



INTERSTATE-10 HASSAYAMPA VALLEY ROADWAY FRAMEWORK STUDY

Meeting Summary Report May 29, 2007

Meeting summary notes of all Funding Partners and Study Review Team meetings, Development Forum, and Community Workshop (February 14, 2006 through April 16, 2007)



TABLE OF CONTENTS

February 14, 2006 – Scoping Meeting Tier I.....2

February 23, 2006 – Scoping Meeting Tier II.....4

March 3, 2006 – Scoping Meeting Tier III.....7

May 31, 2006 – Funding Partners #1.....11

May 31, 2006 – Study Review Team #112

May 31, 2006 – Development Forum #119

July 17, 2006 – Funding Partners #2.....26

July 26, 2006 – Study Review Team #2.....27

July 26, 2006 – Development Forum #2.....33

October 6, 2006 – Study Review Team #343

October 20, 2006 – Funding Partners #3.....46

November 9, 2006 – Funding Partners #449

November 30, 2006 – Funding Partners #552

December 14, 2006 – Funding Partners #6.....55

December 14, 2006 – Study Review Team #457

January 25, 2007 – Funding Partners #762

February 26, 2007 – Funding Partners #864

February 26, 2007 – Study Review Team #566

February 26, 2007 – Development Forum #3.....68

February 26, 2007 – Public Meeting74

April 16, 2007 – Funding Partners #9.....76

MEETING SUMMARY NOTES

Meeting: MAG Interstate 10 – Hassayampa Valley Roadway
Framework Study
Scoping Meeting Tier 1
Date: February 14, 2006; 8:30 a.m.
Location: MAG Palo Verde Room

Attendance

Eric Anderson, MAG
Bob Hazlett, MAG
Roger Herzog, MAG

Consulting Team

John McNamara, DMJM Harris
Ethan Rauch, DMJM Harris
Paul Waung, DMJM Harris
Jennifer Livingston, DMJM Harris

The purpose of this meeting was to complete Tier 1 of the study scoping process. Tier 2 will consist of a meeting with MAG's financial partners on February 22, 2006. Tier 3, involving the remaining partners, is scheduled for March 3. Once these stakeholders have had a chance to comment on the scope, a contract can be executed.

Bob has been getting calls from developers (and land speculators) who complain that he's "taking away" I-10 interchanges that they've been promised, primarily by Supervisor Mary Rose Wilcox. However, only FHWA has the authority to grant TIs, and it wants this study done first. Another reason why this study has a short fuse is that its recommendations are needed as input to the Buckeye General Plan Update. John observed that the work effort will be especially intense during the first three or four months of the study.

HDR is just entering scoping for its study of the I-10 Reliever, identified temporarily as SR 801. There is already talk of routing this facility along a future MC-85 South Bypass.

Bob said that when Buckeye reaches the size of today's Phoenix (around 1.2 million people), it will need a comparable freeway network. The Sun Valley Parkway could be retrofitted to a "boulevard arterial" (no left turns at intersections) or even a freeway in the future. The county road system in the study area will require major improvements. There is talk of a Tonopah MPA, which apparently has not drawn opposition from Buckeye.

SR-85 will be completed as a freeway before any other major facilities are constructed in this area, resulting in significant development pressure along the route.

Eric mentioned a parallel effort to develop a statewide transportation funding initiative. In our study area, as in Pinal County, development is way ahead of the infrastructure. Dennis said that the I-10 corridor will be unable to function without parallel arterials (e.g., McDowell Road), collector/distributor roads or both. Currently I-10 is the only east-west route in the area and no alternatives exist if an accident shuts it down. We must develop both a short-term plan and a long-term “illustrative” plan for the study area. The 1960 Wilbur Smith freeway plan for metro Phoenix was mentioned as a well-known example of long-range regional transportation planning.

MAG has 2005 aerials for the study area, and Bob will provide these to DMJM Harris.

Landowners in the area, many of whom are speculators, see access to I-10 as the key to their short-run financial success. They may not understand that such access will be worth little if I-10 breaks down. We need to educate speculators and developers about the potential “train wreck” if nothing more is done to improve east-west mobility options. This kind of education may lead to consideration of new transportation funding mechanisms, or at least greater willingness of the private sector to donate monetarily and in-kind. Funding and finance are going to be important elements of this study. Concepts include a Community Transportation Facilities District or even turning MAG into a regional transportation authority. We will need to explore how our roadway framework can be paid for.

Bob asked for a model run to estimate future demand on I-10 given the full extent of planned development in the study area, to illustrate the magnitude of the problem we face. There could be a demand for 500,000 to 600,000 vehicles per day at Buildout. John described a seat-of-the-pants estimate that at least three new six-lane freeways will be required just to accommodate east-west travel demand from entitled development west of the Hassayampa River, even if a large proportion of the trips generated in this area remain within it. Bob said that there are 400,000 entitled lots in the study area; by comparison, Pinal County has 600,000.

Bob said that we need to find a politically correct way to present a “doomsday scenario” that will help stimulate action without blowing up in our faces. We need to find a win-win solution, but this will be difficult because in the real world someone always loses.

MEETING SUMMARY NOTES

Meeting: MAG Interstate 10 – Hassayampa Valley Roadway
Framework Study
Scoping Meeting Tier II

Date: February 23, 2006; 8:30 a.m.

Location: MAG Ocotillo Room

Attendance

Bob Hazlett, MAG
Bob Miller, ADOT SPMG
Tim Oliver, MCDOT
Randy Overmyer, City of Surprise
Mario Saldamando, City of Goodyear

Consulting Team

John McNamara, DMJM Harris
Ethan Rauch, DMJM Harris

Before the meeting started, Tim made the following observations:

- Sun Valley Parkway will remain a parkway, not a freeway. There will be full access approximately every mile, and possibly also some intermediate right-in, right-out access points.
- It may not be possible to build a new freeway in the study area (other than CANAMEX and possibly the I-10 Reliever?). Even if it is, there's no place for a freeway to continue east into the urban core.
- Therefore, building bedroom communities won't work. Development in the area needs a very aggressive employment element.

Bob Hazlett began the meeting by reviewing the scoping process. The Tier 3 meeting with the full working group (Study Review Team) is scheduled for March 3 at 8:30. The goal is to have the contract signed by March 10. We will meet with major developers the third or fourth week in March. (This meeting was subsequently scheduled for March 28 at 1:30 p.m.)

The primary means of disseminating the final report will be electronic. There will be an executive summary in the form of a large two-sided poster.

Mario mentioned the funding challenges, and asked when and how we'll involve the development community. In response, John mentioned the March meeting and the four community workshops. We may also need to meet individually with some of the major developers. Curt Lueck will address funding in depth. We may ask him to do a white paper with a menu of options earlier in the study than we originally thought. Bob Hazlett added that we need to start

looking into changes in Arizona state law that may be needed to allow innovative funding methods. It takes time to get anything through the legislature.

Tim said that a critical piece of our study will be a Buildout arterial roadway network to respond to expected levels of future land development. MCDOT ran into a “brick wall” when it tried to run the MAG model with the existing Sun Valley Parkway; i.e., the model crashed, even though Randy was less aggressive than he might have been in socioeconomic growth assumptions for future years. Bridge crossings of the Hassayampa River are another challenge; developers don’t understand the need. In a similar vein, Bob Miller noted that I-10 can be widened only to a certain point without creating unacceptable weaving requirements.

Bob Hazlett said that we need tools for corridor preservation. ADOT has only two years to buy right-of-way once the centerline has been established. The obvious solution is for local jurisdictions to take the lead. Amendments to general plans may be an important step toward accomplishing this. Tim suggested incorporating a provision for such amendments into the funding agreement (for this study) between each financial partner and MAG.

Bob Miller was concerned that current development in our study area may make the study obsolete by the time it’s adopted. Tim replied that a downturn in the market has begun, providing some breathing space. We need to let landowners know very early that they may have to change their proposed I-10 TI locations to reflect the results of this study. This obligates us to give the landowners and developers every opportunity to participate throughout the study. If they are involved from the outset, there will be no surprises at the end. We must also document the process in case someone complains later about being left out.

Other comments by Bob Hazlett:

- We need to line up roadway cross-sections so there will be continuity and consistency between master-planned communities. This won’t happen by itself.
- Between Buckeye, Surprise and Pinal County, a million lots are already entitled, with no transportation plan, let alone funding, to support them. Suggestions for addressing this problem have included a regional transportation district and region-wide impact fees. Another idea is to follow California’s example of requiring developers to do expanded TIs that consider impacts on the entire regional transportation system, not just the adjacent roadways.
- Our study needs to present a variety of financing options and the actions that would be required to make each one feasible. From there it’s up to the elected officials.

- MAG wants to run a “high traffic potential” scenario with just the RTP roadway network, primarily to demonstrate clearly the magnitude of the problem we face.

John asked participants whether they wanted any changes to the project work plan he had presented earlier. The only comment was from Tim: “let’s get going.” Bob asked whether we should maintain the financial partners’ group in addition to the full Study Review Team. Tim replied that the smaller group should consult informally and have prior review of working papers, but there’s no need for another official group with scheduled meetings.

Bob Miller emphasized that landowners and developers want answers now regarding I-10 TI locations. Bob Hazlett and John said that we should know between Thanksgiving and Christmas, but there may be fairly clear indications as early as late summer.

MEETING SUMMARY NOTES

Meeting: MAG Interstate 10 – Hassayampa Valley Roadway
Framework Study
Scoping Meeting Tier III
Date: March 3, 2006; 8:30 a.m.
Location: MAG Saguaro Room

Attendance

Bob Hazlett, MAG
Suparna Dasgupta, Town of Buckeye
Mani Kumar, ADOT
Jim Nichols, City of Goodyear
Tim Oliver, MCDOT
Randy Overmyer, City of Surprise
John Pein, ADOT
Annette Riley, ADOT-Statewide Program Management
Mario Saldamando, City of Goodyear
Carol Slaker, ADOT
Bill Vachon, FHWA

Consulting Team

John McNamara, DMJM Harris
Dan Marum, Wilson & Company
Curt Dunham, PSA
Ethan Rauch, DMJM Harris
Curt Lueck, CLA

John McNamara presented an overview of the work program and Bob Hazlett distributed the draft scope of work. Bob said that implementation—in particular, how to pay for the recommended framework—are our biggest question and the crux of the study. All of the Proposition 400 funding has been spoken for. We'll need to put all kinds of funding options on the table.

Dan stressed the need to get the development community involved early so they will gain ownership in the process and have a stake in the outcome, including the implementation plan. At some point, though, we will have to draw a line and make some development assumptions. Curt Lueck observed that the State Land Department is the biggest developer of all.

MAG is completing new socioeconomic data sets for the 2007 RTP update, as required by SAFETEA-LU. The new data, if ready in time, will be used for this study. There has been no update since 2002, and much has changed since then.

Bob: Massive development west of the White Tanks will require creativity to find solutions. Our options for building additional high-capacity roadways are very limited.

Each member of the SRT was asked to offer thoughts and ideas. Comments included:

- **Goodyear (Mario):**
We must bring the development community to the table early, in the workshops and elsewhere. (Curt Dunham briefly described some of the techniques to elicit participation.) We need to keep the developers involved throughout.
- **Buckeye (Suparna):**
The timing for this study is excellent, as it coincides with the Buckeye General Plan Update (to be prepared by some of the same consultants) and other related efforts. Buckeye already knows in large part what its needs are; the hard part is to find answers. Huge developments in progress on the north side are creating big traffic concerns. Some developers appear ready to step up and contribute to the solution if we involve them from the outset. Buckeye granted 700 residential permits just in January, and this number will increase further because of Tartesso. Suparna also said that county islands with their uncontrolled lot splits are a big challenge for Buckeye.
- **FHWA (Vachon):**
It is essential to preserve the integrity of I-10 as an Interstate route. To this end, the number of TIs needs to be limited. ADOT must avoid putting system TIs too close to local service TIs, and also placing system TIs too close together so that traffic from two major corridors is squeezed onto a single route, creating bottlenecks. It's also important to plan ahead, so that when a facility is improved, there won't be a need to go back and reconstruct it again in a few years. Bob agreed that logical project staging is crucial to prevent unnecessary traffic disruption due to excessive construction.
- **ADOT (Annette):**
Her main concern is similar to FHWA's: the effect of access to I-10 on traffic conditions on the mainline. TIs need to be properly planned.
- **ADOT (John Pein):**
Some say I-10 has already failed, and that it's heading for LOS F 20 to 22 hours a day. Even today it doesn't function as an Interstate highway. Don't call SR-801 the I-10 Reliever, as it won't relieve traffic on I-10. It's expected to divert only 5,000 vehicles a day, which is a drop in the bucket.

--In response to a question from John, Bob said that MAG has tied Buildout to 2030. John McNamara suggested tying it instead to a period, such as 2030 to 2050, to allow for the unpredictability of economic cycles.

--Developers must be educated on the impacts of their projects to the state highway system. The entire statewide system will be heavily affected.

--No state money is available to build new highways in Maricopa County. Creative funding solutions are essential.

- **ADOT (Carol):**

We need to include State Lands and BLM in the process.

- **Surprise (Randy):**

--This study should have been done five years ago.

--Developers are eager to build homes in the area but have shown little interest in employment. You can plan for employment centers but you can't make them come.

--How will new access-controlled corridors tie into the existing freeway network?

--Consider SR-74 as a possible connecting point.

--Cross-fertilize with concurrent studies in this area.

--Surprise has 125,000 lots entitled just in our study area.

--The Daimler-Chrysler Proving Grounds will be transformed into 21,000 homes plus 500,000 square feet of non-residential development.

- **MCDOT (Tim):**

--The sensitivity (Buildout) analysis under highest traffic conditions is critical.

--We need to understand the State Lands vision for urban development of their holdings within the study area. What are their intentions of moving ahead with land disposition? What land uses do they have in mind, where, and at what densities? Also what may happen to BLM land; does the potential exist for conversions?

--Don't forget the ADOT Wickenburg Bypass, which will ultimately extend SR-74 around Wickenburg.

--MAG is moving to a new modeling platform with superior performance, but we may or may not have it in time for this study. If not, we can use simple math to populate the study area under Buildout and other scenarios.

--The local arterial street network is just as important as regional facilities. The latter won't work without adequate arterials to support them.

--We need to find ways to protect roadway corridors now, before developments are approved—e.g., by stipulation prior to approval.

--We at least need to protect the future arterial grid network.

--We won't solve all the problems.

As a concluding question, John McNamara asked how we can get developers to put their cards on the table early. Curt Dunham said that we need to show developers what's in it for them—how our planning process will help them. Tim said that soliciting participation will be tough now because of the economic downturn; developers are obtaining entitlements and then “flipping” their properties, positioning themselves for the next upturn.

Bob will work with members to establish a schedule of SRT meetings for the entire study.

