

## **Appendix M. Public Involvement**

*This page is intentionally left blank.*

## Public Involvement

This appendix provides summary reports and other materials prepared to document the public involvement effort conducted for the North-South Corridor Study:

- Study Team, Agency, and Stakeholder Meetings
- *North-South Corridor Study Draft Agency and Public Scoping Summary*, February 2011
- *Summary of Stakeholder and Public Outreach and Preferences on Possible Route Alternatives North-South Corridor Study*, March 2012
- *North-South Corridor Study Alternative Selection Report Public Meeting Summary Report*, July 2015
- 2017 Alternatives Update Agency and Public Comments and Comment Summary

*This page is intentionally left blank.*



## Cooperating and Participating Agency Meetings

Table M-1 lists the cooperating and participating agency study team meetings held from 2009 through 2017.

**Table M-1.** Cooperating and participating agency meetings

Date	Title
8/25/2009	ADOT meeting
8/31/2009	FHWA meeting
10/29/2009	Kick-off meeting
1/5/2010	Traffic modeling meeting
2/2/2010	Progress meeting
7/13/2010	Progress meeting
12/7/2010	Progress meeting
6/22/2011	Progress meeting
9/6/2011	Progress meeting
10/4/2011	Progress meeting
11/1/2011	Progress meeting
2/14/2012	Progress meeting
3/6/2012	Progress meeting
5/15/2012	Progress meeting
9/11/2012	Progress meeting
11/6/2012	Progress meeting
4/2/2013	Progress meeting
9/10/2013	Progress meeting
5/6/2014	Progress meeting
12/2/2014	Progress meeting
7/14/2015	Progress meeting
11/1/2016	Progress meeting
1/26/2017	Progress meeting
6/8/2017	Progress meeting
8/8/2017	Progress meeting
12/14/17	Progress meeting

Note: Cooperating and participating agency meetings were originally referred to as project "progress meetings."

## Stakeholder Meetings

Table M-2 lists the stakeholder study team meetings held from 2009 through 2018.

**Table M-2.** Stakeholder meetings

Date	Title
11/30/2009	Initial environmental public involvement meeting
2/1/2010	Florence Town Council meeting
2/22/2010	Coolidge City Council meeting
3/16/2010	Florence Chamber of Commerce presentation
3/16/2010	Gila River Indian Community Transportation Technical Team meeting
8/5/2010	Arizona Department of Transportation and Union Pacific Railroad meeting
10/18/2010	Rose Law Group meeting
11/19/2010	Four Southern Tribes Cultural Resources Committee meeting
11/19/2010	Four Southern Tribes Cultural Resources Working Group meeting
1/5/2011	Agency input meetings
1/12/2011	Hutchinson meeting
3/11/2011	City of Eloy follow-up
3/23/2011	Superstition Vistas Technical Advisory Committee meeting
4/7/2011	Salt River Project and Central Arizona Project meetings
5/9/2011	Arizona Department of Transportation and Union Pacific Railroad meeting
5/24/2011	Rail update meeting
6/11/2011	Gila River Indian Community coordination, where North-South Corridor Study was on the agenda
6/27/2011	Eloy special City Council meeting
7/27/2011	Jordan Rose phone discussion
8/23/2011	Rose Law Group Segment 4E meeting
9/2/2011	Rose Law Group Tucson District meeting
10/13/2011	Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community coordination meeting
10/13/2011	Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community coordination meeting, where North-South Corridor Study was on the agenda
10/18/2011	Environmental meeting with Arizona Game and Fish Department
11/18/2011	Four Southern Tribes Cultural Resources Committee meeting
11/18/2011	Four Southern Tribes Cultural Resources Working Group meeting
11/29/2011	Pinal County Board of Supervisors presentation
12/6/2011	Public and agency workshops
1/31/2012	Arizona State Land Department meeting
2/24/2012	Superstition Vistas update
3/19/2012	Rose Law Group Dobson family meeting
3/22/2012	Pinal Partnership Transportation Committee presentation

**Table M-2.** Stakeholder meetings

Date	Title
5/1/2012	Florence and Arizona Department of Transportation meeting
5/2/2012	Arizona Department of Transportation, Federal Highway Administration, and U.S. Environmental Protection Agency alternatives teleconference
5/23/2012	Salt River Project coordination meeting
6/21/2012	Pinal County discussion
6/22/2012	Four Southern Tribes Adamsville traditional cultural property meeting
6/22/2012	Four Southern Tribes Cultural Resources Working Group meeting
6/28/2012	Rose Law Group meeting
7/24/2012	Rose Law Group meeting
9/17/2012	Gila River Indian Community Cultural Resources meeting
9/17/2012	Gila River Indian Community coordination meeting, where North-South Corridor Study was on the agenda
9/18/2012	McRae Properties Segment P meeting
10/22/2012	Superstition Vistas update
11/14/2012	Florence Segment U meeting
11/30/2012	Rose Law Group Segment U meeting
12/6/2012	Eloy and Arizona Department of Transportation Segment AK meeting
1/29/2013	Superstition Vistas Steering Committee meeting
2/21/2013	Mesa land acquisition meeting
11/20/2013	Pinal Land Holdings meeting
1/17/2014	Four Southern Tribes Cultural Resources Committee meeting
1/17/2014	Four Southern Tribes Cultural Resources Working Group meeting
1/5/2015	Gila River Indian Community District 1 meeting
1/6/2015	Gila River Indian Community District 3 meeting
1/7/2015	Salt River Project informational meeting
2/2/2015	Gila River Indian Community District 2 meeting
2/5/2015	Tohono O'odham Nation meeting
3/1/2015	Jurisdiction outreach
3/31/2015	Biology approach meeting
4/1/2015	Arizona Department of Transportation cultural resources meeting
6/26/2015	Arizona State Land Department meeting
9/24/2015	Flood Control District of Maricopa County coordination meeting
10/21/2015	Gila River Indian Community coordination meeting
10/21/2015	Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community coordination meeting
10/21/2015	Gila River Indian Community coordination, where North-South Corridor Study was on the agenda
10/21/2015	Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community coordination meeting, where North-South Corridor Study was on the agenda

**Table M-2.** Stakeholder meetings

Date	Title
1/28/2016	Town of Florence multiple departments meeting
2/24/2016	Stakeholder Pinal Land Holdings meeting
4/5/2016	Flood Control District of Maricopa County meeting
4/11/2016	Arizona State Land Department meeting
4/15/2016	Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community coordination meeting, where North-South Corridor Study was on the agenda
4/20/2016	Town of Florence stakeholders
4/22/2016	Four Southern Tribes Cultural Resources Working Group meeting
5/2/2016	Pinal County multiple departments meeting
6/2/2016	Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community coordination meeting
6/2/2016	Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community meeting, where North-South Corridor Study was on the agenda
6/27/2016	Four Southern Tribes Cultural Resources committee meeting
6/27/2016	Four Southern Tribes Cultural Resources Working Group meeting
8/9/2016	Four Southern Tribes Cultural Resources committee meeting
8/9/2016	Four Southern Tribes Cultural Resources Working Group meeting
12/13/2016	Arizona Game and Fish Department meeting
2/28/2017	Superstition Vistas Steering Committee
3/28/2017	Four Southern Tribes preparation meeting
5/17/2017	Four Southern Tribes meeting
5/23/2017	Jurisdictions meeting
5/25/2017	Florence stakeholder meeting
5/31/2017	Four Southern Tribes meeting
7/14/2017	Florence stakeholder meeting
7/14/2017	Coolidge stakeholder meeting
7/17/2017	Pinal County stakeholder meeting
7/26/2017	Eloy stakeholder meeting
9/8/2017	Tohono O'odham Nation Gu Achi District meeting
11/14/2017	Arizona Game and Fish Department meeting
11/16/2017	Rose Law Group meeting
11/21/2017	Coolidge multiple departments meeting
8/31/2017	Town of Florence multiple departments meeting

# North–South Corridor Study

## Draft Agency and Public Scoping Summary

Pinal County, Arizona

Federal-aid Project No. STP-999-A(BBM)

ADOT Project No. 999 PN 000 H7454 01L

February 2011 | Version 2



Arizona Department of Transportation  
Federal Highway Administration



# North–South Corridor Study

Draft Agency and Public Scoping Summary

Pinal County, Arizona

Federal-aid Project No. STP-999-A(BBM)

ADOT Project No. 999 PN 000 H7454 01L

**February 2011 | Version 2**

## *Prepared for*

Arizona Department of Transportation  
Roadway Predesign Section  
Environmental Planning Group  
Communication and Community Partnerships

