 3 needs to be rewritten. You are confusing the reader. While technically correct, most people will not understand the jargon here. Simplify.	Complied.
	Page 13, sec. 4.3.4	I do not believe there is a TI along SR-85 at Broadway Rd (MP 153).	A TI is planned for Broadway Rd.
	Page 21 #8	The author of this study (SR-303L, Riggs Rd to MC-85) is Parsons Transportation Group, not PB.	Complied.
	Page 24 #13	Who is the author of the Surprise Transportation Plan?	Added author.
	General	There is no mention of the recent Regional Freight Study that I believe was done by MAG. Didn't the study identify several concerns on I-10, in the study area, that would impact operations?	Study has not yet been published and is not on the MAG website. Bob Hazlett will attempt to obtain draft for study team.
Page 8, 4.2.2	Table 4.3 is MCDOT Functional Class. Capacity is never mentioned so how does [high capacity corridors] fit in?	Text OK as currently written.	
Page 9	Minor edits.	Complied.	
Page 10	Some [TI] locations identify the milepost; others do not. Suggest all show milepost.	Text changed to clarify that the exact milepost for proposed TIs is not known.	
Page 10	Not sure what [delegation of authority for change of access] refers to; technically FHWA, not ADOT, makes	Text changed accordingly.	

		the determination of acceptability.	
	Page 11	Should US-60 be identified as a Principal Arterial?	Complied.
	Page 11	Verify these [locations along US-60] will be interchanges and not intersections.	Text is accurate.
	Page 11	Minor edits.	Complied.
	Page 11	Since US-60 is a state facility why is Surprise identifying access management?	Surprise is working with ADOT on access management through the city.
	Page 12	Interchanges or intersections [on SR-74]?	Checked and revised.
	Page 12	This [“will protect” additional R/W along SR-74] seems like a strong statement; will this happen?	Statement has been qualified appropriately.
	Page 12	Is the current plan to have SR-74 become a freeway? Also this leaves a gap from SR-303 to I-17, is the plan to leave this as an arterial?	Text clarified.
	Page 14	Identify MC-85 functional class; refer back to a table to identify what “rural cross-section” means.	Text clarified.
	Page 14	MC-85 Plans for Improvement: I’m not sure I understand this sentence. Is it really needed?	Text clarified.
	Page 15	Is the word “indirect” needed? How would a direct left turn differ?	The text explains this.
	Page 16	“A new interchange will be built” [at I-10/Perryville Rd]—A strong statement, change to proposed TI since none has been approved.	Complied.
	Page 28	(SR-303L study summary): This implies there is one study. Aren’t there two—US-60 to I-10, and I-10 to MC-85 or possibly SR-801? Also project status indicates construction plans are underway. Since the environmental process is ongoing should we say this?	Text clarified.
Thomas Chlebanowski, Town of Buckeye	Not specified	Should mention be made of FHWA and ADOT as well as support from the Town (for FHWA) on its 2-mile [I-10] TI spacing? Or at least mentioning that TI spacing will be at least 2 miles.	Added to text.
		First phase of interim widening of SR-85 from Gila River to Southern is programmed for Aug 07 construction.	Added.
		TI construction on SR-85 from Patterson Road to Gila is programmed for early spring 2007.	Not within our study area.
		Jackrabbit Corridor Study (kickoff by DMJM Harris) from Indian School to Bell Road to begin today (1/26/07)	Included in text.
		Town of Buckeye is agendizing the freeway, parkway, arterial (principal,	Added.

		major, minor), collector, industrial collector and local road classifications and typical cross-sections for council action in February 2007.	
	4.4.3	No mention of: I-10 Valley Metro BRT express route slated for implementation in July 2008 from Central to Watson Road per updated MAG RTP 2006.	Added.
	4.4.3	The Valley Metro Buckeye express from central Phoenix to Sun Valley Parkway is scheduled for implementation in July 2010.	Added.
	4.5	The Town has an ITS MAG CMAQ project (design and install a fiber optic backbone network) on Miller from I-10 to Monroe and from Monroe to Buckeye Town Police Department. Programmed for 2010 and will be run through ADOT local projects division.	Added.
	Not specified	PVNGS must also take into account any type of Emergency Management Plan. I provided a EMS map of the PVNGS area to your office and mentioned that Wickenburg is considered a safe area as designated by the county (I don't have all the information), but this argument lends itself to the use of north-south parkway systems instead of merely arterial networks as contended by the developers.	Emergency evacuation corridors were added to the maps, and the issue was considered in evaluating alternatives.