MEETING SUMMARY NOTES – No Meeting Notes Available

Meeting: MAG Interstate 10 – Hassayampa Valley Roadway
Framework Study
Funding Partners #1
Date: May 31, 2006
Location: Estrella Community College

Attendance

Consulting Team

MEETING SUMMARY NOTES

Meeting: Interstate 10 – Hassayampa Valley Roadway Framework Study
Study Review Team #1
Date: May 31, 2006, 10:30 a.m.
Location: Estrella Community College

Attendance

Suparna Dasgupta, Town of Buckeye	Tina Wrublik, Town of Buckeye
Bahram Narinsh, ADOT	Richard Stafford, Town of Buckeye
Scott Lowe, Town of Buckeye	Hans Koppenhoefer, Pulte Homes
Tim Wilson, ADOT	Thomas Chlebanowski, Town of Buckeye
Carroll Reynolds, Town of Buckeye	Bob Miller, ADOT
Monica Baiza, ADOT	Tim Oliver, MCDOT
Ed Stillings, FHWA	Brad Olbert, Jacobs
Renee Probst, MCDOT	Mario Saldamando, City of Goodyear
Michael Jones, ADOT	Bill Vachon, FHWA
Greg Jones, MC Flood Control	Randy Overmyer, Surprise
Bob Dubsy, Luke AFB	Gerald J. Toscano
Paul Donovan, MBI Homes	Tami Wollaston, ADOT
John Hathaway, MC Flood Control	Farhad Tavassoli, City of Goodyear
Keith Watkins	Murray Johnson

Bob Hazlett, MAG Project Manager

Consulting Team

John McNamara, DMJM Harris
Curt Lueck, CLA Peggy Fiandaca, PSA
Dan Marum, Wilson & Company
Jackie Pfeiffer, DMJM Harris
Ethan Rauch, DMJM Harris

Welcome and Introductions

Bob Hazlett, Maricopa Association of Governments (MAG) Project Manager welcomed everyone and thanked them for participating in the I-10 – Hassayampa Valley Roadway Framework Study. Everyone introduced themselves. Bob mentioned that the study was being sponsored and funded by the cities of Goodyear and Surprise, town of Buckeye, Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) and Maricopa County Department of Transportation (MCDOT). In addition, MAG is using funds from the Federal Highway Administration to help pay for the study.

Framework Study Overview

Bob Hazlett gave a broad overview of the 12-month study. The study area covers a large portion of western Maricopa County, most of which is currently

undeveloped desert. The project limits are generally SR-74 (or a projection thereof) on the north, the Gila River on the south, SR 303L (Estrella Freeway alignment) on the east, and the 459th Avenue section line on the west. Most of the area is within Buckeye, Surprise and unincorporated Maricopa County.

The study's overall intent is to develop a planned roadway network, and to define and prioritize operational and safety improvements to I-10 while forming a framework for regional connections within the study area.

Key study elements include:

1. Develop a network of north/south and east/west roadways, varying in functional classification, that will provide access throughout the study area and preserve I-10.
2. Formulate a prioritization framework for constructing the roadway framework, regional connections and future I-10 interchanges.
3. Study opportunities to incorporate alternative transportation modes into the roadway framework.
4. Evaluate funding options and create a financing plan for the proposed roadway framework.
5. Recommend an access management system and appropriate access management strategies for each functional classification of roadway.
6. Identify and preserve right-of-way for future travel corridors.

Bob mentioned that it was suggested to add the following members to the SRT.

1. Two railroads
2. Greater Phoenix Economic Council
3. Arizona Public Service

Renee Probst asked, "When will the working paper on travel demand forecasts be available?" and Bob answered summer 2006 and no later than Labor Day.

Regional Development – Facilitated Discussion

After a PowerPoint overview of the study by Bob Hazlett and John McNamara, Peggy Fiandaca led a facilitated discussion in which the study team solicited comments on issues, ideas/suggestions, opportunities and constraints. The following input was offered by SRT members:

Issues

- I-10 safety, integrity and congestion are issues.
- Bridge crossings: number, locations, encroachment on floodways.
- Air quality impacts.
- Implementation: timing and responsibilities.
- (Information point: there is only one Luke auxiliary field, in Surprise near Jomax Road.)
- Revisit the proposed Canamex system interchange location.

- Where is the roadway grid going? Where will it be linked to regional access?
- Avoid “throwaway” projects requiring more than one reconstruction of the same facility.
- Final document needs to be a useful tool for decision-making.
- Flood control issues include how to cross the rivers, how flood control structures will be affected by transportation projects, and the impacts of drainage needs on right-of-way requirements. The integrity of the Hassayampa River must not be degraded.
- Consider connections between SR-801, Canamex, I-10 and other high capacity corridors.
- County Parks is not on the SRT.
- Access to regional parks.
- Alternative-fuel vehicle access.
- Environmental protection issues; e.g., protecting raptors near Wickenburg.
- Need buy-in (by municipalities) to socioeconomic input data and projections.
- Consider rail along I-10 and US-60.

Ideas/Suggestions

- Need to determine the reasonable number of lanes for I-10 at Buildout. Establish “horizon widening” scenario for I-10.
- Loop railroad line around White Tanks to link with UPRR and BNSF.
- Future freight roads; e.g., alternative freight road along I-10.
- Interagency/intergovernmental coordination, communication and partnerships.

Opportunities

- Consider rapid transit.
- Intermodal connections; park-and-ride lots.
- Preserve right-of-way along I-10 corridor and for future roads elsewhere.
- Change dams to channels.
- Connections to current and future regional transportation system.
- Better planning and zoning along freeway corridors for other land uses than residential to minimize roadway impact.
- Locate non-residential land use as buffer along high capacity roads.
- Involvement with environmental organizations.
- Support growth of Buckeye Airport—ensure access—consider moving the facility farther west to better serve future community?
- Need good funding base with public support—e.g., private financing, tolls, public/private partnerships, joint financing. Advance projects through innovative financing & implementation.
- If the BNSF Railroad moves its auto facility, the El Mirage location may be a good spot for a commuter rail park-and-ride. Commuter rail along US-60.
- Noise mitigation program and strategies.

Constraints

- Explore funding options: How? When? From where?
- White Tank Regional Park.
- Land use compatibility.
- Consider access to, visibility of and security of Toyota testing facility.
- Where will the water come from?
- Wildlife crossings, concentrations (e.g., raptors), migration patterns

Agency Information Exchange

During lunch, each SRT member was asked for information on infrastructure projects, major development (ongoing or planned) and related topics. The following input was offered:

MAG

Memorandum of Understanding: Hidden Valley Study
Boundary - 459th Avenue/Gila River/I-8/SR-87
Type of Study - Roadway framework
Commuter Rail Study (update of previous studies)

ADOT

Corridor Profile on I-10 (new)
Canamex tie into I-10; pre-design study and system interchange locations.
I-10 widening DCRs (SR- 85-303, 303-101)
SR-303L, SR- 801 to I-10
SR-85 (will be affected by location of 801)
SR-85/I-8 (determine system interchange)

Glendale

Northern Parkway: 303-Grand

Goodyear

SR-801
SR-303 alignment south of I-10
Canyon Trails Town Center (303/Yuma Road)
Estrella Mountain Ranch
300,000 unbuilt entitlements (213,000 south of Gila River)

Surprise

Comprehensive Transportation Plan (just released)
Access Management Policies for US-60
Issues
 Canamex
 Wickenburg Bypass
 Capacity development of SR-74
 Regional grid network
 Sensitivity to Luke auxiliary field
Major Developments
 Grand Vista (old Chrysler Proving Grounds), 21,000 dwelling units
 Sun Haven (west of Grand Vista) 9,000 dwelling units
 Asante
 BNSF Intermodal Logistics Center near US-60/SR-74
 Unbuilt entitlements: 120,000

FCDMC

Hassayampa River
 Characteristics Study (Phase 1)
 Plant Master Plan
 Bridge crossing standards
 (Choose logical locations rather than mile-grid crossings)
Sun Valley
 Alluvial fans (with White Tanks)
White Tanks Area Drainage Master Plan (ADMP)
Buckeye ADMP (start September 2006)
Future studies: Loop Wash (Jackrabbit, Palo Verde)
Issues
 White Tanks drainage structures: how to cross?
 El Rio (Avondale-Buckeye)

Luke Air Force Base

Notification zone to determine what can be built around base
Auxiliary field
Military training routes (concern for residential development under them)
Departure corridor to Gila Bend (along SR-85)

MCDOT

MC-85 (75th Ave-Turner Rd) provides a bypass around downtown Buckeye and ties into SR-85

Sun Valley Parkway (corridor study)

I-10 to Bell Road

New N-S corridor from existing Sun Valley Parkway to SR-74

Present an access management strategy

Final public open house scheduled for this Tuesday (6/6)

Patton/Jomax (corridor study)

299th Ave-Tillman Blvd.

Look for best location for river crossing

Jackrabbit Trail (Camelback Rd-Bell Rd)

163rd Avenue

Entitlements

Six or seven new developments not on map

Buckeye

General Plan Update and Development Code (underway)

Airport (640 acres preserved by town for general commerce)

Master Plan for parks

Town Lake project

El Rio (FCDMC)

Major developments:

- Douglas Ranch major plan amendment—entitled population already larger than Tempe's
- Tartesso (commercial area about 300 acres; approximately 40,000 homes in next 15 years)—at least as big as Anthem
- Sun City Festival
- Mercado @ I-10 south of Verrado (76 acres; power center with Target and other anchors)
 - Trillium (3000 acres on Sun Valley Parkway, first homes open 2007)
- Vestar Power Center (SR 85)
- Sundance (commercial): Watson Road/I-10
- 350,000 dwelling units approved, not committed
- Town is issuing 500-600 permits a month
- Watson Road will be punched through to MC-85
- 56-acre resort at Verrado
- Jackrabbit Trail—two major ones including Blue Horizons

Need alternative north-south access besides Sun Valley Parkway

Town's population was 6000 in 2003; is already 40,000 in 2006; will grow by another 20,000 this year.

Miscellaneous

- The Hassayampa River is typically 3000 feet wide according to John Hathaway of FCDMC. Randy Overmyer of Surprise said that the river is 1.5 miles wide at Jomax Road.
- The only non-existing I-10 interchange that has received final approval from ADOT and FHWA is the 347th Avenue service interchange providing access to Belmont. A Luke military training route goes directly over this community.
- Jerry of Maricopa County Planning and Development said he's getting hammered by developers who want to know where their I-10 access will be located.
- Bob Miller of ADOT asked how we will incorporate in this study the traffic that will be generated in Buckeye south of the Gila River. Bob Hazlett gave a threefold answer:
 1. The MAG socioeconomic database for the entire region will be updated by October, and we hope to use it in this study.
 2. Dan Marum of Wilson is working on interim socioeconomic projections for the study area.
 3. At some point the study must move forward with the best information we have.

MEETING SUMMARY NOTES

Meeting: Interstate 10 – Hassayampa Valley Roadway Framework Study
Date: Development Forum #1
May 31, 2006, 1:30 p.m.
Location: Estrella Community College

Attendance

SEE ATTACHED

Welcome and Introductions

Bob Hazlett, Maricopa Association of Governments (MAG) Project Manager welcomed everyone and thanked them for participating in the I-10 – Hassayampa Valley Roadway Framework Study. Everyone introduced themselves. Bob mentioned that the study was being sponsored and funded by the cities of Goodyear and Surprise, town of Buckeye, Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) and Maricopa County Department of Transportation (MCDOT). In addition, MAG is using funds from the Federal Highway Administration to help pay for the study.

Framework Study Overview

Bob Hazlett gave a broad overview of the 12-month study. The study area covers a large portion of western Maricopa County, most of which is currently undeveloped desert. The project limits are generally SR-74 (or a projection thereof) on the north, the Gila River on the south, SR-303L (Estrella Freeway alignment) on the east, and the 459th Avenue section line on the west. Most of the area is within Buckeye, Surprise and unincorporated Maricopa County.

The study's overall intent is to develop a planned roadway network, and to define and prioritize operational and safety improvements to I-10 while forming a framework for regional connections within the study area.

Key study elements include:

- Develop a network of north/south and east/west roadways, varying in functional classification, that will provide access throughout the study area and preserve I-10.
- Formulate a prioritization framework for constructing the roadway framework, regional connections and future I-10 interchanges.
- Study opportunities to incorporate alternative transportation modes into the roadway framework.
- Evaluate funding options and create a financing plan for the proposed roadway framework.

Recommend an access management system and appropriate access management strategies for each functional classification of roadway. Identify and preserve right-of-way for future travel corridors.

Regional Development – Facilitated Discussion

After a PowerPoint overview of the study by Bob Hazlett and John McNamara, Peggy Fiandaca led a facilitated discussion in which the participants provided comments on issues, ideas/suggestions, opportunities and constraints. This section lists the questions and comments were offered by participants. It also records the results of an exercise in which each participant was asked to place a dot on each of the three issues that he or she considers most important.

Issues

- Consider Hassayampa River crossings, both bridged and low water (four dots).
- BNSF railroad crossings.
- Get the funding in place.
- Toll roads.
- Phasing program to address interim conditions.
- Get a handle on the major developments that are already going in along the northern portion of the Sun Valley Parkway—e.g., Lennar, CPH, Pulte (two dots)
- Need to know where the service TIs will be located on I-10. Also timing, funding, and how many TIs would be allowed.
- Consider the interaction between growth over the next 40 years and Luke Air Force Base activity—possible changes in mission, aircraft, flight patterns (one dot).
- Palo Verde Generating Station security.
- Consider the impacts of road construction (e.g., I-10) on traffic.

Opportunities

- Take into account the time lag between planning and construction of projects.
- We've heard nothing so far about trip reduction, which needs to be emphasized. Also focus on achieving a jobs/housing balance—location of economic development, telecommuting (two dots).
- Consider tolls on roads serving non-local travelers (traveling to or from locations outside the region or state)—e.g., the Canamex corridor. Study toll roads and provide information.
- Tie in the MC-85 corridor to the El Rio project (four dots).
- Regional connections between I-10, SR-74 and a future "Outer Outer Loop," which will not necessarily be located in the planned Canamex corridor (five dots).
- Right-of-way protection and funding (two dots).

Constraints

- Funding options (one dot).
- Growth of area in next 40 years.
- The railroads.
- Railroad corridors, access and utilization (one dot).
- White Tank Mountains block east-west traffic flow.
- We've lacked the foresight or the funding to protect right-of-way for future roads.
- Funding is also a constraint. Proposition 400 won't fund projects in the study area.

Ideas/Suggestions

- For new interchanges, we need a standard "potsharing" arrangement whereby federal, state and local governments contribute a specified proportion of the funding. "Cost sharing of interchanges that everyone understands." (One dot)
- Put an electric train down the I-10 corridor to carry freight—e.g., to the Buckeye Airport. The train could run on power generated at Palo Verde, and would relieve truck traffic on I-10. Passengers can choose not to use a train, but freight cannot (one dot).
- Public transportation in I-10 corridor (five dots).
- Need multimodal transportation to move people.
- In its presentation, the study team failed to mention Northern Parkway in Glendale. Consider extending the parkway west of the White Tanks to alleviate traffic on I-10 and Bell Road.
- Make the public aware of the funding gap (e.g., gas tax).
- Enhancement of roads in Maricopa County (one dot).
- TIs along Loop 303 (two dots).
- Put all possible funding sources on the table—tolls, taxes, impact fees, etc. Do this soon.
- Address roadway design and aesthetics—could impact funding.

Questions

Have we mapped projected growth in Buckeye, Goodyear and Surprise? Where is infrastructure needed to support planned development?

Response (J. McNamara): The recent Surprise General Plan Update and the ongoing Buckeye General Plan Update have shown or will show the growth areas. However, the cities' planning efforts are still struggling to keep up with growth.

Where are the studies concentrating now?