## *Prepared by*

Gordley Design Group, Inc.  
2540 North Tucson Boulevard  
Tucson, Arizona 85716

HDR Engineering, Inc.  
3200 East Camelback Road, Suite 350  
Phoenix, Arizona 85018





## Contents

---

<b>1</b>	<b>Introduction .....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>Agency Scoping .....</b>	<b>1</b>
2.1	Agency Scoping Invitation Letter .....	1
2.2	Agency Scoping Meeting.....	1
2.3	Discussion Session.....	2
2.4	Agency Scoping Written Comments .....	7
<b>3</b>	<b>Study Briefings and Presentations .....</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>4</b>	<b>Public Scoping .....</b>	<b>14</b>
4.1	Public Scoping Notification Flier .....	14
4.2	Newspaper Display Notices .....	14
4.3	Web Site.....	14
4.4	Public Scoping Meetings .....	15
4.5	Public Scoping Comment Summary .....	15

## Tables

---

Table 1.	Agency scoping meeting comments .....	4
Table 2.	Written agency comments .....	7
Table 3.	Study briefings and presentations .....	12
Table 4.	Public scoping meetings .....	14
Table 5.	Newspaper notices .....	14
Table 6.	Meeting attendance .....	15
Table 7.	Issues received .....	16
Table 8.	Public scoping meeting survey responses .....	21

## Figures

---

Figure 1.	North–South Corridor location .....	3
-----------	-------------------------------------	---

## Appendixes

---

Appendix A .....	Notice of Intent
Appendix B .....	Agency Scoping Meeting Invitation Letter
Appendix C .....	Agency Scoping Meeting Attendance
Appendix D .....	Agency Scoping Meeting Presentation and Displays
Appendix E .....	Agency Scoping Written Comments
Appendix F .....	Public Scoping Meeting Notification Flier
Appendix G .....	Public Scoping Meeting Newspaper Notices
Appendix H .....	Public Scoping Meeting Presentation and Displays
Appendix I .....	Public Scoping Meeting Attendance
Appendix J .....	Public Scoping Meeting Written Comments
Appendix K .....	Public Scoping Meeting Comment Summary Map
Appendix L .....	Meeting Survey

# 1 Introduction

---

The Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) and the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), as the lead federal agency, have initiated an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) and Location/Design Concept Report (L/DCR) to identify a transportation corridor to connect US 60 and Interstate 10 (I-10). The proposed North–South Corridor study area begins at US 60, in the vicinity of Apache Junction and extends south for approximately 45 miles to connect to I-10, in the vicinity of Eloy and Picacho, in Pinal County, Arizona (Figure 1).

The first formal step in the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process is the scoping phase, the results of which are summarized in this report. The notice of intent (NOI) was published in the *Federal Register* on September 20, 2010 and represented the official start of the EIS and scoping process (Appendix A). The scoping process was open to agencies and the public to identify the range, or scope, of issues to be addressed during the development of engineering, planning and environmental studies.

The agency scoping meeting for this study occurred on October 5, 2010, and the public scoping meetings occurred October 19, 21, 26, and 28, 2010, in locations throughout the study area. The official scoping comment period ended on November 11, 2010; however, comments received after the comment period will be documented and reviewed by the study team.

The following scoping summary includes the information and presentations provided during the scoping meetings, as well as a summary of comments received from participants and responses from the study team.

## 2 Agency Scoping

---

### 2.1 Agency Scoping Invitation Letter

The study team prepared and distributed a scoping letter inviting agency representatives to participate in the scoping phase of the study. The invitation letters were mailed on September 20, 2010. A copy of the agency scoping invitation letter is included in Appendix B. A total of 206 individuals representing forty-three agencies were invited to participate in the study.

### 2.2 Agency Scoping Meeting

ADOT hosted an agency scoping meeting on October 5, 2010 at the Florence Town Hall, located at 775 North Main Street, Florence, Arizona 85132. The purpose of this meeting was to provide agency representatives with preliminary study information, present the Corridor Opportunity Area, and receive input regarding any issues recommended for evaluation.

Fifty-six individuals representing the following agencies were in attendance (Appendix C):


- City of Apache Junction
- Arizona Department of Corrections
- Arizona Department of Public Service
- Arizona Department of Transportation
  - Communication and Community Partnerships
  - Environmental Planning Group

- Multimodal Planning Division
- Predesign
- Roadway Design
- Traffic Engineering
- Arizona State Land Department
- City of Casa Grande
- Central Arizona Association of Governments
- Central Arizona Project
- City of Coolidge
- Copper Basin Railway
- City of Eloy
- Town of Florence
- Maricopa Association of Governments
- Maricopa County
- Maricopa County Department of Transportation
- City of Mesa
- Phoenix-Mesa Gateway Airport
- Pima Association of Governments
- Pinal County
- Town of Queen Creek
- Resolution Copper Company
- Salt River Project
- San Carlos Irrigation District
- U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
- U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
- U.S. Federal Highway Administration
- U.S. Natural Resources Conservation Service
- Valley Metro

### **2.3 Discussion Session**

Following the presentation, each agency representative was given the opportunity to comment on the study and the information presented. The comments and responses are documented in Table 1. In addition, contact information was provided for agency representatives to continue providing input. A copy of the presentation is included in Appendix D. Aerial mapping of the study area and informational boards (Appendix D) were also available for agency representatives to view.

**Figure 1.** North–South Corridor location



**Table 1. Agency scoping meeting comments**

Agency	Comment	Response
ADOT Communication and Community Partnerships	We are conducting city council briefings prior to public meetings. If you have any questions about the study please let Javier Gurrola or Pamela Cerece know. CCP is also working with the team for public involvement and business outreach.	N/A
ADOT Multimodal Planning Department	The study team should coordinate and evaluate this study as a multimodal corridor and also consider growth areas.	The study team is evaluating transportation facility options including multimodal alternatives. Growth areas including planned developments up to 2020 were considered during the development of the Corridor Opportunity Area and are categorized as "areas to avoid."
ADOT Roadway Design	We will stay involved with the study.	Comment noted by study team.
Arizona State Land Department	Will the maps shown today be available online? There may be some unknown drainage areas near the DMB property.	Study materials including the maps shown in the presentation will be available on-line at <a href="http://www.azdot.gov/Highways/Projects/NorthSouthCorridorStudy/Meetings_Notices.asp">www.azdot.gov/Highways/Projects/NorthSouthCorridorStudy/Meetings_Notices.asp</a> . The study team will also be able to provide additional information as requested.  Regarding the evaluation of drainage areas, an initial inventory of existing drainage areas was used in the development of the Corridor Opportunity Area and more information regarding the drainage areas will be gathered as the study continues.
Arizona Department of Public Safety	Will you be keeping State Route 79 or removing it? We would like to continue to be involved and informed of the study. We recommend you stay west of Picacho Mountain because this alignment will be easier to patrol as most people live on this side of the mountain. Emergency response is on this side of the mountain and east and west of Eloy on I-10. It is difficult to get responders to leave the city and our workforce can only grow if the town is growing.	The study will evaluate both improvements to existing roads such as SR 79 as well as a new roadway.
Town of Apache Junction	The study should include access management for local communities to help protect right-of-way. The study team should also model commercial versus residential traffic. Need to model for ultimate build-out, and address what existing roads look like in the future. Are we going to include community colleges as development/growth areas? The town is very interested in protecting the existing highways system. There are also concerns with the impact of new development on Apache Junction and the need for new infrastructure to support it.	The traffic model is currently being developed and will account for future growth to 2040. The model will account for commercial and residential traffic. Coordination with community colleges and other stakeholders will continue throughout the study. Also, new and planned development is being taken into consideration.  The study team will also evaluate whether expanding existing facilities will accommodate future traffic volumes and meet the purpose and need of the study.
City of Casa Grande	Concern regarding potential impacts to the economy if North-South alignment bypasses the city. To reduce right-of-way acquisition, the study team should consider using existing facilities. The study team should also consider moving the Corridor Opportunity Area to the west border.	Impacts to economic development will be evaluated during this study as well as costs for right-of-way acquisition. The study team will also evaluate whether expanding existing facilities will accommodate future traffic volumes and meet the purpose and need of the study.