### Chapter 6

Source	Location	Comment	Resolution
Robert Miller, ADOT	N/A	Please keep in mind any TI shown on this or any other document is subject to further analysis and approval by ADOT and FHWA. The various lists in circulation show locations that would satisfy only the preferred spacing criterion.	Noted.
Bob Woodring, MCDOT		Since Camelback Road in this area [Buckeye] is already a parkway, it may not make sense to extend the McDowell Parkway (Salome Road alignment) to Indian School and make Indian School a parkway from there to the Wintersburg Parkway. The result would be 2 parkways, 1 mile apart. We may want to consider ending the McDowell Parkway (Salome/Indian School alignments) at the Hidden Waters Parkway, then make both Thomas and Indian School arterials west from the	Made appropriate changes in consultation with the Town of Buckeye.

		Hidden Waters Parkway consistent with the surrounding Master Plans. Also, I believe the TI at 339 <sup>th</sup> & I-10 should be designated as a “parkway” (pink or light red vs. yellow color).	
		We would like to see the “parkway” along 339 <sup>th</sup> Avenue extended southerly from I-10 to SR-801.	
		Camelback will most likely be the “bridged” crossing over the Hassayampa instead of Bethany Home Road. While Bethany may still cross we anticipate a low water crossing.	
		Suggest making Camelback a “parkway” from at least the river west to the proposed Tonopah Parkway. I’ll double check with Renee regarding Camelback through Tartesso.	

### Executive Summary

Source	Comment	Resolution
Robert Maki, City of Surprise	The shot of the boulevard as depicted on the cover of the FHWA tech brief that you used here is good because of the national attention. However, having a crossover so close to a major cross road may not be a good practice if turning volumes from the crossroad are high. In addition, the “rendering” of the parkway shown in plan view may not represent a typical operation. I would not recommend changing either...	No change required.
Tim Oliver, MCDOT	Do you want to soften the language under the parkway section? You have a bullet that suggests a high level of access control. That may not be the case and is one of the things we can give the development community back in return for the screened R/W that is needed.	Language modified accordingly.
Bill Vachon, FHWA	<b>Project Background, Purpose and Objectives</b> Under the objectives met the first one indicates preserve I-10 as an interstate travel and freight corridor. We suggest that this should be a stronger statement (than preserve) since the interstate is the backbone of East/west travel not only in this area but in the region and across the nation.	Language modified accordingly.
	<b>Relationship to Regional Planning.</b> These bubbles identify <u>Not Federally Mandated</u> in one and <u>Federally Mandated</u> in three bubbles. Is there a real need to use these terms? What value does it add to this section? Also in the Transportation Improvement Program bubble it seems to imply that annual updates are federally mandated. SAFETEA-LU only requires a TIP	Language modified accordingly.



	to be updated every 4 years. MAG elects to do annual updates.	
Bill Vachon, FHWA	<b>New Parkway Functional Classification</b> 1 <sup>st</sup> paragraph, last sentence indicates up to double the capacity of arterial and at fraction of the cost of a freeway. This comparison is somewhat misleading since you compare capacity to a lesser type facility but cost to a higher type facility. Also, indicating a parkway is only a fraction of the cost could cause some to conclude freeways are not an appropriate option. Suggest wording be revised.	
	<b>Traffic Interchange Locations</b> This section indicates there will be 20 interchanges. Since the term proposed is used elsewhere in this presentation the word <u>will</u> seems out of place. Also why isn't MAG identified in this description with ADOT and FHWA. Doesn't MAG agree with this concept?	Language modified accordingly.
	<b>Conceptual Transportation Framework Recommendations</b> This section indicates Parkways are a new type of facility. Is this what was meant to be said?	Text clarified.
	<b>Conceptual Transportation Framework Recommendations</b> We need to talk about the third paragraph (Frontage and or Collector-distributor roads).	New study element (Chapter 11) is addressing this issue along I-10 in Buckeye.
	<b>Legend under map</b> In the notes, 3 <sup>rd</sup> paragraph, it indicates FHWA approval is needed for use of parallel roads along freeways. This is technically not correct unless it is a road actually connects to the interstate within the access control, such as to a ramp. Suggest the wording be modified.	Language modified.
	<b>Implementation and Next Steps</b> 1 <sup>st</sup> paragraph last sentence ...in the short term to ensure than land is available... Is the word <u>than</u> the correct word?	Corrected.
	It seems prudent to mention the Hidden Valley study and the additional traffic generators coming from the adjacent study area. Don't want to make Hassayampa a stand alone area. It is one piece of a much bigger pie. It also makes a stronger case for the need for new revenues.	There is no room on the poster to explain the Hidden Valley Roadway Framework Study.
Dianne Kresich, ADOT	The study process does not reflect an integrated multi-modal planning effort. As a "framework" study, Hassayampa does little to address multiple modes or to integrate planning for those modes. It is clearly a roadway plan, and multi-modal transportation corridors are only addressed in a brief "alternate modes" section and secondary map. The recommendation section makes no mention of public transportation or alternate modes.	The study was never intended or envisioned as an integrated multi-modal planning effort. All of the funding partners, including ADOT, understood from the initial scoping meetings that this would be a Roadway Framework Study.