Response (B. Hazlett): MAG is concentrating on the main growth areas—e.g., Hassayampa Valley and Hidden Valley, with the latter stretching into Pinal County. Also commuter rail throughout the region.

What are the pros and cons of toll roads versus sales tax as revenue sources?

Response (J. McNamara): We will address this issue later in the study.

How much money can toll roads raise? Will they generate enough to support the construction and maintenance?

Response (B. Hazlett): Typically, tolls are used to retire bonds that finance both toll way construction and maintenance. The financing can be structured to support maintenance even after the tolls are lifted.

How will we prioritize projects?

Response (B. Hazlett): We will develop evaluation criteria and performance measures and use them as objectively as we can. Projects recommended in this study will later have to compete for funding with other projects throughout the region, through the regular MAG programming process.

Can strong grassroots support (from the bottom up) help get projects programmed and funded?

Response (B. Hazlett): Yes.

How does the MAG air quality conformity analysis relate to this study?

Response (R. Herzog): Once projects have been recommended in this study, they will undergo conformity analysis prior to adoption by MAG (one dot).

What is the timetable for the conformity analysis?

Response (R. Herzog): Probably 1.5 to 2 years from now.

Does growth pay for growth from a regional perspective? Are developers charged impact fees to pay for growth?

Response (P. Fiandaca) Cities can and do levy such fees, but there is no mechanism for a regional or subregional fee.

Rejoinder: A regional impact fee is needed (three dots).

How Else Would You Like to Be Involved?

Peggy Fiandaca asked the participants how they would like to be involved in the study as it evolves.

Response: We would like an opportunity to review products in draft form.

Peggy suggested that everyone consult the website frequently to keep abreast of the study. Invitations will be sent to all those in the database to future meetings.

Next Study Steps

Bob Hazlett thanked everyone for their participation and mentioned that the next development forum will be held in early July, sometime after the 4th.

**Interstate 10 – Hassayampa Valley Roadway Framework Study
Development Forum #1
May 31, 2006**

PARTICIPANTS

1. Dave Rioux, Buckeye Council
2. Terry Marshall, DeRito Partners, Inc.
3. Brandon Miller, Lennar Homes
4. Jerry Leavitt, Common Ground
5. Lindsay Schube, Beus Gilbert
6. Tom Hennessey, El Dorado Holdings
7. Andrew Matusak
8. Larry Tysiac
9. Ryan Nichols, M2 Group, Inc.
10. Eileen O'Connell, MAG
11. Kyle Hindman
12. Scott Phillips, Carefree Partners
13. Teri Walker, Denise Resnik & Associates
14. Sharon Fodness
15. Mark A Voigt
16. Tom Hill
17. Robin L. Berry
18. James DeCremer
19. Matt Rinzlev
20. Tom Haney
21. Greg Haggerty, Dibble & Associates
22. Matt Holm, Maricopa County
23. James P. Smith
24. Paul Donovan, Montalbano Homes
25. Bill Ring, Belmont
26. Anubhav Bagley, MAG
27. Jim Creedon, Landry-Creedon
28. Shannon McLaughlin, Nathan and Associates
29. Curt Johnson
30. Jason Hadley
31. Armado De La Rocha
32. Roxanne Morris
33. Stephanie Wilson, Surprise
34. Heidi Kimball, Sunbelt Holdings
35. Christine Laliberty, Project Design Consultants
36. Michele Pino, Land Advisors
37. Helen Agelakos, Centex Homes
38. Tim Nyberg, PacWest

39. Larry Harmer, WC Scoutten
40. Cameron Carter, Rose Law Group
41. Aaron Atkinson, United Civil Group
42. Molly Edwards, The Lyle Anderson Company
43. Pam Miller
44. Rex Miller
45. Charlie Potter, Capital Pacific Homes
46. Landis Nordenberg, Bade
47. Pike Oliver, Vanderbilt Farms
48. John Devine
49. Pam Urwiller
50. Todd Kinney
51. Jim Harken, Buckeye Main Street
52. Gary Krumwiede
53. Bob Spiers, Stardust Companies
54. Nathan Anderson, Burch & Cracchiolo
55. Greg Keller, ASLD
56. Scott Triutt, DBAI
57. Josh Cameron, DBAI
58. Jay Ellingson, SunCor
59. Tim Reardon
60. Brian Rosella, Grubb & Ellis
61. Bob Hansman Jr., Dibble & Associates
62. Brad Ranly, AZ Land Advisors
63. Eric Cornwell, Cornwell Corp.
64. Jaime Kurry, Deutsch Associates
65. Aaron Iverson, URS
66. Scott Hartson
67. Stephen Cleveland, Goodyear
68. Jason Stephons, MAG
69. Paul Tachin, Real Development
70. D. Mahoney, Don Bennett Realty
71. Jeanine Jerkovic, Surprise
72. Matt Clark, MAG
73. Tom Buick, MMI
74. Greg Land, Global Retail
75. Alan Newberry, Rose Properties SW
76. Sandi Gajkowski, West Valley Arts Council
77. Ash Sabneckar, Sabneckar Consulting
78. Deanne Kupcik, Buckeye Valley Chamber of Commerce
79. Alisa Lyons, Valley Partnership
80. John R. Verdugo, Maricopa County
81. Darrell Wilson, CMX
82. Brent Moser, BRE Phoenix
83. Thomas Chlebanowski, Buckeye
84. Tom Nagy, Millennium Properties and Development, Inc.
85. Bob Hazlett, MAG

Consulting Team

John McNamara, DMJM Harris

Ethan Rauch, DMJM Harris

Jaclyn Pfeiffer, DMJM Harris

Peggy Fiandaca, PSA

Curt Lueck, CLA

Dan Marum, Wilson Company

MEETING SUMMARY NOTES

Meeting: MAG Interstate 10 – Hassayampa Valley Roadway
Framework Study
Funding Partners #2
Date: July 17, 2006
Location: DMJM Harris

NOTE – Detailed meeting notes were not created.

Attendance

DID NOT GET ATTENDANCE

Bob Hazlett, MAG Project Manager

Consulting Team

John McNamara, DMJM Harris
Ethan Rauch, DMJM Harris

Bob gave an overview of the project to date. The Team discussed background, issues and opportunities related to the study:

Surprise
Goodyear
Buckeye
MCDOT – MC-85, Sun Valley Parkway
ADOT – CANAMEX

The participants brainstormed potential routes. The participants also discussed special topics:

Patton/Jomax
Turner
Bell/Sun Valley Parkway/SR-85

The meeting concluded with an open discussion about the project.

MEETING SUMMARY NOTES

Meeting: MAG Interstate 10 – Hassayampa Valley Roadway
Framework Study
Study Review Team Meeting #2
Date: July 26, 2006, 10:30 a.m.
Location: Estrella Community College

Attendance

Monica Baiza, ADOT
Thomas Chlebanowski, Town of Buckeye - Public Works
Suparna Dasgupta, Town of Buckeye Planning & Development
Robert Dubsy, Luke Air Force Base
Kammy Horne, DMJM Harris
Murray Johnson III, Johnson Valley
Michael Jones, ADOT
Harold & Shirley Killman
Dianne Kresich, ADOT-TPD
Randy Overmyer, City of Surprise
Renee Probst, MCDOT
Janice See, City of Surprise
Ed Stillings, FHWA
Farhad Tavassoli, City of Goodyear
Bill Vachon, FHWA
Tim Wilson, ADOT
Tami Wollaston, ADOT Predesign
Bob Woodring, MCDOT

Bob Hazlett, MAG Hassayampa Study Project Manager

Consulting Team

John McNamara, DMJM Harris	Peggy Fiandaca, PSA
Curtis Lueck, CLA	Dan Marum, Wilson & Company
Jackie Pfeiffer, DMJM Harris	Ethan Rauch, DMJM Harris

Welcome and Introductions

Bob Hazlett, Maricopa Association of Governments (MAG) Project Manager, welcomed everyone and thanked them for participating in the I-10 – Hassayampa Valley Roadway Framework Study.

Everyone introduced themselves. Bob mentioned that the study was being sponsored and funded by the cities of Goodyear and Surprise, town of Buckeye, Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) and Maricopa County Department of Transportation (MCDOT). In addition, MAG is using funds from the Federal Highway Administration to help pay for the study.

Framework Study Overview

Bob Hazlett gave a broad overview of the 12-month study. The study area covers a large portion of western Maricopa County, most of which is currently undeveloped desert. The project limits are generally SR-74 (or a projection thereof) on the north, the Gila River on the south, SR-303 (Estrella Freeway alignment) on the east, and the 459th Avenue section line on the west. Most of the area is within Buckeye, Surprise and unincorporated Maricopa County.

The study's overall intent is to develop a planned roadway network, and to define and prioritize operational and safety improvements to I-10 while forming a framework for regional connections within the study area.

Key study elements include:

- Develop a network of north/south and east/west roadways, varying in functional classification, that will provide access throughout the study area and preserve I-10.
- Formulate a prioritization framework for constructing the roadway framework, regional connections and future I-10 interchanges.
- Study opportunities to incorporate alternative transportation modes into the roadway framework.
- Evaluate funding options and create a financing plan for the proposed roadway framework.
- Recommend an access management system and appropriate access management strategies for each functional classification of roadway.
- Identify and preserve right-of-way for future travel corridors.

John McNamara, DMJM Harris Project Manager, gave a PowerPoint presentation providing an overview of the preliminary conceptual alternative scenarios for high capacity corridors. After the presentation, the participants discussed the preliminary alternatives and made recommendations. Following is a summary of the comment.

Bob Miller (ADOT): Many issues need to be considered in looking at the future freeway system. For example, will Belmont really agree to a freeway running north-south through the community that provides no access for a distance of at least 1.5 miles north of I-10? Adjacent communities wouldn't have direct access either. "I see another Arrowhead Ranch."

Response: Bob Hazlett said that today we're just trying to float preliminary ideas and get everyone's reaction.

Bob Miller: Our map still shows local service TIs on I-10 adjacent to ADOT's planned system TI with CANAMEX. The new system TI at this location could drastically alter or even wipe out the existing local TIs. We must tell the development community soon (within 6-12 months) where they'll have access to I-10.

Response: Bob Hazlett agreed that we need to consider and bring out the access implications of any new freeways. Any system TI will have spacing implications, and we don't want to shoehorn in local TIs. There are too many examples of this already.

Randy Overmyer (Surprise): Desert Ridge is a thriving community, yet has direct service from only one TI, at SR-101/Tatum. Randy suggested using a different color for I-10 to clearly identify it as the only Interstate facility.

Dianne Kresich (ADOT) said that we must make the community understand that these lines on the map don't represent precise alignments.

ADOT comment: We don't like frontage roads along I-10. Don't mess with the planned CANAMEX/I-10 system TI.

Response: Bob Hazlett said that MAG understood that the CANAMEX corridor is still flexible and can be moved.

Response: ADOT reply was that no, the agency is now trying to fix the location once and for all.

Response: According to Bob Hazlett, MAG was not aware of this and the issue requires clarification at a higher level. MAG, ADOT and its CANAMEX consultant (Jacobs) need to sit down and determine whether the CANAMEX route can still be shifted.

ADOT: We must establish the CANAMEX/I-10 TI location (through the Jacobs study) before FHWA will approve any privately requested TI locations.

Response: John McNamara of DMJM Harris will coordinate with the CANAMEX project team in the next two weeks. Bob Hazlett agreed that more MAG-ADOT discussions on CANAMEX are needed soon.

Randy Overmyer suggested rethinking or repackaging CANAMEX as a multi-use corridor supporting economic development, rather than a NIMBY-provoking truck route.

Bob Hazlett mentioned that Belmont and Douglas Ranch want a 400-foot freeway corridor from I-10 through their communities. They see this as a potential CANAMEX route.

Renee Probst (MCDOT): Does Turner (Parkway) turn into Festival Parkway?

Response: John McNamara said yes.

Renee Probst: Is the northward extension of the Sun Valley Parkway on our map meant to show a specific alignment from among the alternatives?

Response: John McNamara said no.

Renee Probst: Is Wilson Road shown as an arterial corridor?

Response: John McNamara: Yes, on the arterial layer, but not on the parkway layer.

Bob Miller: At some point, will we have a map showing how our conceptual network fits into the larger regional roadway system?

Response: Bob Hazlett said yes, after Labor Day when we have the modeling results.

Bob Miller: How many lanes do we assume in our conceptual network?

Response: Bob Hazlett said 8 to 12 on freeways; 6 on arterials and parkways.

Dianne Kresich: How did we derive our 50% “capture” assumption for trips generated in the Hassayampa Valley? How does it compare with capture rates in the East Valley, peer cities, etc.?

Response: Dan Marum said that for now, it’s just an assumption, intended to ensure that we are not exaggerating the future need for transportation facilities. Modeling will tell us more.

Reactions from Regional Sponsors

Peggy Fiandaca facilitated a discussion that solicited reactions from the various study sponsors. Following is a summary of their comments.

ADOT

- Concerned about CANAMEX.
- CANAMEX interchange study coordination with Jacobs and also Outer Loop Study.
- CANAMEX Corridor detail and specificity.
- Don’t like frontage road concepts on I-10. They make ADOT nervous.
- Frontage road on the north side of I-10 would conflict with existing flood control structures.
- Need a strong arterial support system close to all freeways, especially I-10
- Breakdown relief capacity.
- Arterial system strength around White Tanks to relieve I-10.
- So far Bob Miller sees no strong continuity to keep shorter trips off I-10.
- Need to define right-of-way needs for corridor widths, TIs and grade separations as soon as possible.

MCDOT

- Shouldn’t we consider freeway frontage roads in the absence of a full arterial grid (Renee)?
- Meet with Sun City Festival and Festival Ranch on their interests and needs with respect to roadway locations.
- Upgrade McDowell Road to parkway.
- Jackrabbit Trail as parkway.

- Note the restrictions on access to and from the SR-303 freeway between Bell Road and Grand Avenue.

FCDMC

- FCDMC is doing several studies directly related to our project. Transportation professionals should attend the meetings and speak up to represent our interests as transportation agencies.
- Without strong input from its partners, FCDMC will always choose the cheapest flood control solution (e.g., dam rehab instead of channelization), which may serve the interests of this agency but not necessarily those of the public as a whole. Greg attends many transportation study meetings, but hardly ever sees transportation planners at FCDMC meetings.
- Dianne agreed that FCDMC projects will affect our actions, and Renee used the opportunities along Jackrabbit Trail (channelization, possible removal or reconstruction of McMicken Dam) as an example.
- Greg said that the Hassayampa study area is a clean slate for flood control, and we all need to work together on planning transportation and drainage infrastructure.
- The public at large will save more money if transportation and flood control are coordinated.

Town of Buckeye

- The Town needs CMP (community master plan) interconnections.
- They do not want to be a bedroom community.
- UPRR does not support commuter rail on the existing alignment. Buckeye is pleased that MAG is proceeding with the commuter rail study.
- Peer city and local comparisons are helpful; good sense of network service.
- 50% trip capture in Hassayampa Valley may be aggressive.
- Need good east-west arterial capacity, including across Hassayampa.
- Seeking to create significant employment and network connections between activity centers.

City of Surprise

- Randy brought a markup map with comments for the study team.
- Even if jobs come to the new communities (as hoped), low-paying retail and service jobs won't support the middle-class and high-end housing that developers want to build.
- An east-west freeway along the Deer Valley Road alignment will probably never happen. Several hundred homes in Sun City Grand would be lost. But Surprise does plan a parkway along Deer Valley Road, with a grade-separated crossing of US-60.
- Dove Valley Road is also envisioned as a parkway.