(continued on next page)



**Table 1. Agency scoping meeting comments (continued)**

Agency	Comment	Response
Central Arizona Association of Governments	Other planned land uses may change within the Corridor Opportunity Area, in addition to existing land uses. The study team should look at impacts to Apache Junction and the potential impacts of incorporating San Tan Valley.	The study team is taking general plans into consideration and has considered planned development prior to 2020 as areas to avoid. The data being used is consistent with CAAG data, and will be updated throughout the study.
Central Arizona Project (CAP)	Concerned with the number of proposed crossings of the CAP canal. There is also a national recreational trail that needs to be considered. Would like to schedule a future meeting to discuss upcoming plans.	The study team will coordinate with CAP as the study proceeds.
Town of Coolidge	Will there be a Public-Private Partnership (P3) or toll road possibility? Also, the corridor will need to serve Superstition Vistas. SR 79 is always going to be there, but is there potential for going over SR 79? What is the centerline approval status? The town would like to keep SR 79 as a separate facility. Questions regarding schedule and future name of the actual road. Why is the Corridor Opportunity Area south of Coolidge and north of Picacho labeled “not available”? Salt River Project (SRP) has updated mapping that shows the Trans-Canada line and other earlier corridor studies. Support the western leg as it serves existing population, this is State Trust land.	P3 is a potential funding option. The study team will also evaluate whether expanding existing facilities will accommodate future traffic volumes and meet the purpose and need of the study. The study is a nominal three-year process for the Draft EIS. Additionally, the study team will continue to coordinate with utilities and other stakeholders to ensure that the information included in the study is up-to-date.
Copper Basin Railway	The railroad has been in existence in the area for a long time. There has been past interest in developing the railroad and utilizing this facility to draw industry to the Florence area. The North-South Corridor could reignite interest in developing and growing industry presence in this area. This could have an impact on the operation of the railroad. Is there a possibility of inter-city rail or Amtrak across the Union Pacific line? We are interested in more information regarding the rail study.	Information specific to the rail study will be shared with the Phoenix -Tucson InterCity Rail study team.
Town of Eloy	The study team should also analyze McClellan Wash and economies of scale with HDR’s flood control study. Eloy just finished the Small Area Transportation Study and the general plan is getting close to being finished.	As the study team proceeds, McClellan Wash and other flood control studies will be reviewed. Also, the study team will review transportation plans, general plans, and other relevant documents in order to establish the affected environment.
Town of Florence	Need to maintain surface transportation routes as there may be pressure/demand on existing routes such as Hunt Highway, SR 79 and SR 87. Also, new developments will increase potential traffic. Military expansion is planned east of SR 79. In general, there is limited economic development potential in this area. If more development occurs west of Anthem, that will affect the sustainability of the downtown area. Currently, there is limited access to downtown Florence. Question regarding the “undefined drainage area.” SR 802 to the east is on hold, is that project dependent upon this study?	The undefined drainage area indicates an area to avoid if possible and was a method to categorize the data. More information about these areas will be gathered as the study progresses. The study team is looking at existing and planned development, including military expansion, and will be coordinating with affected stakeholders throughout the study. The SR 802 east study will resume once this study has progressed to the corridor level.
Maricopa County Department of Transportation	This corridor should provide connectivity within the Sun Corridor.	This study will address providing connectivity within the Sun Corridor.

(continued on next page)

**Table 1.** Agency scoping meeting comments (continued)

Agency	Comment	Response
Maricopa Association of Governments	There will be a Freight Framework study looking at freight corridors within the Sun Corridor, which will be run by Tim Strow.	The study team will coordinate with MAG and review information from the Freight Framework study, when available.
City of Mesa	Mesa has 11,000 acres in Pinal County and nine miles adjacent to the Union Pacific Railroad (UPRR). The study team should look at the rail corridor and consider an intermodal facility. What would the right-of-way width be? This corridor should provide connectivity to the southeastern portion of Phoenix. What is the timeframe for this study? There is also a significant gas facility in the area. The Drainage Master Plan is currently being updated.	Additional coordination with the City of Mesa will occur as the study continues and consideration of multimodal options will also occur. A freeway right-of-way is typically 300-foot wide.
Phoenix-Mesa Gateway Airport	Future passenger/vehicular traffic will increase as the job base in the Gateway area grows. Phoenix-Mesa Gateway Airport would like to work with ADOT throughout this study. We anticipate 5 to 6 million passengers using the Phoenix-Mesa Gateway Airport in the future.	The study team will continue to coordinate with the Phoenix-Mesa Gateway Airport.
Pinal County	We have concerns with the traffic model. The corridor needs to include shared routes (e.g., power lines, utilities, etc.). We should coordinate now/early on in the study. Interstate 11 (I-11) in the Hidden Valley Study did not come this far east. The Central Framework Study extended I-11 east of I-10. The study team should consider I-11 in the traffic model. The maps should show City of Mesa property. Freeways are only beneficial if you get traffic to it; improvements to the arterial street network are also needed. US 60 is an example of this problem. The study team should consider two alternatives: preferred and secondary preferred and elements from both could be used.	The traffic model is currently being developed, and there will be an opportunity for stakeholders to review the model when it is available (early 2011). The study team will continue to coordinate with Pinal County throughout the development of the corridor and alternatives.
Resolution Copper	The existing and planned development areas should be blocked or limited opportunity areas. Also, the railroad is not marked as an avoidance area. Avoidance areas might be opportunities for others.	Existing and planned development to 2020 is shown within the Corridor Opportunity Area as areas to avoid. The Corridor Opportunity Area will be further evaluated and refined during the Alternative Selection process and the avoidance areas will be looked at more closely.
SRP	We can provide more up-to-date information on our built and planned transmission lines and substations in the area.	The study team will coordinate with SRP to get up-to-date information on transmission lines, substations, and future projects.
San Carlos Irrigation District	We are interested in impacts to canal operations and land.	The study team will continue to coordinate with San Carlos Irrigation District.
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers	We will submit our comments.	[Written comment received by study team. See Table 2 and Appendix E.]
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency	The purpose and need for the corridor needs to be clearly justified. During the alternatives analysis, the study team should look at possible improvements to the existing infrastructure and also alternatives that are adjacent to existing infrastructure such as Ironwood Road and Hunt Highway. Additional comments will be submitted to the study team in writing.	[Written comment received by study team. See Table 2 and Appendix E.]

(continued on next page)



**Table 1.** Agency scoping meeting comments (continued)

Agency	Comment	Response
U.S. Natural Resources Conservation Service	The study team should consider existing agricultural plans in the area.	The study team is taking into consideration all planned land uses.
Valley Metro/Regional Public Transportation Authority (RPTA)	The study team should consider alternatives that would do the least environmental damage and should also be coordinating with the State rail plan to consider multimodal options.	The study team will be evaluating the environmental impacts of all of the alternatives being developed. The study team will also be coordinating with the Phoenix-Tucson Intercity Rail study team.

*Note:* Comments and responses summarized in the table above were clarified or paraphrased in the development of this summary report.

## 2.4 Agency Scoping Written Comments

Following the agency scoping meeting, attendees were able to submit comments to be included in the scoping process and project record on forms provided, by letter, e-mail, or fax. The comment forms, letters, and e-mails are also attached (Appendix E). Table 2 summarizes the written agency comments.

**Table 2.** Written agency comments

Agency	Comment Summary
ADOT Southern Region Traffic Engineering	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Consider access to existing highway system as a criterion for location.</li> <li>If more regional traffic can use this corridor, then existing corridors may be more viable as well.</li> </ul>
ADOT Tucson District – Environmental	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Avoid one open and two closed landfills north of SR 287, between Coolidge and Florence.</li> <li>Consider having a hydraulic engineer evaluate where bridges could be safely located (with respect to current/proposed mining activities) over both the Queen Creek and Gila River.</li> </ul>
Arizona Game and Fish Department	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concerned with fragmentation, degradation, complete loss of wildlife habitat, and future degradation of wildlife populations and habitats from direct and indirect effects.</li> <li>Concerned with wildlife collisions.</li> <li>Concerned with diversions and impediments of important historic wildlife movement corridors and linkages.</li> <li>Concerned with the introduction and spread of invasive plant species.</li> <li>Concerned with the facilitation of unauthorized off-road access to previously undisturbed areas.</li> <li>Concerned with loss of access to public/state trust land for hunting and recreation.</li> <li>Concerned with negative impacts to special status and common native wildlife species.</li> <li>Encourage avoidance, mitigation of potential negative impacts.</li> <li>Supportive of placing the proposed transportation corridor on the west side of Picacho Mountain on previously disturbed land.</li> <li>Supportive of using or replacing parallel existing roadways or railroads.</li> <li>Maintain wildlife connections between the Mineral, San Tan, and Picacho mountains, and the Gila River.</li> <li>Avoid disrupting wildlife linkages.</li> <li>Secure funds to identify wildlife corridors within the study area and develop mitigation measures.</li> <li>Use the Heritage Data Management System to provide documentation of special status species within and adjacent to the corridor.</li> <li>Survey the area for special status species and habitats and identify measures to help minimize impacts resulting from the proposed transportation corridor.</li> <li>Design a route that avoids and minimizes impacts to desert washes, floodplains, and the Gila River.</li> <li>Do not impact implementation of the Pinal County Open Space and Trails Master Plan.</li> </ul>