	<p>ADOT expressed concern that until relatively late in the study only the Intermodal Transportation Division had been included in all meetings of the funding partners; that meeting notes had not been distributed to the partners and, thus, there had been no written record of comments (this has since been remedied); that the MAG Web site was far from user-friendly, making it very difficult to locate study documents; and that outreach to the public outside of the development community had been weak.</p>	<p>(1) TPD was invited to participate in the funding partners' meetings as soon as it expressed an interest in doing so. (2) MAG has made, and continues to make, efforts to make its website more user-friendly. Suggestions are always welcome. (3) Stakeholder outreach was aimed primarily at property owners and developers because the study area is sparsely settled. However, the four forums were open to all and a public open house followed the third forum.</p>
<p>Dianne Kresich, ADOT</p>	<p>In addition, a major concern at that time was that a complete set of working papers had not been distributed for review and comment by the funding partners and study review team. This problem has not been resolved. The draft executive summary of the final report, which takes the form of a poster, has now been provided for review. However, the entire set of working papers has not. This appears to be a "cart before the horse" situation. A set of recommendations is being presented without complete documentation and review of the process. Where is the final report that the poster purports to summarize?</p>	<p>Ideally, the funding partners would be presented first with a complete series of working papers to review, and then with an executive summary reflecting comments on the working papers. In this study, however, MAG's efforts to be responsive to the immediate needs of its funding partners and their elected officials made this unachievable. The final report will consist of the working papers provided electronically along with the executive summary.</p>
	<p>Overall, the quality of writing is in need of refinement.</p>	<p>No specific changes indicated.</p>
	<p>Paragraph one of the recommendation section clearly states that the roadway concept represents general corridors and not specific alignments. This would be an appropriate place to emphasize the essential role of ADOT and FHWA in studying, approving, designing, and constructing highways. Presently, this is stated only in the fine print under the large map.</p>	<p>The poster format offers limited space. Since this Framework Format goes beyond the state highway system, we chose to limit details on the role of ADOT and FHWA.</p>
	<p>Paragraph two, which addresses the tunnel, needs clarification. It seems to be stating that the tunnel is "necessary." It would be better to state that an additional east-west connection from west of the White Tanks to east of them is needed. A tunnel, then, is one option toward meeting this need.</p>	<p>When the tunnel is first mentioned, the words "or an equivalent" follow in parentheses.</p>
	<p>Buildout, which is a central assumption of this study, needs more explanation. The text should clearly state that build-out represents a level of development, rather than a year.</p>	<p>Language modified accordingly.</p>
	<p>The study concentrates on roadway system funding, which is not a complete picture of</p>	<p>This is true, but the scope and budget of the funding element</p>