- Surprise envisions “airport compatible” (employment-oriented) land uses around Luke Auxiliary Field #1. Add this as a major economic activity center.
- What about the long-term development of Wickenburg? It could become a huge bedroom community (200,000 or more residents?) in need of connections to and through the Hassayampa Valley. Wickenburg’s planning area may expand, and there are ASLD holdings west of town.

City of Goodyear

- The conceptual transportation framework needs to be multimodal.
- Look at transit as well as the roadway network.

FHWA

- The operation and safety of the Interstate system remain their paramount concerns.
- Environmental clearance is needed for approval of anything.
- There needs to be an early screening of concepts for fatal flaws.
Response: Bob Hazlett replied that this study will include a fatal flaw analysis at a “50,000-foot level.”
- Decisions relating to TI spacing on I-10 need to be made ASAP.

Next Steps

Bob Hazlett explained that the next steps in the process include modeling and fine-tuning the alternatives. More meetings will be held in the fall.

MEETING SUMMARY NOTES

Meeting: MAG Interstate 10 – Hassayampa Valley Roadway
Framework Study
Development Forum #2
Date: July 26, 2006, 1:30 p.m.
Location: Estrella Community College

Attendance

See Attached

Bob Hazlett, MAG Hassayampa Study Project Manager

Consulting Team

John McNamara, DMJM Harris
Curtis Lueck, CLA
Jackie Pfeiffer, DMJM Harris

Peggy Fiandaca, PSA
Dan Marum, Wilson & Company
Ethan Rauch, DMJM Harris

Welcome and Introductions

Bob Hazlett, Maricopa Association of Governments (MAG) Project Manager, welcomed everyone and thanked them for participating in the I-10 – Hassayampa Valley Roadway Framework Study.

Everyone introduced themselves. Bob mentioned that the study was being sponsored and funded by the cities of Goodyear and Surprise, town of Buckeye, Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) and Maricopa County Department of Transportation (MCDOT). In addition, MAG is using funds from the Federal Highway Administration to help pay for the study.

Framework Study Overview

Bob Hazlett gave a broad overview of the 12-month study. The study area covers a large portion of western Maricopa County, most of which is currently undeveloped desert. The project limits are generally SR-74 (or a projection thereof) on the north, the Gila River on the south, SR-303L (Estrella Freeway alignment) on the east, and the 459th Avenue section line on the west. Most of the area is within Buckeye, Surprise and unincorporated Maricopa County.

The study's overall intent is to develop a planned roadway network, and to define and prioritize operational and safety improvements to I-10 while forming a framework for regional connections within the study area.

Key study elements include:

- Develop a network of north/south and east/west roadways, varying in functional classification, that will provide access throughout the study area and preserve I-10.
- Formulate a prioritization framework for constructing the roadway framework, regional connections and future I-10 interchanges.
- Study opportunities to incorporate alternative transportation modes into the roadway framework.
- Evaluate funding options and create a financing plan for the proposed roadway framework.
- Recommend an access management system and appropriate access management strategies for each functional classification of roadway.
- Identify and preserve right-of-way for future travel corridors.

John McNamara, DMJM Harris Project Manager gave a PowerPoint presentation providing an overview of the preliminary conceptual alternative scenarios for high capacity corridors. Following the presentation, the participants were divided into several small groups to discuss the preliminary alternatives and make recommendations.

Small Group Discussions

Participants were divided into four small groups and provided the following comments on the maps.

Issues:

- Verrado Way is designed to be only a minor arterial roadway.
- Look at Douglas Ranch Master Plan for Hassayampa river crossings.
- Keep in mind power line corridors.
- Multiple issues with CANAMEX system TI.
- TI spacing should be evaluated.
- Development Master Plans (DMPs) propose access at 403rd Avenue.
- DMPs propose a parkway at the Camelback Road alignment.
- Preserve the White Tanks; do not tunnel though, but be careful not to take too much land from Verrado. Maintain on Northern Avenue alignment.
- Check with Festival Ranch – platting in place, golf courses planned, may not want a parkway though the middle of their development.
- More arterials needed in the Tonopah area; maintain grid.
- Where does Tonopah-Salome Road fit into the network?
- Look into the idea of toll roads for high capacity corridors.
- North-South freeway (as shown on Preliminary Draft map of potential high-capacity corridors) impacts a lot of development.
- More intermodal illustrations.
- Where does Old US-80 fit into the network?
- Right-of-way preservation necessary through public-private partnerships and jurisdictional preservation
- Work with Flood Control, especially concerning McMicken Dam.

Planning suggestions:

- Could tie East-West freeway into US-60 rather than SR-303L.
- East-West freeway could use CAP Canal corridor.
- North-South freeway could extend even further west in the Harquahala Valley.
- Use Collector-Distributor roadways instead of frontage roads.
- Encourage some arterials not to connect with I-10 – extensive grid network to minimize TIs.

Network change suggestions:

- Major arterial north of and parallel to US-60.
- Parkway at Sarvival Avenue north of US-60.
- Change major arterial from Southern to Broadway.
- “Tee” SR-303L into the North-South freeway near the Sonoran Desert National Monument.
- Maintain parkway along Northern Avenue alignment.
- Dove Valley Road should be upgraded to a parkway.
- Change Jomax Road to freeway; get rid of Deer Valley-Tonopah freeway.

Map notes:

- Add CANAMEX Corridor to the map.
- Note location of an armory at Miller Road and I-10.
- Show mass transit nodes.
- Note airport locations.

Menu of Financing Options

Curtis Lueck with CLA gave a PowerPoint presentation regarding the various financing options and their implications. The presentation will be posted on the project web site.

Next Steps

Bob Hazlett explained that the next steps in the process include modeling and fine-tuning the alternatives. More meetings will be held in the fall.

**Interstate 10 – Hassayampa Valley Roadway Framework Study
Development Forum #2
July 26, 2006**

QUESTIONNAIRE SUMMARY

Do you feel the Conceptual Transportation Framework for the I-10/Hassayampa Valley Roadway Framework Study presented today responds to the study area's transportation issues and needs over the next 40 years?

YES – 5 of 8 questionnaires received

- It's a good start; eager to see modeling results.
- But we don't need to have every slide read to us!

NO – 3 of 8 questionnaires received

- We still need to discuss more, especially when impacting proposed developments.
- Need to focus on preservation/expansion of I-10 corridor and interchange spacing
- Need more work, but it is a great start!

What additional suggestions do you have to refine the Conceptual Transportation Framework presented today?

- Preserve the White Tank Mountains. Going through it is not cost effective and destroys the natural beauty of that landmark area.
- Tax on sale of used autos. Change state statutes to allow home valuation for property tax purposes until appraised to be the permit value.
- Railways? Commuter rails? More vision for workforce.
- Prioritize corridors. Parkways can be built first, then expanded to freeways – or use as freeways.
- Maintain the arterial grid network as traditionally seen in the rest of the Valley.
- After the meeting with ADOT and they are in agreement that we should go "at risk" with all studies, etc.

What role should or could the following entities play in the planning, design, and implementation of the I-10/Hassayampa Valley Roadway Framework Study similar to what you have seen today?

ADOT

- [Sharing responsibility with regional agencies], to put in place a plan of action for road development (prioritize most to least important) and to

oversee it come to fruition, making sure developments allow space for roadway improvements.

- [Sharing responsibility with regional agencies, cities & towns, and development community], keep communicating. Inform study team of ongoing and anticipated studies and other decisions made/expected. Keep study focused on conceptual planning. Build state facilities.
- Yuma district representative.
- Lead/support depending upon the type of facility.

Regional Agencies

- Plan regionally.
- All partners to be coordinated by MAG.
- Lead.

Cities or Towns

- Preserve right-of-way. Create arterial system and maintain.
- Lead/support, depending upon the type of facility.

Development Community

- Be willing to do their share in allocating for roads.
- Contribute financially.
- [Sharing responsibility with property owners], right-of-way identification and dedication at early point!
- Coordinate master plans for roadways with MAG, ADOT, and MCDOT.
- Support/partner with other agencies.
- To work hand in hand for regional compliance

Property Owners

- Be informed as to what is happening in their area, and work with the entities developing roads.
- Buyer beware!
- Excellent for connections.
- Support.

Public Land Management Agencies (BLM, ASLD, etc.)

- Work with all entities to come up with best solutions for implementing road development.
- Work with other governmental agencies on roadway planning, design, etc.
- Support.

From the Conceptual Transportation Framework you have seen today, what would be your three highest priorities for investment in each of the following timeframes?

Year 2010 – 2025 – Priority #1

- I-10
- I-10
- CANAMEX Route
- Toll road
- Seek right-of-way dedications
- Freeway and parkway rights-of-way determined and protected
- Arterial network – maintain grid where possible
- Expanding I-10

Year 2010 – 2025 – Priority #2

- North/south freeways
- SR-85 completion to I-8
- SR-85 improvements
- Widen I-10, 801 reliever
- All funding sources put in place
- Determine I-10 T1 situation → frontage collectors – spacing
- Increased number of parkways and arterial roads
- Sun Valley Parkway
- Johnson TI

Year 2010 – 2025 – Priority #3

- Right-of-way preservation
- CANAMEX north of I-10
- Widen Sun Valley Parkway
- Backbone transportation network in place
- Identify and put in place funding sources (#1?)
- West of Hassayampa

Year 2026 – 2040 – Priority #1

- North-south freeway south of I-10
- Route 93
- Build the plan

Year 2026 – 2040 – Priority #2

- 303 south of I-10
- SR-801
- Protect the rights-of-way

Year 2026 – 2040 – Priority #3

- 801

What financial tools do you feel will be most viable to implement the I-10/Hassayampa Valley Roadway Framework Study recommendations?

- Next generation of the ½ cent, impact fees, bonds, federal funds. Need to consider all sources.
- County impact fees.
- CFDs
- Transportation property tax
- Toll roads
- Change in statutes for authorization of uses and funding sources
- Broad vision necessary
- Toll roads!!
- User fees – tolls, HOT lanes, congestion pricing
- Developer contributions. At least we can try . . .
- Impact fees for local roads/parkways
- Construction sales tax dedicated to transportation
- Sales tax on gas sales; local/county gas taxes
- Toll roads
- CFDs – both county & city
- Private capital

Do you have any other thoughts, ideas, or recommendations?

- All “groups” important with input.
- Don’t forget landowners or residents.
- Speakers need to move more quickly – not read their slides.
- Make sure the air conditioning works next time.
- Forum was well-organized.
- Keep exploring frontage road concept.
- Will state verbally

**Interstate 10 – Hassayampa Valley Roadway Framework Study
Development Forum #2
July 26, 2006**

PARTICIPANTS

1. Carmelo Acevedo
2. Aaron Atkinson, United Civil Group
3. Monica Baiza, ADOT
4. Cyrus Behrana
5. Kim Bendon, City of Goodyear
6. Evan Bilton, MZ Group
7. Eric Bourassa
8. Bobby Bryant, Mayor - Town of Buckeye
9. Matt Burdick, ADOT-CCP
10. Bob Bushfield, Town of Buckeye Planning & Development
11. John Casey, Morrison Majerle
12. James M. Cavanaugh, Mayor - City of Goodyear
13. Jeff Chan, Millennium Development
14. Thomas Chlebanowski, Town of Buckeye - Public Works
15. Jim Creedon, Landry-Creedon
16. Jeff Dana, Anderson Land and Development
17. Suparna Dasgupta, Town of Buckeye Planning & Development
18. Mike Delmarter, Kimley-Horn
19. Kent Dibble, Dibble & Associates
20. Robert Dubsy, Luke AFB
21. Molly Edwards, The Lyle Anderson Company
22. Cliff Elkins, Surprise City Council
23. Jay Ellingson, SunCor Development
24. Peggy Fiandaca, Partners for Strategic Action, Inc.
25. David French, The Lyle Anderson Company
26. John Fuller
27. Brooks Griffith, Grubb & Ellis
28. Jeanine Guy, Buckeye Acting Town Manager
29. Eddie Gutzman, Millennium Development
30. Greg Haggerty, Dibble & Associates
31. Sharolyn Hahman
32. Bob Hansman, Dibble & Associates
33. Jim Harken, Buckeye Main Street Coalition
34. John Hathaway, FCDMC
35. Bob Hazlett, MAG
36. Tom Hennessy, El Dorado Holdings, Inc.
37. Tom Hill, CPH
38. Kyle Hindman

39. Richard Hock
40. Matt Holm, Maricopa County Planning & Development
41. Aaron Iverson, URS Corporation
42. Murray Johnson III, Johnson Valley
43. Michael Jones, ADOT
44. Michele Justice, CANDO Contract Compliance
45. Robert Kammerle, DMB Associates Inc./Verrado
46. Carol Kassick
47. Greg Keller, Arizona State Land Department
48. Heidi Kimball, Sunbelt Holdings
49. Aggie Kirschmann, Langley Properties
50. Dianne Kresich, ADOT-TPD
51. Craig Krumwiede, Harvard Investments, Inc.
52. Jill Kusy, DMB Associates, Inc.
53. John Lang, WLB Group
54. Eric Larson, A R Mays Construction
55. Terry Leija, Maricopa County
56. Curtis Lueck, CLA
57. Jack Lundsford, WESTMARC
58. Dan Marum, Wilson & Company
59. Michelle McGirty
60. Shannon McLaughlin, Nathan and Associates
61. John McNamara, DMJM Harris
62. Bill Meredith
63. Pam Miller
64. Rex Miller
65. Gonzalo Mosquera, Rose Properties Southwest, LLC
66. Tom Nagy, Millennium Properties and Development Inc.
67. James Neal, Diversified Partners
68. Alan Newberry, Rose Properties Southwest, LLC
69. Tim Nyberg, PacWest
70. Ron Ober, Policy Development Group
71. H. Pike Oliver, Vanderbilt Farms, LLC
72. Randy Overmyer, City of Surprise
73. Jackie Pfeiffer, DMJM Harris
74. Bob Pikora, CMX Inc.
75. Renee Probst, MCDOT
76. Ethan Rauch, DMJM Harris
77. Mark Reddie, LVA Urban Design Studio, LLC
78. Boyd Richardson, Buckeye Development Board
79. David Rogers, Voyager Properties
80. Brian Rose, Town of Buckeye
81. Brian Rosella, Grubb & Ellis
82. Ash Sabnekar, Sabnekar Consulting
83. Lindsay Campbell Schube, Beus Gilbert PLLC
84. Woody Scoutten, W.C. Scoutten, Inc.
85. Janice See, City of Surprise

86. Mike Smalley, Rose Law Group
87. Ed Stillings, FHWA
88. Farhad Tavassoli, City of Goodyear
89. Trent Thatcher, Stantec
90. Kelly Thatcher
91. John Thomas, Thomas Family Trust
92. Jerri Toci, REMAX
93. Scott Truitt, Don Bennett & Associates, Inc.
94. Pam Urwiller
95. Bill Vachon, FHWA
96. Lorenzo Valdez, Development Planning and Finance Group (DPFG)
97. John Verdugo, Maricopa County
98. Tim Wilson, ADOT
99. Tami Wollaston, ADOT Predesign
100. Bob Woodring, MCDOT
101. Chuck Wright

MEETING SUMMARY NOTES

Meeting: MAG Interstate 10 – Hassayampa Valley Roadway
Framework Study
Study Review Team #3

Date: October 6, 2006

Location: DMJM Harris

Attendance

Tom Chlebanowski, Town of Buckeye

Consulting Team

Bob Hazlett, MAG Project Manager
John McNamara, DMJM Harris
Ethan Rauch, DMJM Harris
Dan Marum, Wilson & Company

Bob called the meeting to order and updated everyone on the process.