**Table 2. Written agency comments**

Agency	Comment Summary
City of Casa Grande	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Prefer western alignment of the Corridor Opportunity Area</li> <li>• Consider east-west connectivity in relation to positioning the corridor. Freeway level connections east/west should be part of the concept.</li> <li>• Consider traffic interchange placement.</li> </ul>
City of Coolidge	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Western leg [of the Corridor Opportunity Area] from Coolidge south would serve existing population centers.</li> <li>• The eastern leg [of the Corridor Opportunity Area] would run primarily through unpopulated state trust lands and would poorly serve existing communities.</li> <li>• Consider the following other issues as part of the study: generating stations, substations, TransCanada generating station (south of Coolidge, east of Randolph) and the SRP 500kV line.</li> </ul>
Departments of the Army and Air Force	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support protecting the Rittenhouse Auxiliary Airfield (located at the northeast corner of Schnepf Road and Ocotillo Road), locating a highway within two miles of this airfield would impact National Guard training.</li> <li>• Concern regarding a potential freeway's affect on day and night helicopter training use at Rittenhouse Airfield. Freeway-associated structures (light poles, etc.) may negatively affect safe flight operations</li> <li>• Avoid encroachment on the Florence Military Reservation and associated facilities.</li> </ul>
Flood Control District of Maricopa County	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Flood Control District of Maricopa County (District) is currently conducting the Powerline, Vineyard Road, and Rittenhouse Flood Retarding Structures Rehabilitation or Replacement Project.</li> <li>• These dams range from 16 feet to 24 feet in height and are approximately 12 miles long, are operated and maintained by the District and should be considered as part of the study.</li> <li>• The District will work with ADOT and share any information that is completed.</li> </ul>
Town of Florence	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Unsupportive of a corridor west of the Anthem Merrill Ranch development.</li> <li>• A corridor five or more miles from downtown Florence would have a negative impact to the downtown economy and future development plans.</li> <li>• The corridor maps should reflect current and planned SRP development (e.g., 230/500kV transmission lines, solar development, etc.)</li> <li>• The corridor maps should show the Magic Ranch Community, Poston Butte (F Mountain) and the two buttes along Hunt Highway at the Franklin Road alignment as "avoid."</li> <li>• Proposed development along Arizona Farms Road may not occur by 2020. Suggest coordinating with developers regarding the corridor alignment process.</li> <li>• Development upstream of the Magma Dam may minimize the role of this structure over time. Corridor planning may incorporate an alternative design to the current dam structure.</li> <li>• Avoid development on, or directly adjacent to, the Florence Military Reservation and Waste Management/Pinal County landfill at Highway 287.</li> <li>• Keep a distance between the proposed alignment and the Magma Junction area as there are potential future plans for industrial development, and railroad/freight corridor. This might also be an opportunity for a multi-modal transportation corridor incorporating commuter and inter-city rail, transit-oriented development plans and overall enhanced compatibility.</li> <li>• Keep proposed alignment off of major existing corridors, such as SR 79, SR 287 and Hunt Highway.</li> <li>• There are wild-horse crossings from the Gila River Indian Community to open space areas east of Florence.</li> <li>• Concerned about a route that goes too far east (between Heritage Road and Bella Vista Road), due to potential loss of economic development impacts.</li> <li>• There is a floodplain in the western section of the Corridor Opportunity Area that would require a larger crossing of the Gila River. This crossing would remove potential valuable land in the area and would be more costly and challenging, while minimizing the number of interchanges that could provide economic benefit to the town.</li> <li>• Request a meeting with the study team and town to discuss the Downtown Florence North End Framework Plan.</li> <li>• Suggest further discussions about access management and traffic interchange locations to ensure that access is properly placed to support economic development.</li> </ul>

**Table 2. Written agency comments**

Agency	Comment Summary
City of Mesa (Engineering Department)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Corridor is much needed and will be a great catalyst for economic development and regional connectivity.</li> <li>Add Mesa land ownership to maps.</li> <li>Include the Flood Control District of Maricopa County in the study.</li> <li>Discuss utility needs (not just electric) to provide routes as the area develops.</li> <li>The study area also crosses the Mormon Battalion Trail along the Gila River.</li> </ul>
City of Mesa (Office of the City Manager, Pinal County Farm Land Project Manager)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Supports the opportunity to have the North-South Corridor near Mesa farm lands.</li> <li>Consider an alignment that minimizes impacts to large-property owners.</li> <li>Include traffic interchanges every mile to accommodate access.</li> <li>Locate high speed rail corridor alternatives east of roadway alternatives.</li> </ul>
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Consider floodplains and drainages from an environmental and engineering perspective.</li> <li>Evaluate drainages under 'environmental data' due to Section 401, 404 and riparian qualities in the corridor.</li> <li>Avoid drainages that have riparian vegetation.</li> </ul>
U.S. Bureau of Reclamation (BOR)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The CAP is a BOR-owned facility that conveys Colorado River water to agricultural and municipal users in the Tucson and Phoenix areas.</li> <li>BOR is providing funds to support the rehabilitation of San Carlos Irrigation Project facilities, in addition to preparing an EIS for this effort (see 75 <i>Federal Register</i> 53332).</li> </ul>
U.S. Department of Agriculture Natural Resources Conservation Service	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Include in the development of each alternative, where applicable, the analysis of permanent conversion of prime and unique farmland per the Farmland Protection Policy Act.</li> </ul>
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The purpose and need should clearly identify why the project is being proposed and focus on desired outcomes of the project rather than a pre-determined solution.</li> <li>The range of alternatives should include a no-build alternative, improvements to existing facilities, and alternatives that incorporate transit options.</li> <li>Recommend alternatives be evaluated that incorporate improvements to existing facilities, such as Ironwood Road, Hunt Highway, and SR 87.</li> <li>Recommend focus alternatives west of the CAP canal, where feasible, in order to minimize potential induced growth and habitat fragmentation-related impacts.</li> <li>Recommend coordination with the Federal Transit Administration and METRO in the design and analysis of potential transit options, including the Phoenix-Tucson Interdty Rail.</li> <li>Identify current transit facilities/operations and plans for future expansion.</li> <li>Recommend the Draft EIS identify activities that FHWA, ADOT, and other agencies can take to enhance transit ridership and effectively increase overall mobility throughout the region.</li> <li>Evaluate the need for Clean Water Act Section 404 permits for waters of the U.S. given the proximity to important aquatic resources, including the Gila River, CAP Canal and McDellian Wash.</li> <li>Recommend a Clean Water Act jurisdictional delineation be completed and submitted to the Corps of Engineers for verification prior to release of the Draft EIS.</li> <li>Demonstrate that all potential impacts to waters and wetlands of the U.S. have been avoided and minimized to the greatest extent possible.</li> <li>Include a systematic analysis for drainage crossings that identifies and prioritizes the potential for improvements to the aquatic system and for wildlife use at each crossing, as applicable.</li> <li>Incorporate a buffer zone for the Gila River in the design of alternatives to adequately protect the river from indirect impacts.</li> <li>Recommend estimating temporary and permanent impacts to waters of the U.S. for each alternative studied, including acres of waters impacted.</li> <li>Quantify the benefits from measures and modifications designed to avoid and minimize impacts to</li> </ul>