	transportation funding needs.	of this study were limited.
	Although the primary framework map includes railroad lines, it contains no references to public transportation. The reader must go to the secondary map for such information. This is inappropriate.	The transit information is relegated to the secondary map to enhance legibility and reduce clutter.
	The "implementation and next steps" chart is void of public transportation or rail infrastructure.	The scope and budget did not cover implementation of transit and rail, which would require another study.
	The secondary map is unclear regarding the labeling of the Rail Connector and Commuter Rail. It is also unclear what the Connector might accomplish without some better definition of land use, as BNSF and UP do not require or need that connection.	The potential freight rail connector and commuter rail are discussed in the text accompanying the map. Have BNSF and UP stated that they will not need this type of freight connection? This is a long-range planning study and that the needs of the region may change.
	The light rail segment shown on the secondary map makes little sense, especially when it is unclear what its connection may be to other services outside the study area.	Removed light rail designation.
	The secondary map uses terms such as "Shuttle Transit" that are undefined in the Valley Metro system.	Removed "Shuttle."
	The poster concept obviously puts extreme limits on the amount of text. As a result, explanations for technical terms and concepts are inadequate for those outside the transportation field. The general public, elected officials, etc. will not understand much of what is here. Admittedly, this is a problem with all transportation reports, but the minimal text compounds it.	No specific changes indicated.
	The parkway concept (which, as we know, is notoriously difficult to convey) is not served well by the two drawings. Readers will probably draw upon their existing notions of parkways as having "nice landscaping," but will probably not understand the indirect left turn concept. The text appears to do a better job than the images at explaining parkways.	Both text and drawings are used to communicate the concept to as many readers as possible. If ADOT feels that different drawings would be clearer, the team will consider them.
	The poster states that a special Web page is linked to the MAG Web site. The Web address should be included on the poster.	Web address added.

**Environmental Resource Agency Briefing: January 30, 2007**

<b>Source</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Resolution</b>
Greg Jones, FCDMC	FCDMC has given the study team some resources to help evaluate visual integrity. The ADMPs contain a lot of similar information, but in much more depth. Some of this may help us in our work.	We will look at the information and use it where appropriate to modify our map of opportunities and constraints.
	Disagrees with those who say a tunnel will never be built through the White Tanks. He sees it happening someday, because the pressure from east-west travel demand will become irresistible. There is a logical linkup with the Northern Avenue Parkway on the east side of the mountains. Game & Fish needs to take a more proactive role to get its concerns addressed while there's still time.	Noted.
Bill Knowles, AZ Game & Fish	BLM is doing an Agua Fria (National Monument)/Bradshaw/Harquahala Plan. BLM wants to preserve open space. On rural highways connecting communities, consider access control to prevent encroachment on open space. In addition, AGFD is working with ADOT and NAU on a statewide wildlife linkages study. These agencies will request wildlife pathways across new roads, which will increase construction costs. They could also militate against wide medians, such as those proposed for parkways. Deer and bighorn sheep cross highway corridors at many locations, which endangers not only the animals but the motoring public.	Noted.
Not recorded	There's a 94-foot limit on tunnel width. Any tunnel generates concerns about terrorism.	Noted.
Not recorded	Avoid placing roadways near White Tank Mountain Regional Park. There are also 8,000 acres of BLM land south of the park on which Buckeye has an "open space patent." Maricopa Co. Parks is talking with the Town and BLM about adding this land to the park. Any nearby parkway should be routed south of this area.	The team will get the boundaries of this parcel from Janine Guy at the Town of Buckeye and show it on our maps. It will also show emergency evacuation zones and routes for the PVNGS.

**Miscellaneous Comments and Responses**

<b>Source</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Resolution</b>
Tim Oliver and Mike Sabatini, MCDOT (7/20/07)	Do not identify MCDOT as the agency that will provide new Hassayampa bridge crossings. MCDOT will not be the provider. In some areas (e.g., Douglas Ranch), Buckeye has annexed both sides of the river and the county has just a strip in the middle. The report should include a section on bridge implementation, mentioning that any new bridges will serve Buckeye and Surprise,	Complied.