Evolving Roadway Framework

The latest unofficial draft of the roadway framework was posted on the wall. The only major piece we're still nervous about is the "Deer Valley Freeway." This is the one major corridor with unresolved issues. We've met with all the major developers except one or two—including Belmont. Eric Anderson wants to talk with Terry Johnson and Dave Moody about making the Northern Ave. Parkway a freeway, since we're already in the freeway cost range of approximately \$50M per mile. Eric would move Northern Avenue from the Arterial to the Freeway Life Cycle Program. This is a major change to the RTP.

Peggy's e-mail says we need to meet with Greg Keller again about "tweaking" Turner Boulevard (don't call it a parkway) as well as Jackrabbit Trail. John offered to prepare a short paper defining typical facility types and intersection/TI types, with illustrations of typical cross-sections.

Dan said that we have issues with MCDOT on three corridors: Jackrabbit, Patton/Jomax and Jomax East. The last is a new corridor study that URS is just starting.

John said that we need to meet (separately) with Tim Oliver and Greg Keller ASAP to deal with the issues mentioned above. Other meetings should also be scheduled (see action items below).

Buckeye/SR 801 Coordination

This is an issue raised by Peggy and Suparna. HDR wants to talk about the SR 801 alignment again. Bob: Let's stay away from this and avoid getting involved in SR

801 east of SR 85. John: Let Peggy run interference through her work on the Buckeye General Plan. However, John and Rodney Bragg will do a quick drawing of the proposed SR 303/801 TI.

Belmont

Ethan summarized yesterday's Maricopa County Planning and Zoning Commission meeting, where the commissioners voted 4-2 to recommend approval of the developer's request for a major plan amendment. We need to meet with Paul Gilbert to see if we can get the Belmont TI moved over to match the latest MAG/ADOT/FHWA scheme. There's an existing TI at 339th Avenue and one already approved at 347th Avenue. We think the TI approval expires after eight years, but we need to check whether this time limit applies to 347th. In any event, FHWA can rescind an approval. The next TI to the west will be at 359th or 363rd Avenue.

Verrado

Peggy thinks we should follow up with them, but no one at this meeting was sure why. John described his meeting with Verrado, which Peggy didn't attend and it went very well. John will talk to her, but he doesn't think anything else needs to be done now.

FHWA/ADOT Meeting on I-10 TIs

John summarized the October 3 meeting with Bill Vachon and Ken Davis of FHWA. We need to talk to Belmont about a parallel C/D arterial on the north side of I-10, which ADOT prefers to frontage roads. Tom said we should examine the potential role of the Salome Highway (south of I-10) in our framework. The team felt this was an excellent idea. We will ask Jackie to add Salome Highway to our map, and figure out how this roadway fits into our network.

Socioeconomic Data Validation and Spot Checking

Wilson has questions about the data, but Anubhav has been too swamped to look into them. Dan handed out several tables comparing the Hassayampa study area with the East Valley. Dan needs to talk with John and Ethan about spot checking, a process that Jackie has begun. She has already found trouble spots in Douglas Ranch.

Action Items

- Population/employment spot checks (John, Jackie, Dan, Ethan)
- Meet with Tim Oliver on SR 804/805 with respect to the Jackrabbit, Patton/Jomax and Jomax East corridors. We'll invite Randy Overmyer and an appropriate person from Peoria. Bob will arrange this.
- John will set up a meeting with Greg Keller on the Turner and Jackrabbit corridors.

- After the Keller and Oliver meetings, we will schedule a larger SR 804/805 meeting involving MCDOT, FCDMC, Surprise and Buckeye.
- Check out Festival Ranch in relation to SR 804. Tom will do this.
- John will set up a Belmont meeting with Paul Gilbert.
- DMJM Harris will prepare a short paper on typical facility types (arterial, parkway/boulevard, and freeway) with intersections/TIs and illustrated cross-sections.
- John and Rodney will create a quick sketch of 303/801/MC-85 TI configuration.
- Integrate Salome Highway into roadway framework. (DMJM Harris)
- Clarify status of 347th Avenue TI approval.
- Bob and John will prepare a brief (15 minutes) presentation to the MAG TRC and TPC. The date is uncertain.
- Present to the city managers and intergovernmental coordinators of study area jurisdictions. This should be done before the TRC and TPC.
- Funding partners meeting October 20, 9:00 at MAG.
- SR 804 presentation to Peoria, Glendale and Surprise.
- Wilson will write up its socioeconomic conclusions for use in Working Paper 2. We need to get this document out ASAP, as it will serve as a model for others.
- Schedule a “pseudo” environmental overview meeting for early November. Include Arizona Game & Fish, U.S. Fish and Wildlife, ADEQ, BLM, ASLD, and U.S. Bureau of Reclamation.

MEETING SUMMARY NOTES

Meeting: MAG Interstate 10 – Hassayampa Valley Roadway
Framework Study
Funding Partners Meeting #3

Date: October 20, 2006

Location: MAG

Attendance

Thomas Chlebanowski, Town of Buckeye
Randy Overmyer, Surprise
Tim Oliver, MCDOT

Bob Hazlett, MAG Project Manager

Consulting Team

John McNamara, DMJM Harris
Ethan Rauch, DMJM Harris
Jackie Pfeiffer, DMJM Harris
Dan Marum, Wilson & Company

PROCESS UPDATE

Bob Hazlett reviewed the progress on each element of the scope of work. To complete the second working paper, we still need the information on major developments from Surprise. Randy has talked to John about this and will give us something to fill the gap, although it may involve some assumptions.

Jackie has created an environmental atlas of around two dozen maps that is unique to this project. We will run the atlas by the various environmental resource agencies responsible for this area. We will thereby get a head start on the SAFETEA-LU requirements for environmental coordination.

Bob is reviewing the draft memo on the evaluation framework, which will then go the Funding Partners.

The following stakeholders meetings will be scheduled –

Meeting with Belmont (Paul Gilbert)

Meeting with Stardust Development (developer for Tartesso – Bob Speirs)

MODELING UPDATE

Tim expressed his strong concern that the Funding Partners are not being given enough input into decision-making. This group needs to meet much more often than every two or three months. All of the funding agencies must work together to identify fatal flaws. For example, none of the maps should show Sun Valley Parkway as a potential freeway – this is simply not realistic given the available right-of-way and the results of MCDOT's planning process with the local

community. Tim has been blindsided because others have seen lines on a map that MCDOT has not reviewed or agreed to. The Funding Partners must approve all network and alignment concepts before we bring them to other stakeholders, and MCDOT must participate in all decisions.

Bob will make sure that Tim's concerns are addressed and that MCDOT is included in all future discussions. Tim added that the county currently (and for the foreseeable future) is responsible for roads in unincorporated territory, including those that lie within MPAs. Therefore, MCDOT must be given a voice in all long-term planning for these facilities, even if they may someday be annexed. The usual practice is for the county to improve a road before it is annexed into a city or town.

Dan distributed a map showing proposed screenlines at which to measure future travel demand versus capacity. Tim suggested extending the east-west screenlines to SR-101L. We will also add a north-south screenline along this freeway.

Additional comments on the conceptual roadway network map include:

- Do we need multiple north-south parkways north of Sun Valley Parkway? If not, keep Turner, but possibly move it to support Surprise.
- Is it possible to turn Turner Parkway into SR-85 through Tartesso? Yes, the developer is okay with this and so is ADOT, but we need to check the Turner location through Tartesso with Bob Speirs of Stardust Development.
- The county planning and zoning commission forwarded Belmont's major plan amendment to the Board of Supervisors. However, the developer's proposed TI spacing is not acceptable to the county or ADOT. John must contact Belmont right away. We need to know the kind of road the developer is proposing along the 347th Avenue alignment. The Hassayampa Freeway/I-10 system interchange at 363rd Avenue is okay.
- We won't be able to do anything in Whispering Springs Ranch. Move the Hassayampa Freeway west (out of Whispering Ranch) and reroute it through Douglas Ranch along the gold arterial to connect to connect with the western Wickenburg bypass. Talk with Douglas Ranch about this.
- Reroute SR-74 along the south Wickenburg bypass.
- Divert Hassayampa River Parkway along east Hassayampa Freeway alternative.
- The White Tanks Freeway won't go on the Sun Valley Parkway alignment.
- Move the White Tanks Freeway onto Jomax. Pass through the Festival Ranch at "narrow throat." Split off from Hassayampa Freeway near Douglas Ranch Town Center. Take it east through Peoria, where it should connect with SR-101L.
- Connect Jackrabbit to Deer Valley Freeway. Connect with Surprise Parkway to SR-74. Or Northern where it curves and turns into Jackrabbit. "Tees into Northern curve?"
- Get Surprise alignments from Randy (211th Avenue).

We need to start talking about funding options. The transportation improvement district has just been applied in Pima County. We should explore the institutional framework for a special transportation district and the use of impact fees. The county can't consider a community facilities district because of liability issues.

Bob concluded by asking DMJM Harris to draw up the revised roadway network that was presented at the meeting. An all-or-nothing traffic assignment will also be done.

MEETING SUMMARY NOTES

Meeting: MAG Interstate 10 – Hassayampa Valley Roadway
Framework Study
Funding Partners Meeting #4
Date: November 9, 2006
Location: MAG

Attendance

Randy Overmyer, Surprise
Mario Saldamando, Goodyear
Raul Varela, Goodyear
Bob Woodring, MCDOT

Bob Hazlett, MAG Hassayampa Study Project Manager

Consulting Team

John McNamara, DMJM Harris
Ethan Rauch, DMJM Harris
Peggy Fiandaca, PSA
Dan Marum, Wilson & Associates

PROCESS OVERVIEW

Bob Hazlett gave an overview of the process to date. He mentioned that the Team has met with Greg Keller, ASLD and Hadley/Belmont since the October 20th meeting. Upcoming meetings include: Pulte Homes, Belmont, Greg Vogel with AZ Land Advisors, Stardust/Tartesso.

ROADWAY FRAMEWORK UPDATE

The project has worked out with ADOT and FHWA the TI locations from the 303 to 459th Avenue. The two-mile TI spacing will be maintained. Bob distributed the list of TI locations.

Will the Hassayampa go through Toyoto Proving Grounds? It will be west of the Toyoto Proving Grounds which is better than the east side because it minimizes the impact on Whispering Spring Ranch.

ADOT would be okay with the route designation SR 85 for the Turner Road extension.

The participants discussed issues east of the White Tank Mountains (e.g., Hassayampa and Turner Parkway). Four freeways go around the White Tanks to handle the million trips per day.

Maricopa County mentioned a project called Sun Valley Villages that is being proposed on the Arizona State lands around the White Tanks. Participants also discussed the Broadstone development.

Bob mentioned that the study needs to show TI spacing on US-60/Grand Avenue due to the development activity occurring in the City of Surprise. There is a Design Concept Report being developed on 163rd Avenue. The TIs being identified through this study should be included in the framework. It is important to distinguish between the approved and proposed TIs on the 303 and 85. Need to add these to the map.

MODELING UPDATE

Dan Marum gave an overview of the effort. The Team is updating the TAZs. Once the model is done, Surprise, Buckeye and Goodyear will have a “build-out” tool that can be used to test the validity of the general plan transportation elements.

Bob mentioned that this is the first type of study that is looking at “build out” scenarios.

WORKING PAPERS

Ethan gave an overview of the working papers that will be distributed by November 30th. He stressed to pay particular attention to the evaluation criteria.

- Working Paper #1 – Work Plan, Management Plan, and Stakeholder/Outreach/Consent Plan
- Working Paper #2 – Existing Conditions and Future Land Use; Existing Environmental and Socioeconomic Data
- Working Paper #3 – Draft Criteria for Evaluating Alternatives which is partially completed
- Working Paper #4 – Existing and Planned/Committed Transportation System

Ethan also mentioned the Environmental Atlas that was being completed.

Funding Partners would like to receive a copy of the Environmental Atlas.

PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT ACTIVITIES

Peggy Fiandaca gave an overview of public involvement activities. The Team is continuing to conduct stakeholder meetings.

The next Forum is as follows:

Third Development Forum/Public Event

Thursday December 14, 2006
Estrella Vista Reception Center
1471 N. Eliseo Felix Jr. Way
Avondale, AZ 85323

Purpose: To discuss the Draft Roadway Framework and receive input from agencies, developers, landowners, and the general public.

Environmental Resource Agencies

Peggy is also working on organizing an environmental resource agencies workshop.

Purpose: To discuss the Draft Environment Analysis Atlas and receive input.

Potential Invitees:

Bureau of Land Management	Clay Templin; Jim Andersen
Arizona State Land Department	Greg Keller
Arizona Game & Fish	Alicia Sweezer
Flood Control	Greg Jones
Maricopa County Parks	Bill Scalzo
MCDOT Environmental	Joe Pinto
ADOT Environmental	
AZ Dept. of Environmental Quality	
AZ Dept. of Water Resources	
US Fish & Wildlife	
SHPO	

Next Steps

- All slides/materials for both presentations must be ready for review at the SRT meeting on Thursday December 7th.
- We need to start briefing officials in January. As a first step, Peggy will talk to Matt Clark at MAG about briefing the various intergovernmental coordinators. Bob wants to do this in December, before the development forum. Peggy said we should brief the department heads and elected officials separately. Peggy will get the Hassayampa project on the MAG committees' review cycle for March 2007.
- Jackie will add the Hummingbird Springs crossing of the Hassayampa River to our network map.
- Ethan will send a copy of the environmental atlas to each of the five funding partners. Ethan will check with Jackie to make sure that all the TIs from the SR 74 Access Management Study appear on our map. (They do.)
- Provide comments on the four draft working papers to Ethan as soon as possible.

Bob Hazlett explained that the next steps will begin to understand revenue and funding analysis.

- Meeting with environmental resource agencies
- Funding Partners meeting – November 30, 2006; 9:00 at MAG with Curt Lueck
- Study Review Team meeting – December 7, 2006; 9:00 at MAG with Curt Lueck

MEETING SUMMARY NOTES

Meeting: MAG Interstate 10 – Hassayampa Valley Roadway
Framework Study
Funding Partners Meeting #5
Date: November 30, 2006
Location: MAG

Attendance

Ruth Garcia, Buckeye
Bob Woodring, MCDOT
Randy Overmyer, Surprise

Tim Oliver, MCDOT
Mario Saldamando, Goodyear

Bob Hazlett, MAG Project Manager

Consulting Team

John McNamara, DMJM Harris
Curtis Lueck, CLA
Peggy Fiandaca, PSA

Ethan Rauch, DMJM Harris
Jackie Pfeiffer, DMJM Harris
Dan Marum, Wilson & Company

Bob Hazlett gave an overview of the process to date. He discussed the stakeholder meetings that have been held. A meeting with Lyle Anderson and Tom Hennessey is being rescheduled and a meeting with Greg Vogel with Arizona Land Advisors is scheduled for December 4, 2006.