**Table 2. Written agency comments**

Agency	Comment Summary
	<p>wetland and water resources for each alternative studied and include in the Draft EIS.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The waters assessment for each alternative should be of an appropriate scope and detail to identify sensitive areas or aquatic systems with functions highly susceptible to change. Recommend providing enough information to compare impacts and make a determination of which alternative will have fewer impacts to aquatic resources.</li> <li>• Recommend including the classification of waters and the geographic extent of waters and adjacent riparian areas.</li> <li>• Recommend characterizing and assessing the functional condition of waters and adjacent riparian areas.</li> <li>• Describe the extent and nature of stream channel alteration, riverine corridor continuity, and buffered tributaries.</li> <li>• Include wildlife species affected that could reasonably be expected to use waters or associated riparian habitat and sensitive plant taxa.</li> <li>• Analyze the potential flood flow alteration.</li> <li>• Characterize the hydrologic linkage to any impaired water body.</li> <li>• Analyze the potential water quality impact and potential effects to designated uses.</li> <li>• Address techniques proposed for minimizing surface water contamination due to increased runoff from additional impervious surfaces.</li> <li>• Recommendations for each fully evaluated alternative should include a detailed discussion of ambient air conditions for the study area's attainment or non-attainment status for National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) and potential for air quality impacts (including cumulative and indirect impacts) from construction and operation of the project and include estimates of all criteria pollutant emissions and diesel particulate matter (DPM) in the Draft EIS.</li> <li>• Recommend the disclosure of health risks associated with vehicle emissions and how the proposed project will affect current emission levels.</li> <li>• The Draft EIS should describe any applicable local, state or federal air quality requirements.</li> <li>• The Draft EIS should ensure that the emissions from both the construction and operational phases of the project conform to the approved State Implementation Plan and do not cause or contribute to violations of the NAAQS.</li> <li>• The Draft EIS should describe how any traffic estimates were developed and how these traffic estimates relate to regional transportation estimates included in the regional transportation plan.</li> <li>• Include a construction emissions mitigation plan with the Record of Decision using Best Available Control Measures for PM10, fugitive dust source controls, mobile and stationary source controls, and administrative controls.</li> <li>• Provide a quantitative analysis of the greenhouse gas emissions that will result from implementation of the project and identify measures to minimize and reduce emissions and discuss the full implication of those emissions on the greater Phoenix metropolitan area.</li> <li>• Recommend identifying measures that will be taken to minimize greenhouse gas emissions and promote initiatives to reduce the project's overall carbon footprint.</li> <li>• Concern expressed about the potential indirect impacts (40 CFR Part 1508.8(b)) of this project related to growth-inducement. Improved access to undeveloped areas may affect the location and timing of growth on surrounding lands, leading to indirect impacts to air quality, waters, biological resources, etc.</li> <li>• Suggest preparation of analysis of growth-related impacts early in project development.</li> <li>• Use guidance for preparers of growth-related indirect impact analyses, identifying how the project will affect the location and/or timing of planned growth, types of resources that may be affected by growth, mitigation to reduce impacts, and integrate smart growth and sustainable principles.</li> <li>• Suggest an analysis of potential resources that may be affected by the increased "zone of influence" associated with interchanges and impacting resources outside of the right-of-way.</li> <li>• Suggest including a discussion of mitigation strategies to reduce impacts if adverse impacts cannot be avoided or minimized.</li> <li>• Draft EIS should include discussion of actions that can be taken during project development to foster the implementation of smart growth strategies in the project area, including limiting the number of exits in</li> </ul>

**Table 2. Written agency comments**

Agency	Comment Summary
	<p>rural areas, increasing distance between exits, working with transit providers to ensure multimodal opportunities are available between small communities and job centers, and coordinate with local municipalities in the pursuit of zoning ordinances that encourage smart growth.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cumulative impacts should consider non-transportation projects, such as large-scale developments and approved urban planning that is reasonably foreseeable and identified in city and county planning documents.</li> <li>• The cumulative impact analysis should describe the “identifiable present effects” to various resources attributed to past actions.</li> <li>• Suggest conducting a thorough cumulative impact assessment that includes a complete list of reasonably foreseeable actions, including non-transportation projects.</li> <li>• Suggest identifying potential large, landscape-level regional impacts, as well as potential large-scale mitigation measures.</li> <li>• Identify whether the proposed alternatives may disproportionately and adversely affect low income or minority populations in the surrounding area, and provide appropriate mitigation measures for any adverse impacts.</li> <li>• Provide opportunities for incorporating public input especially in environmental justice communities into the facility design process to promote context sensitive design.</li> <li>• Document the process used for community involvement and communication, including all measures to specifically outreach to potential environmental justice communities. Include an analysis of results achieved by reaching out to these populations.</li> <li>• Assess potential impacts to historic, archeological, and cultural resources and coordinate with affected tribes and other interested parties.</li> <li>• Identify the status of any Memorandum of Understanding with the State Historic Preservation Officer regarding the project.</li> <li>• Document methods for determining potential impacts to cultural/historic resources, address mitigation techniques and coordinate with the State Historic Preservation Officer.</li> <li>• Consider special status species, such as the Desert Tortoise and Tucson Shovel-Nosed snake, among others, and coordinate early with Arizona Game and Fish Department and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service in order to avoid and minimize impacts to species to the greatest extent possible.</li> <li>• Identify all petitioned and listed threatened and endangered species and critical habitat within the project area and assess which species and critical habitats might be directly or indirectly affected by each alternative.</li> <li>• Include the status of the Endangered Species Act Section 7 in the consultation process.</li> <li>• Identify proposed methods to minimize the spread of invasive species and use native plant and tree species where revegetation is planned.</li> <li>• Clearly demonstrate compliance with Section 4(f) (49 U.S.C. 303).</li> </ul>
Town of Queen Creek	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suggest keeping alternatives west of CAP between Apache Junction and Queen Creek.</li> <li>• Consider using a western route until the intersection of the Union Pacific Railroad and the Magma Railroad.</li> <li>• Use of an eastern route would locate the proposed freeway in close proximity to SR 79, thus minimizing the regional benefits of the corridor.</li> </ul>
Western Area Power Administration	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerned with activities under transmission lines, towers, conductors, etc.</li> <li>• Concerned with impacts to sensitive natural and cultural resources.</li> </ul>

### 3 Study Briefings and Presentations

In keeping with the study's Public Involvement Plan, ADOT provided briefings to elected officials, as well as presentations to council meetings, work sessions and teams prior to the public scoping meetings. Presentations and briefings were provided to the entities listed in Table 3.

**Table 3.** Study briefings and presentations

Agency	Date of Briefing
Coolidge City Council Work Session	October 11, 2010
Pinal County Board of Supervisors –Individual	October 12, 2010
Eloy City Council – Individual	October 18, 2010
Casa Grande City Council Work Session	October 18, 2010
Apache Junction City Council Work Session	October 18, 2010
Gila River Indian Community Transportation Technical Team	October 19, 2010

A summary of comments, questions, and issues expressed at the briefings is included below:

- Ensure planned and existing development within the study area is considered and incorporate changes related to these developments into the study.
- Consider adjacent studies and projects, and previous planning efforts in the study process.
- Prioritize regional transportation improvements based on community needs.
- Need to maintain regional mobility.
- Questions related to the planning, growth and development assumptions used to support the need for the proposed transportation corridor.
- Support the effort to plan ahead of projected growth.
- Support for the proposed transportation corridor due to anticipated growth and urbanization.
- Concern regarding whether the proposed transportation corridor will induce growth.
- Maintain community cohesion.
- Minimize negative impacts to the local economy.
- Support the economic benefits the proposed transportation corridor may bring to the local community.
- Coordinate with local municipalities, utilities and environmental agencies to protect open space.
- Concern regarding potential impacts the proposed transportation corridor may have on threatened and endangered species.
- Concerns regarding potential impacts to air quality.
- Concern for the protection of prehistoric and historic cultural resources within the study area.
- Concern related to subsidence near CAP facilities in the Eloy and Coolidge area
- Incorporate utilities and their associated districts into the study.
- Integrate commuter rail and other multimodal transportation options into the study.
- Preferences expressed regarding the location and design of the proposed transportation corridor and corridor-associated improvements:

- Provide a connection with the proposed SR 802 (SR 24) and US 60 alignments.
- Locate the corridor on the west side of the Corridor Opportunity Area to best serve existing communities.
- Locate the corridor west of Picacho Mountain and avoid Mount Newman.
- Consider utilizing previously disturbed areas in locating the corridor.
- Locate traffic interchanges to allow access to cities and population centers.
- Consider economic development, job creation, and sustainability in corridor location process.
- Utilize existing linear corridors to limit right-of-way impacts.
- Accommodate farming activities in design (e.g., bridge widths, etc.).
- Concerns regarding the lack of funding for the design and construction of the corridor. Consider P3 funding options.
- Address freight movement in the study.
- Question regarding the right-of-way acquisition process (full and partial acquisitions).
- Questions regarding the study schedule and process.
- Comment regarding whether public input is an important component of the study process.
- Suggestion to form non-political working group.

In addition, the following organizations were recommended during the briefings and presentations as entities that may be interested in a study-related presentation:

- Central Arizona Regional Economic Development Foundation
- Copper Corridor Economic Development Council
- Economic Development Group of Eloy
- Pinal County Government Alliance
- Pinal Partnership

## 4 Public Scoping

### 4.1 Public Scoping Notification Flier

The study team prepared and distributed a self-mailing informational notification flier (Appendix F) inviting recipients to four public scoping meetings hosted at the locations listed in Table 4.