	<p>even if they are located in areas that are unincorporated today. Some 12 or 13 bridges will be required, with up to four in Douglas Ranch, but the county doesn't want them and has no money to build them. No one else has stepped up to the plate.</p>	
Oliver/Sabatini	<p>New bridges will not necessarily be built initially to their ultimate cross-section.</p>	<p>Noted in implementation chapter.</p>
Oliver/Sabatini	<p>Do not suggest or imply that the county will build or operate parkways. There is no commitment to do so. The implementing agencies could be cities, MCDOT, a regional agency and/or ADOT: don't single one out.</p>	<p>Complied.</p>
Randy Overmyer, City of Surprise	<p>The map shows purple squares identified in the legend as "Towns." These include Wittmann, Circle City and Morristown in the Surprise MPA and Wintersburg, Liberty, Arlington and others in the Buckeye MPA. None of these are incorporated cities and towns per ARS, and any incorporation moves would be resisted by Surprise and probably Buckeye, in our respective areas. I raise this because such issues are occasionally broached by Wittmann area residents who object to urbanization (or incorporation by Surprise). If it is decided we need such identification on the map for cartographic accuracy and/or wayfinding, perhaps we should label them "settlements."</p>	<p>We will designate unincorporated places as "communities" instead of "towns" on the maps.</p>
Mario Saldamando, City of Goodyear	<p>The Goodyear section [of some meeting notes] indicates that the study will mention tolling as one of several funding options. I thought the study was not going to address funding and that funding would be a part of the reconnaissance study.</p>	<p>This study discusses funding, but will not make recommendations.</p>
Ruth Garcia, Town of Buckeye (4/17/07)	<p>The Town of Buckeye has concerns with the alternatives regarding the lack of a placement of a TI at Wilson and the need for either configuration of a collector system or a frontage road design, along with either under or over passes to allow for the adequate flow of traffic between Buckeye north of I-10 and Buckeye south of I-10. This will also keep local trips off the I-10. As was agreed to at the last meeting involving the Town, MAG, DMJM and Stardust, further study would be done by DMJM regarding this matter. As we discussed late last week, you were waiting to received a revised scope of work from DMJM to do analysis on a collector or frontage road design along with either under or over passes.</p> <p>Unless or until you hear differently from Dave Wilcox, the Town of Buckeye will not support a preferred alternative until these issues have been resolved or an interim solution has been agreed to and is a part of the preferred alternative. The position that supporting a preferred alternative with the caveat that changes can be made in the future is not an acceptable solution at this time.</p>	<p>This issue was addressed in a special study for the Town of Buckeye and MAG (Chapter 11 of report).</p>

## COMMENT CARD SUMMARY

**Project:** MAG I-10/Hassayampa Valley Roadway Framework Study  
**Development Forum #1**  
**Date:** May 31, 2006

The following is a summary of the responses received on 14 comment cards distributed at the Development Forum #1 on May 31, 2006.

### What is the most important issue this study should address?

- Funding and right-of-way acquisition
- Major ports, transfer stations, depots for freight and passengers
- Bridge river crossings – especially the Hassayampa River – number, location, length (floodway encroachment), adherence to grid pattern vs. suitable location – connectivity between developments
- Future growth
- Linkage to Highway 74 and south of Pinal County
- Timelines of construction
- Define roadway network – conceptual alignments and classifications (freeways, parkways, arterials)
- Changes in legislation to permit early right-of-way preservation/acquisition – donation versus purchase
- Coordinate the proposed development with the regional transportation needs
- Future right-of-way preservation
- Funding
- Credible projection of growth and population and transportation needs
- We need the transportation solutions ASAP
- Consider that the development community is focused on small areas as individual companies – a greater understanding of current development projects underway as a region at the next forum would be helpful
- To plan for major transportation arteries before commercial or residential areas get built right up to existing roads and our potential land needed for more roadways

### What issues or topics should the study consider in greater depth?

- How to expedite the process/study
- Consideration of “competitive” interests for additional transportation systems (Carefree Highway, SR 303, eastern Maricopa County, etc.). West Valley interests need support of entire Valley (politically and citizens).
- Multi-modal transportation, particularly commuter rail, “Hassayampa Valley RR”, connection to BNSF rail yard at El Mirage/Grand Avenue
- I-10 widening
- TI locations along I-10
- Right-of-way acquisition/preservation
- Trip reduction
- Multi-modal methods
- Partnering with Flood Control on MC 85 by-pass

- Incorporate it with the El Rio Project (Gila River)
- Pool funding sources
- Identify roadway alignments to preserve right-of-way
- Private toll road financing
- Processing of development requests
- Connectivity between master planned communities and other area development
- Funding (Big time)
- Funding
- Continue to look at where the growth is going and build the roadways ASAP in those areas look at keeping Sun Valley Parkway a parkway - with no lights

#### **How can MAG maximize stakeholder input?**

- Include stakeholder representation on the SRT
- Utilize the web site
- Good Mail communications
- Some engineers represent several projects (such as CMX) so coordinate through them to address development interests in a consolidated fashion. Smaller ad ho groups to represent developer interests.
- Keep the website up to date
- Have meeting with individual property owners at least the larger properties
- Provide a draft to stakeholders for review and comment
- Website – keep up to date
- Update meetings/emails every 2-3 months
- Invite us again to attend
- Put out information on a monthly basis and set up information meetings as often as needed to keep citizens informed and to allow for input

#### **Other comments**

- Well done!