Revenue and Funding Analysis

Curtis gave an overview of the revenue and funding analysis.

Tim – Need to be a series of funding options for elected officials to consider. There needs to be some ability to do the “super transportation district;” we will have multiple regions. They need to hear the public/private options.

Bob – Explained the Oregon public/private initiative – a corridor was opened up by a private entity; they take on the risk and then there is an agreement to transfer it back to the public.

Tim – We need to show the elected officials creative options; need to show details so they understand them. There needs a new “bowl” of funding.

Bob – RTP is tied up for the next 20 years. The costs keep going up. The fact that South Mountain and I-10 collector-distributor roads is not going forward quickly is our saving grace. There needs to be a funding strategy with a built-in contingency.

Tim – A series of funding alternatives should be presented to the elected officials. We cannot make the financing recommendation it has to go through them. It is important to do a risk analysis for each alternative.

Ruth – Right-of-way advance may be able to be sold to the Legislature. We need to continue to push the Legislature to keep the funding the STAN (instead of tax cuts). The Legislature is all about the public/private partnerships. When cities increase funding through impact fees, need to ensure that the Legislature does not counteract by limiting community ability.

Mario – Maybe consider having a representative from each of the communities to serve on a subcommittee to discuss funding options. I like the idea showing “peer city/state” success stories and how they could be applied here. Can the plan be submitted in phases? Nothing in the plan is funded; let’s not be fooled.

Ruth – It will be important for the Mayor and Council to be briefed prior to the plan being finalized.

Bob – It will probably be next summer before MAG will act on the framework plan. Bob asked everyone to send him Council regular and study session meeting dates for 2007 as well as the contact person so briefings can be set up.

Roadway Network

Bob and John gave an overview of the latest roadway network.

Ruth – Did you build in freight traffic into the model? The model accounts for freight traffic. We did not do a special study. The concern is that the model may be under in terms of freight traffic.

Randy – Where the model might not have sophistication is related to new inter-modal transportation facility in Surprise.

Bob – The framework timeframe is build out. It is not associated with any particular year. The “no build” option includes all of the city general plans but not any new recommended roadways. It uses 2030 for the rest of the region including the roadways planned.

Bob – The demand shows the need for 12 new freeways across the White Tank Mountains. The framework is only showing 4. How do we address the need for an additional 8 roadways? It is a real dilemma.

John – These numbers represent approximately three million people in the study area. However, this is the worse case scenario. Maybe we need to be a more targeted 20 year scenario with a longer term strategy. If there is ever a need to discuss multimodal transportation options, this study shows the need. The study needs to clearly examine economic development options because the lack of employment is driving the travel demand numbers up.

Ruth – In California, rail would be a special generator in the model. What I want to be able to explain to the feds. Is that freight is impacting us dramatically.

Randy – UP and BNSF Corridors – potential freight connections between the two through Douglas Ranch; must be doubled tracked for commuter and freight.

Randy – Our general plan shows so much employment around Auxiliary Field. I do not think it is realistic. I am concerned that the residential and commercial will be built out and the impact would be great.

Bob – The model is based on current trip mode and lengths of trip, not future trips. Parkways would be six lanes.

John – North/south movements are manageable. This includes the 303. We may need to examine another high capacity north/south corridor.

Ruth – We need to look at a transportation plan at build out and develop financing tools for a build out transportation plan.

Development Forum

Peggy discussed the Development Forum arrangements.

MEETING SUMMARY NOTES

Notes Produced: December 18, 2006
Meeting: MAG Interstate 10 – Hassayampa Valley Roadway
Framework Study
Funding Partners Meeting #6
Date: December 14, 2006
Location: MAG

Attendance

Tim Oliver, MCDOT

Randy Overmyer, Surprise

Bob Hazlett, MAG Hassayampa Study Project Manager

Consulting Team

John McNamara, DMJM Harris

Peggy Fiandaca, PSA

Ethan Rauch, DMJM Harris

Jackie Pfeiffer, DMJM Harris

Curt Lueck, CLA

Funding partners reviewed the revised framework map.

Changes

Following are changes to the map.

- Dove Valley Parkway – ends at Hidden Water Parkway; the road will continue
- Southern or Broadway Parkway (Buckeye may want to reconfigure it a bit)
Southern on the west to MC 85 then move it to the north
- Wintersburg Parkway/Salome Highway connection
- Hidden Waters Parkway down to 801 at about 339th/331 Avenue
- Cactus Road; however, need to look at the river crossings
- Need to check all the Hassayampa River crossings
- Northern Parkway
- Riggs Road will not tie into MC-85; the interchange is north of the landfill;
Riggs Road will have to do an S curve to get up to the interchange; check
the access control plan
- Dick Rublick is in Rainbow Valley – Need to talk to them; they are south of
Goodyear annexation

To Do List

Following is the activities to follow-up on:

- Ask to have Perryville Road included in the Jackrabbit Trail Study as an
alternative
- Incorporate Goodyear Sonoran Valley GPA
- Riggs Road will not have a TI with SR-85

- Ladera Interchange - Finetune the Hassayampa/SR-85 interchange in the area of Ladera Service T-I; Add Ladera DMP to mapping (call Bob Woodring for a copy)
- Add Sonoran Valley designation to mapping
- Broadway/Southern Parkway – alignment within Buckeye to MC-85
- Work with planning department knowledge regarding the Hassayampa River crossings

Meetings

Following are the meetings that have occurred recently and are planned.

1. Greg Vogel meeting results to consider
2. Anderson/Pulte/Douglas Ranch meeting tomorrow at MAG
3. Sun Valley projects meeting yet to schedule
4. Jackie to meet with Bob Woodring on prison/SR-85 area projects
5. Environmental meeting in January

60-Day Schedule

- Continue/complete stakeholder meetings
- Round #3: Public Outreach – Funding Partners Meeting, SRT, Rescheduled Development Forum #3, and first public open house
- MAG Intergovernmental Relations Folks, City Council Briefings, and Maricopa County Board of Supervisors
 - Goodyear City Council Work Session – January 29
 - Buckeye Town Council Work Session – January 16; 6:00 p.m.
 - Surprise City Council Work Session
 - Maricopa County Mary Rose Wilcox and Max Wilson
- MAG Committee structure briefings

Funding and Implementation Discussion

Curtis distributed an outline and the participants discussed.

- Include a graphic that shows the amount of funding for the planning that will be needed (Tim Oliver suggested)
- Need to ensure that the report recognizes that ADOT does a good job for the resources they have
- Include some discussion about the Federal Highway Trust Fund – that there will be no more funding in the future
- We shouldn't underestimate the private sector involvement
- Add – for funds restricted to specific uses

Modeling Progress

This only analyzes the first cut at the high capacity; as we move forward we will introduce the capacity that will be provided parkways and arterials though that will further meet the deficit by the freeways

MEETING SUMMARY NOTES

Meeting: MAG Interstate 10 – Hassayampa Valley Roadway
Framework Study
Study Review Team Meeting #4
Date: December 14, 2006
Location: MAG

Attendance

Tim Oliver, MCDOT	Randy Overmyer, Surprise
Dianne Kresich, ADOT	Dan Lance, ADOT
Bob Miller, ADOT	Suparna Dasgupta, Buckeye

Bob Hazlett, MAG Hassayampa Study Project Manager
Dennis Smith, MAG

Consulting Team

John McNamara, DMJM Harris	Peggy Fiandaca, PSA
Ethan Rauch, DMJM Harris	Jackie Pfeiffer, DMJM Harris
Curt Lueck, CLA	Dan Marum, Wilson

Updates since November 30 Meeting

Bob Hazlett welcomed everyone and each introduced themselves. Bob gave an overview of the project to date.

Refinement of Conceptual Roadway Framework

John McNamara gave an overview of the refinement of the Conceptual Roadway Framework. The Roadway Network is dated December 7, 2006. He mentioned that we have had over 70 meetings with stakeholders. We are still trying to set up meetings with environmental interest

We are trying to shoot to wrap up these meetings with stakeholder so we can make our final set of revisions to the framework. By early January 2007 these meetings will be finalized.

Map Overview – It represents a three-tiered system – parkway, arterials, and freeway/high capacity corridors

Freeways -

- I-10 (worked with preferred interchange spacings)
- 801 extended through study area beyond MC-85
- Hassayampa North/South Freeway connecting up to 60/93 on north and connecting up with the 303 and then to I-10 or I-8; a major spine
- 303
- 74 extended to connect to White Tanks Freeway

- White Tanks Freeway and eventually to connect to the 303 (this may be very difficult; the need is there but a lot of interests really don't want it; there is a lot of on-going discussions about this)

Parkways –

3-5 miles rational spacings for north/south and east/west
200 – 200 plus ROW

Arterial Network –

Started what the development plans had and trying to stitch them together;
good response from developers and landowners

Other Refinements -

Identified interchange spacing on the other freeways using the ADOT spacing requirements

Next Refinements -

Once we get everyone comments and put them together and rationalize them – we will dissect it a bit and determine which elements will be come part of the model. We will examine system performance. Ex: Jackrabbit Parkway may be analyzed as a freeway and a parkway or a combination depending on the performance in the model

Bob Hazlett - The concept of parkway; evolved out of Surprise Transportation Plan; more of a boulevard that would not allow left turns; it would allow u-turns; at signals now we have to allow for left turn movements; this takes a way that capacity; In Michigan, they have 2-phased signals that allow you to go through the intersection and the make the u-turns; it allows us to carry more capacity at a third of the cost of a freeway.

Transit issues – MAG is about to unleash the consultants on the commuter rail study; we will work with them on high capacity transit corridor in this area

Freight Movement – another important issues that we are talking to stakeholders about; if we need to make movements between lines it has to go downtown and come back out; we have been talking with stakeholders allowing a line to go between the two rail lines; put in a freight line to eliminate the freight switching in downtown Phoenix; stakeholders have been interested in this to improve the jobs/housing goal; though it is a roadway framework study we are looking at all modes of travel

Dianne Kresich – You are talking about corridors and not alignments, right? Yes; How wide are these lines going to be in the study? How refined are they?

John McNamara responded -

Gold lines – principal arterials – they are exactly where the roads will be because they are in plats

Green lines parkways – a little less defined but many have their routes in development proposals

Freeways – ½ mile preferred location; the master plans are getting their approvals right now and we are trying to work them; we are explaining ADOT's process; we are trying to do a "fine dance" in this area because we want to get the

Dan (ADOT) - Is there any type of environmental overview process now? Yes there is but not as detailed as a preliminary design study; we are working with all the environmental resource agencies; we are asking them to take a close look at the information so we are not just using secondary data

Bob Hazlett – The team has prepared an environmental atlas that we will be running by all the environmental agencies to ensure early coordination and a first review; this is something can ADOT can use; this will compliment the study

Dianne Kresich – Developers might not understand how long the environmental process takes

Dianne Kresich - Is the concept being used throughout the area? Ye Buckeye is examining them and incorporating them; MCDOT is reviewing them; It is a different type of facility but the goal is to introduce a high capacity facility to get increased volumes

Tim Oliver – We are going to try to do a study about this concept in a DCR on a piece of Sun Valley Parkway to look at the operational analysis; a parkway with access control you can provide additional capacity; some type of parkway will be out there and if done properly it will be able to provide additional capacity; we want to understand what it will do to the rest of the network

Randy Overmyer – the only parkway level DCR is Glendale on Northern; it had a number of grade separations that caused the roadway to reach freeway costs and not freeway capacity; we believe

What have we assumed for Grand Avenue? Green is marked; we have not looked at it being a freeway due to constraints

East West Freeway doesn't show how it goes into 303? T into the 303 is a recommendation; funding partners are saying we still need to show a freeway between 101 and 303; that is going to be difficult; ADOT is moving into final design and we are not looking freeway capacity; we would be interest in some traffic volumes as soon as possible; we are not anticipating big volumes at Grand Avenue

Randy – US-60 is designated as an expressway in Surprise – we need a number of crossings between 303 and 74 on Grand Avenue

Randy Overmyer – Interchanges on the 303 – due to lack of funding; those interchanges if built with local and developer funds will be difficult; the White Tank Freeway allows us to deal with freeway interchanges; we get a lot more efficiency for the cost

Bob Miller – Concerned about the frontage road along I-10. This is still being carried through at ADOT has a problem with these. Bob Hazlett said that we are still carrying this concept forward until the modeling is complete

Bob Miller - We have issues with a frontage road; there is a need for parallel roadways but not frontage roadways; operational concerns

Bob Miller - 95,000 ADT at some of the interchanges on I-10; I am having some difficulty understanding what the TIs might be;

Bob Miller - What will the parkway to parkway interchange look like? Bob – the team is looking at a parkway to interstate interchange; DMJM will be looking at this; Parkway to parkway interchange – the model will help us determine what will be needed

Randy Overmyer – You might want to go back to look at the original 303 DCR and look at designs

Suparna Dasgupta– we have heard some concerns about the Turner Parkway (extension of SR -85); some of the developments are currently coming on-line; this will carry more traffic than Sun Valley Parkway according the modeling; there are some entitlements

Dan Marum – We need to define the next steps. The parkway designation is not too different than freeway spacing; we are trying to look at appropriate spacings for parkway facilities; we think the 200 foot is a flexible ROW spacing to allow for future transportation planning

John McNamara – Some of the alternatives will include down grading some of the roadways and seeing what happens

Modeling Progress

Bob Hazlett gave an introduction – He explained that we built out the Hassayampa Valley to proposed entitlements and kept the rest of the Valley at 2030 projected. This is not intended to strike fear in people but it is to show the need to have some high capacity corridors developed in the Hassayampa Valley.

Dan Marum distributed and reviewed a Model Development Process/Initial Analysis Results Presentation handout. His presentation ended with Key Observations and Next Steps.

Funding Source Analysis and Conclusions to Date

Bob Hazlett said that one thing that is important to take away from the modeling and study progress to date is that it shows that we are working in the right way with a framework study in this area. We can't build the framework without being able to fund it. So Curt Lueck is on our team to discuss some potential funding sources.

Curt Lueck gave an overview of the work being done on two reports - Existing Revenues (done Mid-January) and Alternative Revenues and Implementation (just Underway) Reports.

Dianne Kresich – Please note that the truck bypass study is really occurring outside the planning process. The two corridor studies will be looking at the need for a bypass as well as the new Freight Study.

Dennis Smith – Eliminate reference to the new entity and a super MPO as this information moves forward.

Dennis Smith – Don't rule out the state raising taxes for transportation as a possible funding source.

Dennis Smith – Is the smart card idea the Seattle experiment? Yes

Dennis Smith - What is the local option vehicle registration fee?