**Table 4.** Public scoping meetings

Date	Location
Tuesday, Oct. 19, 2010	Union Center at Merrill Ranch 3925 North Sun City Boulevard Florence, AZ 85132
Thursday, Oct. 21, 2010	Picacho Elementary School 17865 South Vail Road Picacho, AZ 85141
Tuesday, Oct. 26, 2010	Apache Junction High School 2525 South Ironwood Drive Apache Junction, AZ 85120
Thursday, Oct. 28, 2010	Skyline Ranch K-8 School 1084 West San Tan Hills Drive Queen Creek, AZ 85143

The notification included information about the study and an invitation for recipients to attend any of four scoping meetings. The flier was mailed on October 5, 2010, to approximately 4,600 residents, businesses, government officials and other key stakeholders and interested parties in the study area. It was e-mailed to approximately 1,950 stakeholders on October 6, 2010.

### 4.2 Newspaper Display Notices

Four newspaper display notices announcing the public scoping meetings were published, as noted in Table 5.

**Table 5.** Newspaper notices

Media	Publish Date	Distribution	Circulation
<i>Tri-Valley Dispatch</i>	Oct. 6, 2010	Casa Grande, Eloy, Picacho, Florence	16,000
<i>East Valley Tribune</i>	Oct. 8, 2010	Queen Creek, Gilbert	100,000
<i>Apache Junction/Gold Canyon Independent</i>	Oct. 13, 2010	Apache Junction, Gold Canyon	20,000
<i>Queen Creek/San Tan Valley Independent</i>	Oct. 13, 2010	Queen Creek, San Tan Valley	15,000

The newspaper notice is attached in Appendix G.

### 4.3 Web Site

The study web site was developed and the web address was published on all informational materials. Public scoping meeting information and project details were provided on the web site:  
[www.azdot.gov/northsouthcorridorstudy](http://www.azdot.gov/northsouthcorridorstudy).



## 4.4 Public Scoping Meetings

The purpose of the public scoping meetings was to provide an overview of the study process, discuss the environmental and engineering processes and schedule, present the Corridor Opportunity Area and provide the opportunity for the public to ask questions and provide feedback. Each meeting was held from 6 to 8 p.m. and was identical in presentation content. At each meeting, attendees signed in and were given packets of information, which included an agenda, fact sheet with Corridor Opportunity Area information, frequently asked questions, comment form and question card.

Each meeting included a formal presentation at 6:15 p.m., followed by a question-and-answer session, and maps and displays were available for review and comment. A copy of the presentation and display boards are attached (Appendix H). Attendance at each meeting location is documented in Table 6.

**Table 6.** Meeting attendance

Date	Location	Attendance
Tuesday, Oct. 19, 2010	Union Center at Merrill Ranch, Florence	52
Thursday, Oct. 21, 2010	Picacho Elementary School, Picacho	14
Tuesday, Oct. 26, 2010	Apache Junction High School, Apache Junction	55
Thursday, Oct. 28, 2010	Skyline Ranch K-8 School, Queen Creek	29
Total		150

The sign-in sheets for the public scoping meetings are attached in Appendix I.

## 4.5 Public Scoping Comment Summary

During the scoping comment period, comments could be submitted in a variety of ways, including in writing (e.g., comment survey or comment form), by telephone, e-mail, fax and at the public meetings. Meeting attendees were encouraged to complete and submit comments by November 11, 2010. Copies of the written comments received are attached (Appendix J).

### 4.5.1 Summary of Comments Received

A comment survey was distributed at the public meetings whereby citizens could rank environmental and engineering issues by importance, list preferences for evaluating future corridor locations and write questions and comments to be submitted to the study team (Appendix J). Eleven comment forms were submitted and the top three environmental issues identified were:

- Economic development
- Air quality
- Threatened and endangered species

Additional issues of concern listed were: aesthetics/visual resource, water resources, employment, noise, land use, hazardous contamination and community cohesion.

The comment survey asked respondents to provide feedback regarding issues to be considered as the study team identifies corridor alternatives. Of the comments forms submitted, the following issues received the most responses:

- Improve access to US 60 and I-10
- Maintain existing local roads and highways
- Improve public transportation services (e.g., bus, rail, etc.)
- Improve local traffic and circulation

The comment survey also asked if respondents agreed with the purpose and need for the study, as presented. The following purpose and need elements received the most responses:

- Accommodate projected traffic to relieve anticipated congestion
- Relieve I-10 traffic
- Provide a direct connection to the eastern portion of the Phoenix metropolitan area

A quantification of all comments (e.g., comment survey, question and answer card, letter, e-mail, etc.) by issue is provided in Table 7. In general, comments were received via comment survey, letter, e-mail, and at the public scoping meetings. The study team received 13 comment surveys, three letters, two e-mails, and 38 comments/questions were submitted during the public meetings. A total of 56 comments were received during the scoping period. Responses were typically submitted via the method in which the comment was received (e.g., e-mailed comments were responded to via e-mail).

**Table 7.** Issues received

Issue	Number Received
Agency coordination	2
Air quality	5
Community cohesion	2
Cultural resources	3
Cumulative impacts	1
Design	20
Employment	2
Existing and planned development	2
Fissures	1
Funding/public private partnership	6
General public involvement	9
General transportation	3
Hazardous materials	3
Land use	4
Multimodal options	3
Noise	4
Rail connection	2
Recreation and open space preservation	2
Socioeconomic impact/real property	12
Study process	6
Study purpose and need	2

**Table 7. Issues received**

Issue	Number Received
Threatened and endangered species	4
Traffic	2
Utilities	1
Visual/aesthetic resources	4
Water resources	3
Wildlife	1
Non-project related	4

In addition to the comment surveys which allowed commenters to rank issues of importance, comments were also submitted, either at the public scoping meetings or following, with specific details pertaining to the following issues:

### **Agency Coordination**

Comments provided encouraged the study team to coordinate with relevant local and state entities and agencies.

The study team coordinates regularly with federal, state, and local agencies and stakeholders throughout the entire study process.

### **Air Quality**

Comments submitted to the study team regarding air quality urged an evaluation of air quality and greenhouse gas emissions given the introduction of the proposed facility and additional vehicular traffic in the Pinal County area. In addition, one commenter recommended that the study team produce a dust mitigation plan during construction of the facility.

The study team will provide both an existing conditions and environmental impact evaluation pertaining to air quality, following the completion of the ASR, for inclusion in the EIS.

### **Cultural Resources**

The comments submitted pertaining to cultural resources supported additional study and inventory and avoidance or preservation of potential historic areas.

The study team will conduct a comprehensive cultural resources evaluation as well as coordinate with the State Historic Preservation Office during the refinement of the Corridor Opportunity Area for inclusion in the EIS.

### **Design**

The majority of comments submitted were design-related and included comments such as:

- Consider locations that will be completed most expeditiously
- Consider connections to SR 802 (SR 24), US 60 and I-10
- Consider expanding existing roads
- Why use undeveloped land?

- Follow the CAP canal
- Consider alternatives that will provide connections to other roads and will save money
- When will east-west connections be made?

Comments related to the design of the corridor will be considered during the development as part of the Alternatives Selection Report (ASR), which is the next phase of study.

### **Existing and Planned Development**

Several commenters also urged the study team to avoid existing development and areas where planned development will occur. Comments were also provided regarding the inclusion of the Florence Copper project and Superstition Vistas development in the study process.

Planned developments to 2020 were avoided during the development of the Corridor Opportunity Area and will be considered as areas to avoid in future alternatives evaluations. Coordination with development projects within the study occurs throughout the study process. The Superstition Vistas area is within the future planning area, and the study team is using information from the Superstition Vistas Plan, as well as information regarding other future planned development in the area.

### **Fissures**

Comments expressed concern related to the many fissures in the study area, and the stability of these fissures after groundwater has been utilized by pending development.

Fissures and ground subsidence are among the factors being considered in developing and evaluating alternative alignments for the corridor.

### **Funding/Public Private Partnership**

Six comments were submitted regarding study funding and how project construction would be funded. Representative comments included:

- What is the funding source for future phases of the project?
- How is funding obtained?
- Are toll roads being considered?
- Will public private partnerships be considered and/or developed?
- Will this study use economic stimulus funding?

Comments regarding project funding were responded to with an explanation that the study is currently funded; however, a funding source for construction has not yet been identified. The current study is following a federal process, in order to be able to use federal funds in the future. A public private partnership is one type of funding option for the construction phase of the project, if approved. This study will not utilize economic stimulus funds, as those funds are reserved for “shovel ready” projects.

### **General Public Involvement**

Comments categorized as general public involvement included all comments submitted about public meeting logistics, and requests for more information. A suggestion was made to hold meetings during the November to May timeframe, since many people travel away from Arizona during the summer months.

## **General Transportation**

Comments categorized as general transportation included support for a North-South corridor to be constructed, and support for access to adjacent cities, towns, and landmarks. In addition, comments were provided regarding potential traffic impacts, both local and regional, the corridor may have on residential and commercial property and development.

Responses to general transportation comments were noted and specific questions about multimodal options were relayed to the appropriate ADOT representative, study team members, or local agency. Traffic studies will be conducted as part of the L/DCR.

## **Recreation/Open Space**

Several comments urged the study team to preserve the existing recreational and open space areas as identified by Pinal County, as well as considering the impact of a transportation route on opportunities for quiet recreation.

The study team will inventory existing and proposed recreational and open space areas during the ASR process and will include an evaluation of impacts to these areas in the EIS.

## **Multimodal Options**

Comments provided were both supportive and unsupportive of multimodal options. Comments urged the study team to evaluate the potential of a multimodal system within the corridor. The concept of a dual corridor for rail and vehicular traffic was recommended for the area between Phoenix and Tucson.

Multimodal options are being evaluated as part of this study. In addition, the study team is coordinating with the Phoenix-Tucson Intercity Rail study team regarding the potential integration of multimodal options.

## **Rail Connection**

Two comments were submitted regarding a potential rail connection or use of rail for freight hauling. Responses to rail-related comments were taken into consideration by the study team and/or shared with ADOT Multimodal Planning representatives for inclusion in other rail studies as appropriate.

## **Socioeconomic Impact/Real Property**

Six comments were submitted regarding socioeconomic impact, property value, and property acquisition process. Comments were submitted that questioned the growth projections used for the study given the economic downturn and urged the study team to re-evaluate socioeconomic data being used to reflect current conditions for growth. Of the comments submitted regarding property acquisition, the majority of the commenters were not supportive of their properties being acquired and expressed concern regarding the impact to property values.

Specific information about property acquisition and future economic impacts was not available during this initial stage of the study. It is ADOT's goal to locate this corridor in a location that avoids or minimizes adverse impacts on existing development.

## **Study Process**

Comments categorized as study process included comments about the study schedule, timing of construction or when the freeway would be operational, and development of the materials presented. Representative comments about study process included:

- Why does ADOT conduct studies so far in advance of construction?
- Who decides what projects get priority?
- How do projects get prioritized?
- How are previous studies' recommendations incorporated?
- When will the freeway be operational?

Responses to study process comments included an explanation that the study must follow federal guidelines to be considered for federal funding. The current process will identify a corridor to help preserve right-of-way ahead of development. Information was also provided regarding the prioritization process for ADOT projects. Information and recommendations from previous studies are considered in the study process.

## **Study Purpose and Need**

Comments questioned the need for the study and further asked what problem the study was addressing.

Responses provided explained that planned growth (identified by local agencies) in the Sun Corridor show the need for this corridor. Studies identifying the need for the corridor have been ongoing since 2003.

## **Utilities**

One comment was submitted regarding on-going utility projects in the area, specifically SRP-related projects. This comment urged the study team to coordinate with utility services during the alternatives development phase of the study.

The study team will coordinate with utilities located within the study area.

## **Wildlife**

One comment was submitted pertaining to wildlife and included suggestions that the study team include an evaluation of threatened and endangered species and an evaluation of the affect of the potential facility on wildlife crossings, and the introduction of invasive species. Concern was also expressed regarding the potential fragmentation and loss of habitat. The comment recommended that the study look to mitigate impacts to wildlife and habitat.

The study team will complete comprehensive biological analysis that includes an evaluation of wildlife, flora and fauna, threatened and endangered species, existing habitat and wildlife crossings as part of the EIS.

## **Non-Project Related**

Comments regarding other projects adjacent to the study area were received and these questions have been submitted to the appropriate study team representatives.

## 4.5.2 Comment Summary Map

During each public scoping meeting, maps were displayed for attendees to view and provide comment. Appendix K shows a summary of all comments provided on the maps during the public scoping meetings.

## 4.5.3 Public Meeting Survey Results

A meeting survey was also distributed at the public scoping meetings. The survey contained five questions. Thirteen responses to this survey were received. A summary of the responses to each question is documented in Table 8 and attached in Appendix L.

**Table 8.** Public scoping meeting survey responses

Question	Response
How did you hear about the meeting?	Invite: 1 Newspaper: 6 E-Mail: 4 Friend: 2 Other: 2 (City Council Meeting and Town Committee)
How helpful were the following resources in your understanding of the project?	Display Boards: 4 (very helpful); 6 (somewhat helpful) Handouts: 5 (very helpful); 3 (somewhat helpful); 1 (not helpful) Presentation: 7 (very helpful); 2 (somewhat helpful); Staff/Study Team: 5 (very helpful); 2 (somewhat helpful)
How would you rate this facility for holding future meetings?	Tuesday, Oct. 19 (Union Center at Merrill Ranch, Florence) • Very good: 6 respondents Thursday, Oct. 21 (Picacho Elementary School, Picacho) • Very good: 1 respondent Tuesday, Oct. 26 (Apache Junction High School, Apache Junction) • Very good: 1 respondent • Good: 1 respondent
What methods or aspects of the public meeting and public process do you like best and least?	Best: • Visuals were very good • Meeting format (presentation, question and answer, and open house) • Meeting was well organized Least: • Direction and signage was not good, and location was hard to find. Facility looked closed and empty. Small sporadic signs were difficult to read (Oct. 19 meeting location). • Did not like the one-on-one aspect.
What can we do to improve the process?	• Improve meeting notification • Team did a great job • Hold the presentation away from the display tables and project team. Both are individually valuable and should be freely accessible throughout the time allotted.





## Appendix A

---

### Notice of Intent



## Appendix B

---

### Agency Scoping Meeting Invitation Letter



## Appendix C

---

### Agency Scoping Meeting Attendance



## Appendix D

---

### Agency Scoping Meeting Presentation and Displays





## Appendix E

---

### Agency Scoping Written Comments



## Appendix F

---

### Public Scoping Meeting Notification Flier



## Appendix G

---

### Public Scoping Meeting Newspaper Notices



## Appendix H

---

### Public Scoping Meeting Presentation and Displays





## Appendix I

---

### Public Scoping Meeting Attendance



## Appendix J

---

### Public Scoping Meeting Written Comments



## Appendix K

---

### Public Scoping Meeting Comment Summary Map



## Appendix L

---

### Meeting Survey

*This page is intentionally left blank.*



# CONNECT North-South Corridor Study

Potential New  
Transportation Route

from US 60



to Interstate 10

## SUMMARY OF STAKEHOLDER AND PUBLIC OUTREACH AND PREFERENCES ON POSSIBLE ROUTE ALTERNATIVES

### NORTH-SOUTH CORRIDOR STUDY

ADOT Project No.: 999 PN 000 H7454 01L  
Federal Aid No.: STP-999-A(365)X

**Prepared for:**  
Arizona Department of Transportation



**Prepared by:**  
GORDLEY GROUP  
2540 N. Tucson Blvd.  
Tucson, AZ 85716

HDR ENGINEERING, INC.  
3200 E. Camelback Road, Ste. 350  
Phoenix, AZ 85018

March 2012

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION.....	2
AGENCY STAKEHOLDER OUTREACH.....	3
Overview .....	3
Preferences.....	3
PUBLIC WORKSHOPS .....	7
Overview .....	7
Notification .....	7
Workshops .....	7
Participation .....	8
Comments.....	8
Most Important Factors in their Selection for a Possible Route Alternative.....	9
Themes.....	9
Toll Roads .....	9
Themes.....	10
Public Workshop Segment Preferences.....	10
Segment Themes.....	11
Additional Comment Themes.....	13
Other Comments Received .....	13
Themes.....	13

## FIGURES

Figure 1. Local Agency Preferences .....	4
Figure 2. Regional, State and Federal Agency Preferences.....	5
Figure 3. Public Preferences.....	12

## TABLES

Table 1. Agency Preferences.....	6
Table 2. Public Workshop Newspaper Circulation .....	7
Table 3. Public Workshop Participation .....	8
Table 4. Most Important Factors .....	9
Table 5. Toll Road Preferences .....	9
Table 6. Public Segment Preferences.....	10

## APPENDICES

Appendix A. Nov. 1, 2011, Agency Stakeholder Progress Meeting Minutes
Appendix B. Summary of Agency Stakeholder Preferences Regarding Possible Route Alternatives
Appendix C. Public Workshop Notification
Appendix D. Public Workshop Materials
Appendix E. Public Workshop Comments on Factors
Appendix F. Public Workshop Comments on Funding
Appendix G. Public Workshop Comments on Segments
Appendix H. Public Workshop Comment Form Summary
Appendix I. Public Workshop Additional Comments

## INTRODUCTION

This document summarizes the agency and public outreach and input received on possible route alternatives for the North–South Corridor during the fall and winter of 2011.