Where would you include extending the length of the sales tax?
Sub heading 3 – it would require action by the Legislature

MEETING SUMMARY NOTES – Are not Available

Meeting: **MAG Interstate 10 – Hassayampa Valley Roadway
Framework Study
Funding Partners Meeting #7**

Date: **January 25, 2007**

Location: **MAG**

MEETING AGENDA

1. Stakeholder activities since December 14 meeting
 - Lyle Anderson et al, 12/15/06 at MAG
 - Town of Buckeye staff and Woody Scoutten, 1/8/07 at Woody's office
 - Hassayampa/Buckeye General Plan coordination, 1/9/07 at MAG
 - Presentation to MCDOT TAB, 1/16/07 (John McNamara)
 - David Wilcox, new Buckeye Town Manager, 1/16/07
 - Presentation to Buckeye Town Council, 1/16/07
 - I-10 TI concepts—discussion with ADOT and FHWA, 1/19/07 at MAG
 - Agency and public scoping for SR-801, 1/23-1/24/07 (Bob)
2. Status of working papers (DMJM Harris, Wilson and Lueck)
 - Working paper #2—Future Land Use & Socioeconomic Conditions
 - Working paper #3—Evaluation Criteria & Performance Measures
 - Working paper #4—Existing & Expected Future Transportation Conditions
 - Working paper #5—Traffic Modeling & Demand Forecasts (Wilson)
 - CLA “white paper” on Existing Transportation Revenue Sources
3. Discuss draft evaluation criteria and performance measures
4. Initial Buildout analysis for conceptual transportation framework
 - Screen line analysis—how alternatives will be analyzed from a modeling perspective
5. Discuss draft network alternatives, plus transit map
6. Upcoming meetings, events and activities
 - Stakeholder meeting with Brian Rosella et al (following this meeting)
 - Goodyear City Council study session (1/29/07, 5:00)
 - Environmental resource agency briefing (1/30/07, 2:00)
 - Potential “e-briefing” of Study Review Team (2/1/07)
 - Surprise City Council study session (2/8/07, 5:00)
 - Buckeye C of C lunch meeting (2/21/07, 11:30, Bob and Ethan to attend)
 - Funding Partners: 2/22/07, 9:00 at MAG

Study Review Team: 2/26/07, 10:30 or 11:00 (preceding development forum)

Development Forum #3: 2/26/07, 1:30, Estrella Community College

Public open house: 2/26/07, 4:30-6:30, Estrella Community College

Brief Supervisors Wilcox and Wilson (not yet scheduled)

7. Other business

MEETING SUMMARY NOTES

Meeting: MAG Interstate 10 – Hassayampa Valley Roadway
Framework Study
Funding Partners Meeting #8
Date: February 26, 2007, 9:00 a.m.
Location: Estrella Community College

Attendance

Cheryl Toy, MCDOT
Bob Woodring, MCDOT
Mario Saldamando, City of Goodyear

Bob Hazlett, MAG Hassayampa Study Project Manager

Consulting Team

John McNamara, DMJM Harris	Peggy Fiandaca, PSA
Curtis Lueck, CLA	Dan Marum, Wilson & Company
Jackie Pfeiffer, DMJM Harris	Ethan Rauch, DMJM Harris

Welcome and Introductions

Bob Hazlett, Maricopa Association of Governments (MAG) Project Manager, welcomed everyone and thanked them for participating in the I-10 – Hassayampa Valley Roadway Framework Study. The study is sponsored and funded by the cities of Goodyear and Surprise, town of Buckeye, Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) and Maricopa County Department of Transportation (MCDOT). In addition, MAG is using funds from the Federal Highway Administration to help pay for the study.

Framework Study Overview

Bob Hazlett gave a broad overview of the 12-month study. The study area covers a large portion of western Maricopa County, most of which is currently undeveloped desert. The project limits are generally SR-74 (or a projection thereof) on the north, the Gila River on the south, SR-303L (Estrella Freeway alignment) on the east, and the 459th Avenue section line on the west. Most of the area is within Buckeye, Surprise and unincorporated Maricopa County.

The study's overall intent is to develop a planned roadway network, and to define and prioritize operational and safety improvements to I-10, while forming a framework for regional connections within the study area.

Key study elements include:

- Develop a network of north/south and east/west roadways, varying in functional classification, that will provide access throughout the study area and preserve I-10.
- Formulate a prioritization framework for constructing the roadway framework, regional connections and future I-10 interchanges.
- Study opportunities to incorporate alternative transportation modes into the roadway framework.
- Evaluate funding options and create a financing plan for the proposed roadway framework.
- Recommend an access management system and appropriate access management strategies for each functional classification of roadway.
- Identify and preserve right-of-way for future travel corridors.

John McNamara, DMJM Harris Project Manager, gave a PowerPoint presentation providing an overview of the preliminary conceptual alternative scenarios for high capacity corridors.

Next Steps

Bob Hazlett explained that the next steps in the process include finalizing the modeling and fine-tuning the alternatives. He discussed the Development Forum #3 and public meeting scheduled for today.

MEETING SUMMARY NOTES

Meeting: MAG Interstate 10 – Hassayampa Valley Roadway
Framework Study
Study Review Team Meeting #5
Date: February 26, 2007, 10:30 a.m.
Location: Estrella Community College

Attendance

Thomas Chlebanowski, Town of Buckeye - Public Works
Dianne Kresich, ADOT-TPD
Randy Overmyer, City of Surprise
Ed Stillings, FHWA
Paul Patane, ADOT

Bob Hazlett, MAG Hassayampa Study Project Manager

Consulting Team

John McNamara, DMJM Harris	Peggy Fiandaca, PSA
Curtis Lueck, CLA	Dan Marum, Wilson & Company
Jackie Pfeiffer, DMJM Harris	Ethan Rauch, DMJM Harris

Welcome and Introductions

Bob Hazlett, Maricopa Association of Governments (MAG) Project Manager, welcomed everyone and thanked them for participating in the I-10 – Hassayampa Valley Roadway Framework Study. The study is sponsored and funded by the cities of Goodyear and Surprise, town of Buckeye, Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) and Maricopa County Department of Transportation (MCDOT). In addition, MAG is using funds from the Federal Highway Administration to help pay for the study.

Framework Study Overview

Bob Hazlett gave a broad overview of the 12-month study. The study area covers a large portion of western Maricopa County, most of which is currently undeveloped desert. The project limits are generally SR-74 (or a projection thereof) on the north, the Gila River on the south, SR-303L (Estrella Freeway alignment) on the east, and the 459th Avenue section line on the west. Most of the area is within Buckeye, Surprise and unincorporated Maricopa County.

The study's overall intent is to develop a planned roadway network, and to define and prioritize operational and safety improvements to I-10, while forming a framework for regional connections within the study area.

Key study elements include:

- Develop a network of north/south and east/west roadways, varying in functional classification, that will provide access throughout the study area and preserve I-10.
- Formulate a prioritization framework for constructing the roadway framework, regional connections and future I-10 interchanges.
- Study opportunities to incorporate alternative transportation modes into the roadway framework.
- Evaluate funding options and create a financing plan for the proposed roadway framework.
- Recommend an access management system and appropriate access management strategies for each functional classification of roadway.
- Identify and preserve right-of-way for future travel corridors.

John McNamara, DMJM Harris Project Manager, gave a PowerPoint presentation providing an overview of the preliminary conceptual alternative scenarios for high capacity corridors.

Comments

Do we want to continue to use the word freeway with all the discussion of tolls and financing options? Maybe use expressway? Or totally controlled access corridors?

Bob responded that “expressway” has a different connotation that might not mean fully controlled access.

How do we handle the question about development not building out at the planned rate?

Bob responded by saying that we are using Buildout capacity based on the entitled land today. There are large state land parcels that currently do not have land uses identified, but will at some point. We have made our best estimate according to what we know now.

Comment Cards Submitted

One comment card was received.

- Please add some sort of disclaimer language to the draft maps – residents and their representatives have been calling in alarm when they see the Jackrabbit Trail alignment. Printing the word “DRAFT” on a map is not enough to prevent some of the map recipients from panicking.

Next Steps

Bob Hazlett explained that the next steps in the process include finalizing the modeling and fine-tuning the alternatives. He discussed the Development Forum #3 and public meeting scheduled for today.

MEETING SUMMARY NOTES

Meeting: MAG Interstate 10 – Hassayampa Valley Roadway
Framework Study
Development Forum #3
Date: February 26, 2007, 1:30 p.m.
Location: Estrella Community College

Attendance

See Attached

Bob Hazlett, MAG Hassayampa Study Project Manager

Consulting Team

John McNamara, DMJM Harris
Curtis Lueck, CLA
Jackie Pfeiffer, DMJM Harris

Peggy Fiandaca, PSA
Dan Marum, Wilson & Company
Ethan Rauch, DMJM Harris

Welcome and Introductions

Bob Hazlett, Maricopa Association of Governments (MAG) Project Manager, welcomed everyone and thanked them for participating in the I-10 – Hassayampa Valley Roadway Framework Study.

Bob mentioned that the study was being sponsored and funded by the cities of Goodyear and Surprise, town of Buckeye, Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) and Maricopa County Department of Transportation (MCDOT). In addition, MAG is using funds from the Federal Highway Administration to help pay for the study.

Framework Study Overview

Bob Hazlett gave a broad overview of the 12-month study. The study area covers a large portion of western Maricopa County, most of which is currently undeveloped desert. The project limits are generally SR-74 (or a projection thereof) on the north, the Gila River on the south, SR-303L (Estrella Freeway alignment) on the east, and the 459th Avenue section line on the west. Most of the area is within Buckeye, Surprise and unincorporated Maricopa County.

The study's overall intent is to develop a planned roadway network, and to define and prioritize operational and safety improvements to I-10 while forming a framework for regional connections within the study area.

Key study elements include:

- Develop a network of north/south and east/west roadways, varying in functional classification, that will provide access throughout the study area and preserve I-10.
- Formulate a prioritization framework for constructing the roadway framework, regional connections and future I-10 interchanges.
- Study opportunities to incorporate alternative transportation modes into the roadway framework.
- Evaluate funding options and create a financing plan for the proposed roadway framework.
- Recommend an access management system and appropriate access management strategies for each functional classification of roadway.
- Identify and preserve right-of-way for future travel corridors.

John McNamara, DMJM Harris Project Manager gave a PowerPoint presentation providing an overview of the conceptual alternative scenarios for high capacity corridors. Following the presentation, the participants were divided into several small groups to discuss the preliminary alternatives and make recommendations.

Comment Cards

Participants were asked to complete comment cards and submit for inclusion in the summary report. Following is a summary of comments received.

- Must have frontage roads; collector distributor roadways and parallel spine roads to compliment the freeways are needed.
- Critical flaws = with lane miles per capita in Hassayampa similar to that in the Valley. And with the one mile frequency of interchanges failing today in the Valley, won't the two mile spaced interchange carrying twice the traffic fail even sooner
- Proposed service traffic interchange at 395th Avenue/I-10 (Copper Leaf TI). Also, interest in proposed service traffic interchange at 435th Avenue/I-10. This may vary the two mile interchange spacing
- Please provide as much of the presentation material as is available
- Primarily interested in the Buckeye/Avondale area
- How will 403rd Avenue crossing I-10 without interchange work? There is a major wash crossing and this does not look feasible.
- Would like some consideration of economic impacts on local communities of dividing them with a freeway can be a negative.
- Good job – very methodical!
- Excellent and very comprehensive
- Big challenge is (as you all know) cost and funding options
- 395th North or I-10 needs to run straight at least to Bethany Home. Conflicts with existing approved land uses.
- Move 427th interchange to 435th (i.e. Vaquero); based on location of Hummingbird Wilderness and BLM land. This is appropriate and more efficient.

- Plus ROW controlled by one owner and the only chance for public/private partnership
- Land use sensitivity must occur – current West Valley general plans are light on employment and commercial. In long term, we will be similar to the East Valley
- Very informative and well presented
- Maintaining a two-mile spacing between interchanges on I-10 is critical. MAG, ADOT, and FHWA should stand firm on this recommendation.
- Good thorough presentation. Glad to have an opportunity to ask questions at the end.

Next Steps

Bob Hazlett explained that the next steps in the process completing the modeling and finalizing the alternative. He also mentioned the public evening this evening.

**Interstate 10 – Hassayampa Valley Roadway Framework Study
Development Forum #3
February 26, 2007**

PARTICIPANTS

100. Rachel Aja, HBACA
101. Dave Hedlund, WC Scoutten
102. Josh Cameron
103. Landis Elliott, Bade
104. Arthur Meredith, Utility West
105. Jerry Brunk, TRAK of Arizona
106. Molly Edwards, LAZ
107. John Lang, WLB Group
108. Nona Baheshone, BLM – Hassayampa FD
109. Brian Weikert, Utility West
110. Ron Gross, Landquest Holdings
111. Jed McClure, ACI
112. Chuck Wright, KHA
113. Kim Korp, Harvard Investments
114. Brett Jarman, Phoenix City Investments
115. Joy Butler, PDG
116. Todd Kinney, DBAI
117. Scott Chesney, City of Surprise
118. Pike Oliver, W. Holdings
119. Richard Wrublik, Tempe Leasing
120. Brad Olbert, Jacobs
121. Amy Linert, Denise Resnick & Associates
122. Gary White, Duncan & Sons
123. Woody Scoutten, Town of Buckeye
124. Harold Killman, Ko-NO Properties
125. Cindy Paddock, JF Companies
126. Charlie Potter, Capital Pacific Homes
127. Heidi Kimball, Sunbelt Holdings
128. Scott Ford, ACI
129. Randy Overmyer, City of Surprise
130. Bob Woodring, MCDOT
131. Keith Watkins, J. F. Companies
132. Tim Wilson, ADOT
133. Aaron Atkinson, UCGC
134. Brian Bombardier, HDR
135. Jason Crisanbi, DEA
136. Ray Schweibsburg, AGFD
137. Robert Miller

138. Brad Ranly, Land Advisors
139. J.P. Smith, SBR
140. Scott Truitt, Twin Peaks Realty
141. Josh Hartmann, Pulte
142. Trent Kelso, HDR
143. Eric Maceyko, DEA
144. Keith Niederer, CMX
145. James Condit, JF Companies
146. Kevin Helland, Don Bennett
147. Brandon Miller, Lennar
148. Robert Wagoner, Conterra Partners
149. Donald Scher, Momentum Development Company
150. Bob Maki, City of Surprise
151. Rob Lemke, AZTEC/PacWest
152. Matthew Sawhill, Barclay Group
153. Murray Johnson, Johnson Valley
154. Dianne Kresich, ADOT
155. Timothy Trait, ADOT
156. Shelley Bade, SL Bade & Associates
157. Tom Nagy, Millennium
158. Rick Lloyd, LEADS, Inc.
159. Melvin Bodily, MZ Group
160. Troy Mortensen, Sunbelt Holdings
161. Brandon Campbell, EMCC
162. Tom Buick, Morrison Maierle
163. Denise Lacey, RBF Consulting
164. Richard Jellies, LEAD Group
165. Derek Earle, DMB Associates
166. Alisa Lyons, Valley Partnership
167. Dennis Newcombe, Beau Gilbert
168. Jack Lunsford, WESTMARC
169. Roger Theis, Coe & Van Loo
170. Doug Sandstrom, City of Surprise
171. Luke Albect, City of Goodyear
172. April Choe, Meritage
173. Michelle Yerger, Community Southwest
174. Jeff Dana
175. Art Welch, CZI Metro
176. Shannon McLaughlin, Nathan & Associates
177. Eric Gorsenger, Sonoran Institute
178. Michelle Lehman, City of Surprise
179. Sarah Nixon, El Dorado
180. Phil Allred, MD Group
181. John Fulles, All State Associates
182. Jim Creedon, Landry & Creedon Associates
183. Glen Tuck, T USA

- 184. Russ Watson, Sterling
- 185. Bill Oliver, Empire Group
- 186. Andrew Matusak, Ritoch-Powell Engineering
- 187. Kevin Hoskell, AREAD, Inc.
- 188. Carrie Bailes, SL Bade & Associates
- 189. Kyle Hindman, farmer
- 190. Mark Reddie, LVA
- 191. Edward Dietrich, SR Land
- 192. Tom Hennessy, Douglas Ranch
- 193. Paul Patane, ADOT Yuma District

MEETING SUMMARY NOTES

Meeting: MAG Interstate 10 – Hassayampa Valley Roadway
Framework Study
Public Meeting
Date: February 26, 2007, 4:30 p.m.
Location: Estrella Community College

Attendance

Mayor Bobby Bryant, Buckeye	Terry Lewis, CVL
Heather Honsberger, HDR	Dave Wilcox, Buckeye
Craig Weaver	Judith Shaw, TAC
Joe Bourland, Century 21	Aaron Lamourney, Steve Johnson Dev.

Bob Hazlett, MAG Hassayampa Study Project Manager

Consulting Team

John McNamara, DMJM Harris	Peggy Fiandaca, PSA
Curtis Lueck, CLA	Dan Marum, Wilson & Company
Jackie Pfeiffer, DMJM Harris	Ethan Rauch, DMJM Harris

Welcome and Introductions

Due to a small turnout, Bob Hazlett, Maricopa Association of Governments (MAG) Project Manager, provided the PowerPoint presentation to the small group in an informal manner.

Bob mentioned that the study is sponsored and funded by the cities of Goodyear and Surprise, town of Buckeye, Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) and Maricopa County Department of Transportation (MCDOT). In addition, MAG is using funds from the Federal Highway Administration to help pay for the study.

Framework Study Overview

Bob Hazlett gave a broad overview of the 12-month study. The study area covers a large portion of western Maricopa County, most of which is currently undeveloped desert. The project limits are generally SR-74 (or a projection thereof) on the north, the Gila River on the south, SR-303L (Estrella Freeway alignment) on the east, and the 459th Avenue section line on the west. Most of the area is within Buckeye, Surprise and unincorporated Maricopa County.

The study's overall intent is to develop a planned roadway network, and to define and prioritize operational and safety improvements to I-10, while forming a framework for regional connections within the study area.

Key study elements include:

- Develop a network of north/south and east/west roadways, varying in functional classification, that will provide access throughout the study area and preserve I-10.
- Formulate a prioritization framework for constructing the roadway framework, regional connections and future I-10 interchanges.
- Study opportunities to incorporate alternative transportation modes into the roadway framework.
- Evaluate funding options and create a financing plan for the proposed roadway framework.
- Recommend an access management system and appropriate access management strategies for each functional classification of roadway.
- Identify and preserve right-of-way for future travel corridors.

John McNamara, DMJM Harris Project Manager, gave a PowerPoint presentation providing an overview of the conceptual alternative scenarios for high capacity corridors.

Comment Cards

Participants were asked to complete comment cards and submit them for inclusion in the summary report. Only one was received.

- I would like a blowup of the 200 (SR-303L) and 801; I am working on two projects at MC-85 and Cotton Lane. The projects are called King Ranch and River Ranch.

Next Steps

Bob Hazlett explained that the next steps in the process involve completing the modeling and finalizing the alternative.

Adjourn

Meeting adjourned approximately 6:00 p.m.

MEETING SUMMARY NOTES

Meeting: MAG Interstate 10 – Hassayampa Valley Roadway
Framework Study
Funding Partners #9
Date: April 16, 2007
Location: MAG

Attendance

Randy Overmyer, Surprise	Dianne Kresich, ADOT
Thomas Chlebanowski, Buckeye	Vince Li, ADOT
Peggy Rubach, MCDOT	Mario Saldamando, Goodyear

Bob Hazlett, MAG Project Manager

Consulting Team

John McNamara, DMJM Harris	Peggy Fiandaca, PSA
Dan Marum, Wilson & Company	Ethan Rauch, DMJM Harris
Jackie Pfeiffer, DMJM Harris	

Bob Hazlett welcomed everyone. He gave an overview of project's status.

Development Forum #3 Report

Peggy Fiandaca gave an overview of the Development Forum #3. The event was very successful with approximately 94 attendees signing in. A summary report will be distributed to the Funding Partners.

Future TI Spacing on ADOT Freeway

Vince Li said that everyone, including Dan Lance, agrees on the need for two-mile spacing on I-10 west in our study area. Keep "weavers" off the I-10 mainline.

John – FHWA is especially concerned about the Interstate system; less so about other freeways.

Bob – To a developer, a freeway is a freeway, regardless of the route number. Two-mile TI spacing must be applied consistently as the new systemwide standard.

Vince – The TPD statewide access management plan, now under development, also advocates two-mile spacing. ADOT will push for two-mile spacing on the Williams Gateway Freeway, despite Dan Lance's recent remarks.

Stakeholder Meetings

Stardust – It is a positive working relationship and they want to work with us. DMJM will be doing a special study to analyze development on a mile of both

sides to look at CD roads, auxiliary lanes, etc. but still protect the integrity of I-10 and the system interchange.

Stardust counted on a TI at Wilson Road and somehow got the impression that this will happen, although no commitment was ever made. Vince said that if Stardust absolutely can't live with the TI spacing proposed by ADOT in this area, it may be possible to apply solutions involving auxiliary lanes, collector-distributor systems, frontage roads, etc. However, these solutions are expensive and the developer will have to pay for them.

ADOT - Supports long range planning in terms of TI spacing and then look at any other solutions to address the requirements such as CD roads, etc.

Patton/Jomax – Developer Lyle Anderson of the Festival development is concerned with the proposed White Tanks Freeway alignment, but not with the proposed arterial street on the Jomax Road alignment which would cut through the proposed golf course. They are showing the freeway on Patton Road. They have no problems with the freeway. They do not want Jomax going across the river at all. An example of a similar roadway suggested is Kierland where Greenway Parkway goes over the golf course.

Randy - Surprise might want to reclassify Jomax as a ½ mile major arterial from a freeway.

Dan Marum – However, the Patton/Jomax Study is going to have to address this issue. The study will be making a recommendation to MCDOT for a river crossing. The thinking is that one alternative that might be beneficial to invest the next increment of capital in crossing the river at Jomax and keep the low flow crossing. There is one other crossing between Patton/Jomax corridor down to Deer Valley and each of the crossings are carrying 40 to 50,000 per day (2030 number).

Randy - The further north you go north of Auxiliary Field #1 and to Whittmann the more houses you will encounter.

Recommendation -

Bob Hazlett - Include a dash line on a map showing future arterial freeway crossings between Deer Valley and I-10. The crossing will be determined in later studies such as the Patton/Jomax Study.

Revise the freeway as Randy showed.

NOTE – MCDOT will be consulted regarding the recommendation.

Pulte – Pulte has pugnaciously defended its position on a piece of Turner Parkway through Festival Ranch, between Sun Valley Parkway and Deer Valley Road. They want to see a 130-foot arterial, not the MAG 200-foot parkway

section that would displace entitled homes. There are ways of narrowing the section through this area, but only if no access is provided to Pulte.

The Funding Partners discussed the letter from Supervisor Wilcox supporting Pulte dated April 10, 2007. MAG is preparing a response for Dennis Smith's signature. MAG is not backing down – if anything, the traffic forecasts generated for this study are likely too low, not too high. Ruth Garcia has said that the Town of Buckeye Mayor and Town Manager are disturbed by the Wilcox letter and support the MAG parkway concept. Peggy Fiandaca suggested that MAG attach Supervisor Wilcox's original letter to Dennis' reply.

Surprise City Council – The meeting went well and elicited strong support for the study to move ahead. Statements made about the study were that the study was very comprehensive and thorough.

Surprise Community Development Director – Implementation of a framework like this that will impact quality of life and identity; sense of place – Scott felt that there was a large steamroller to lay down corridors that will all look like Bell Road; explained that this study is a framework that identifies the need and there is flexibility as it moves forward to define specific design and character. He is in complete support now.

Modeling Results

Dan Marum described the modeling results. He has been working with MAG regarding the alternative networks. The group agreed to keep five of the alternatives for full evaluation: A, A3, A5, B and C. These include the four highest-scoring alternatives (on the combined mobility criteria), plus the base criteria without the White Tank Mountain tunnel. Alternatives A4, D, E, and F will be dropped at this point.

DRAFT Possible Evaluation Criteria and Performance Measures Revised 4/16/07 was distributed – many of the criteria will be a more qualitative analysis. Funding Partners were encouraged to participate in a workshop on April 27th 10:00 a.m. at DMJM to evaluate the first cut of the evaluation.

Funding Partners meeting - Thursday May 17th at Noon to 5:00 p.m. at MAG Palo Verde Room to discuss the evaluation results.

Dianne Kresich - Is there a benefit/cost analysis? No not now; Bob said that we will take a look at it but I cannot guarantee that we will be able to include it.

Dianne Kresich - Add ADOT Wildlife Linkages to the Environmental Impacts

Working Papers

The last ones are in process and hope to have them at the end of the month.

Newsletter

Peggy gave a brief overview of the possible last newsletter to be distributed in June.

Wrap Up Forum

It was May 31st but it will be pushed off until the evaluation finishes up. It will be in Buckeye at the request of the Mayor.

Draft Report Outline

Ethan distributed revised evaluation criteria and a draft report outline. Comments are due within the next week on the draft report outline that Ethan distributed.

Dianne and Tom also requested that the completed working papers be posted on the DMJM Harris FTP site. Jackie will do that.

Next Steps

The last Funding Partner's Meeting could occur in mid June if necessary. However, the type of comments received during the review process will determine if another meeting is needed.

Q &A FROM FINAL DEVELOPMENT FORUM

Date: July 12, 2007, 4:00 p.m.
Location: Buckeye High School

Q: Are GIS capabilities and SHAPE files available for public use on the MAG BQAZ website?

A: No. MAG gives its GIS files only to agencies that file a signed release form. However, all the maps are in printable .pdf files.

Q: We recall that the I-10 geometric/access study (now beginning) was to extend from Miller Road to Johnson Road. Why does the map show it extending only from Miller to Sun Valley Parkway?

A: This is an error that we will correct on the map.

Q: Is 200 feet truly the maximum width required for a parkway, or will more width be needed at intersections?

A: The MCDOT study (now nearing completion) indicates that there may be some flares out to 225 feet, but only at grade separations—not at ordinary intersections.

Q: When will we know for sure?

A: Please attend the ADOT parkway design workshop on August 9th from 8:30 to noon (at HDRC under the Stack) for more information. Everyone is invited.

Q: How will the proposed improvements be coordinated with the FDCMC Flood Retarding Structure #1 on the north side of I-10?

A: MAG has been working with the Flood Control District on roadway crossing issues.

Q: There are nine apparent conflicts between this study and the draft Buckeye General Plan. How will these be resolved?

A (Peggy): The 60-day review process and comment period for the General Plan Update is just beginning. The Buckeye staff and consulting team will work to resolve any conflicts during this period. Please feel free to discuss any issues with Peggy or Suparna. All of the General Plan information will be on the town website starting tomorrow.

Q: Since December we have been requesting the underlying datasets from MAG so we can understand how the modeling was done. These have not been forthcoming. We need this backup to get our property owners to support the plan. In addition, our traffic forecasts (those of the development consultants) are quite different from MAG's. When will we get the database? When can we work out the differences between forecasts?

A (Bob): The new 2030 forecasts at the RAZ level have just been approved by the MAG Regional Council, which is why they weren't released previously. Eric: We will now be glad to sit down with you and walk you through our data. Now is

the time to request it. Bob: The MAG Buildout assumptions are just that. MAG does not conduct Buildout forecasting.

Q: When and how will this study be completed?

A: It was scheduled to go to the Regional Council for approval (not formal adoption as a plan) in September, but this may move back to October. Further discussions can occur between now and then.

Q: We've heard rumors that SR-85 may be placed on the federal Interstate Highway system.

A: MAG has heard nothing to this effect, although some people want to see this route on the Interstate system. The long-term plan is to make it a freeway from I-8 to I-10.

Q: This region will never build a \$20 billion network without toll roads, so leave this option open. Orange County provides an example of what tolling can accomplish. Don't close the door on toll roads as a future funding option.

A (Eric): MAG is not opposed to toll roads and there is no intention to rule them out. However, only a few roadways or corridors are suitable for private financing through tolls, without a need for public subsidies. Tolls are probably not yet politically feasible, but this may change in the future. Congestion pricing is being explored in the Pacific Northwest.

Q (from a resident): We must drive I-10 to jobs in Phoenix, and the commute is a nightmare. It takes an hour to get from SR-303L to Dysart Road. When will this be fixed?

A (Eric): Relief is on the way. Construction will go out to bid soon and the I-10 widening work should begin in February 2008. The project will be built in phases over several years. Bob: Jim Tate of ADOT can provide more information.

Q: Does our map showing the Hassayampa Freeway crossing I-10 at 355th Avenue?

A: It actually crosses at 363rd Ave.

Q: The area north of I-10 and west of the White Tanks consists mostly of unique master-planned communities that are designed to balance housing with employment. How did the modeling take this into account? Also, what opportunities exist for additional MAG model runs?

A (Bob): Many similar master-planned communities exist in the East Valley and elsewhere, and experience shows that the internal trip capture rate remains modest. There is no guarantee that employment will locate as proposed in the master plans. For example, companies have located at the Scottsdale Airpark because their executives—not the workers—live nearby. John added that the population and employment inputs were based on the master plans and entitlements provided by developers and jurisdictions. Even for a master-planned community, a 25% trip capture rate would be "incredibly high" based on experience elsewhere.

Q (Greg Jones of FCDMC): Consider grade separation of light rail. Crossing of mainline railroads is a concern.

A (John): This study didn't consider such details. Later studies will look at these issues.

Q (Susan of Beus Gilbert): We know how freeways and arterials are usually funded, but what about parkways?

A (Bob): This study didn't try to settle the issue or make a recommendation. Various alternatives are possible. In some ways parkways are more like arterials—e.g., right-in, right-out private access to some private driveways is usually provided.

Q: Have we talked with BLM? Some of our proposed corridors traverse their lands.

A: Yes. We had a meeting of environmental resource agencies, and BLM gave us input. They recognize the need for new roads to serve growth and are willing to discuss them.

Q (from "West of White Tanks" group): Reiteration that we want to see the MAG model and supporting data. Also, the disclaimer that all alignments are "subject to change" is vague (and by implication makes it harder for owners and developers to plan).

A (Peggy): During the 60-day General Plan comment period, we can discuss specific application of the Hassayampa study results to the Buckeye roadway network. Bob: We can't be more definitive now, because feasibility and environmental studies will be needed in order to set specific alignments. These studies may dictate alignment changes. For now we're trying to get a dialogue started, because a network composed of just arterial streets and I-10 is doomed to failure.

Q: What's happening with the Northern Avenue alignment between SR-303L and the White Tank Mountains?

A (Bob): The MAG RTP includes a Northern Parkway from SR-101L to SR-303L. Glendale and MCDOT are still studying this, and alternative alignments are under consideration. It would be logical to extend this west, and possibly through the mountains via a tunnel. Greg Jones: The current concept has the alignment ½ mile north of the Northern Avenue section line at SR-303L.

Q: Will phased construction be discussed at the August 9th parkway design meeting?

A: Yes.

Q: Will the data used for the MAG modeling be provided?

A (Bob): Yes, you need to see us now to obtain the datasets.