Following the scoping phase of the study, the team developed a number of possible route alternatives based on agency and public input and detailed analysis of drainage, utilities, ground water subsidence and fissures, and economic development opportunities in the area.

The study team will further screen the possible route alternatives by using the input received from the agency and public outreach, along with detailed screening criteria, to recommend a smaller set of alternatives to carry forward into the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) and Location/Design Concept Report (L/DCR).

# AGENCY STAKEHOLDER OUTREACH

## **Overview**

The Arizona Department of Transportation and Federal Highway Administration meet regularly with North–South Corridor Study agency stakeholders to discuss study progress and obtain feedback.

At the Nov. 1, 2011, stakeholder progress meeting, the study team gave an overview of the screening process and reviewed updated route alternatives. The study team requested feedback from agency stakeholders on the possible route alternatives via an eight-page Agency Stakeholder Input Form.

The Agency Stakeholder Input Form (also available electronically) included each segment of the possible route alternatives and asked whether the agency finds a particular segment favorable or unfavorable, and why. Only one form was accepted per agency; it was assumed that the study representatives for each agency would obtain the input necessary to complete the form. Completed forms were due back by Dec. 12, 2011. A total of 17 forms were received.

Meeting minutes for the Nov. 1, 2011, stakeholder progress meeting are in Appendix A.

## **Preferences**

Local agencies in general favored:

- The end of Superstition Freeway terminus over the two other northern termini.
- Central alternatives paralleling the Central Arizona Project canal.
- The furthest of the eastern alternatives in the southern half, along with the terminus two miles east of the existing SR 87 interchange.

Local agencies in general did not favor:

- The western alternatives.
- The far eastern alternatives in the northern half.

In general, regional, state and federal agencies combined favored:

- The Ironwood Road terminus over the two other northern termini and the SR 87 interchange over the other southern terminus.
- The use of existing routes such as Ironwood Road, Hunt Highway and SR 87 over all other route alternatives.

In general, regional, state and federal agencies combined did not favor:

- The far eastern segment in the middle of the corridor.

Figure 1 (below) provides a graphic overview of local agency preferences. Figure 2 (below) provides a graphic overview of regional, state and federal agency preferences. The preferences range from red (unfavorable) to green (favorable). A detailed report of agency stakeholder input is in Appendix B.

North-South Corridor Study DRAFT Summary of Stakeholder and Public Outreach and Preferences for Possible Route Alternatives  
ADOT Project No.: 999 PN 000 H7454 01L, Federal Aid No.: STP-999-A(365)X  
Page 4 of 13





North-South Corridor Study DRAFT Summary of Stakeholder and Public Outreach and Preferences for Possible Route Alternatives  
ADOT Project No.: 999 PN 000 H7454 01L, Federal Aid No.: STP-999-A(365)X  
Page 5 of 13



Table 1. Agency Preferences

SEGMENT	FAVORABLE	UNFAVORABLE	NO RESPONSE
A	8	7	2
B	8	5	4
C	6	3	8
D	7	3	7
E	5	4	8
F	7	2	8
G	7	0	10
H	6	2	9
I	7	4	6
J	4	7	6
K	3	6	8
L	4	3	10
M	3	7	7
N	2	10	5
O	2	7	8
P	3	4	10
Q	2	6	9
R	2	11	4
S	1	11	5
T	1	9	7
U	3	6	8
V	3	5	9
W	0	11	6
X	3	5	9
Y	5	5	7
Z	7	5	5
AA	7	5	5
AB	4	4	9
AC	2	6	9
AD	4	5	8
AE	2	7	8
AF	3	7	7
AG	2	6	9
AH	4	5	8
AI	3	4	10
AJ	3	4	10
AK	5	4	8
AL	5	4	8
AM	4	4	9
AN	4	4	9
AO	2	5	10

# PUBLIC WORKSHOPS

## Overview

ADOT and FHWA held a series of four public workshops for the North-South Corridor study in the first two weeks of December 2011. The workshops were held in Eloy, Apache Junction, Coolidge and San Tan Valley. The objective of the public workshops was to provide an update about the study's progress and timeline, and present the possible route alternative segments for public review and feedback.

## Notification

- Week of Nov. 14, 2011: Official public workshop notification was emailed to government officials, an internal memorandum was sent to ADOT management and notification was posted on the study's official website.
- Wednesday, Nov. 16, 2011: Newsprint advertisements were published in local newspapers within the study corridor.
- Tuesday, Nov. 22, 2011: Public workshop invitation/announcement was mailed via USPS to approximately 51,500 residents, businesses and stakeholders in the study area.
- Wednesday, Nov. 30, 2011: News release was issued to local media within the study corridor area

*Table 2. Public Workshop Newspaper Circulation*

NEWSPAPER	CIRCULATION
East Valley Tribune	100,000
Tri-Valley Dispatch	23,000
Apache Junction/Gold Canyon Independent	18,261
Queen Creek/San Tan Valley Independent	16,049
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>157,310</b>

See Appendix C for copies of the notification documents and a map of the mailing area.

## Workshops

All meetings were held from 6 to 8 p.m. and were identical in content. Each meeting began with an open house format. Attendees were given a packet of information that included a comment form, agenda, fact sheet, frequently asked questions document and glossary of terms. Attendees were seated randomly in groups at tables, where detailed aerial maps of the study were available to view and reference.

A presentation was given at 6:15 p.m. At three of the workshops, ADOT Senior Community Relations Officer Teresa Guillen began the presentation. At one workshop, ADOT CCP Assistant Communication Director Teresa Welborn began the presentation. At all workshops, ADOT Predesign Project Manager Javier Gurrola gave an overview of the study, and Kimley-Horn and Associates Project Manager Dave Perkins gave an overview of the alternatives. After the presentation, study team members circulated throughout the room to facilitate completion of the comment form and answer questions.



Displays were available for attendees to view and take-home information was available regarding the study's purpose and need, engineering and environmental elements, schedule and process. Additionally, representatives from ADOT and its consultants from the Intercity Rail Study, U.S. 60 and SR 24 projects were available to answer questions, including topics such as right of way and noise mitigation.

See Appendix D for copies of workshop documents, the presentation and display boards.

## **Participation**

*Table 3. Public Workshop Participation*

<b>DATE</b>	<b>LOCATION</b>	<b>SIGNED IN</b>	<b>FORMS</b>
Tues., Dec. 6	Santa Cruz Valley Union High School Cafeteria, Eloy	19	2
Wed., Dec. 7	Moose Lodge Large Meeting Room, Apache Junction	75	9
Thurs., Dec. 8	Coolidge-Florence Elks Lodge Banquet Room, Coolidge	106	33
Mon., Dec. 12	Walker Butte Elementary School Cafeteria, San Tan Valley	69	27

Most workshop participants chose to take the comment forms with them after the workshop to complete at a later time. The comment form was also available online. The study team requested that comment forms be returned by Jan. 12, 2012, in order to be included in the workshop summaries.

The team received phone calls and emails weeks before the public workshops and during the comment period.

Total participation was 269 attendees, 205 comment forms, eight phone calls, two letters and 35 emails through Jan. 12, 2012.

## **Comments**

The public comment forms were designed to request feedback on a total of 41 possible route alternative segments. Respondents could mark any segment as favorable or unfavorable and provide a reason for their answer. Space was provided for additional comments. Respondents could also draw lines on the provided maps to show where they thought a possible route alternative should be placed. They were not required to comment on every segment. The comment form also included two questions unrelated to the segments that asked respondents to place a checkmark next to the three most important factors in selecting a possible route alternative, and if they would support and/or use a new highway if it were tolled.

## Most Important Factors in Respondents' Selection for a Possible Route Alternative

Table 4. Most Important Factors

Respondents ranked the factors as follows	Responses
Least impact to existing development	103
Best connects to other major routes	94
Best relieves traffic on local streets	62
Best connects to cities/towns	55
Best relieves traffic on other highways/freeways	51
Best connects to employment centers	39
Makes best use of existing roads/highways	33
Input received from public	33
Other	30
Lowest cost	29
Best connects to other destinations	23
Least impact to planned development	22
Least impact to natural areas/open space	21
Input received from local government	11

### Themes

For the "Other" selection, the majority of comments reiterated or clarified already selected factors.

- Input from local government – 7
- Input from local property owners – 6
- Direct connection – 3
- Economic development – 3
- Least impact on residents – 3
- Best long-term solution – 2

A summary of the comments received regarding the most important factors is in Appendix E.

### Toll Roads

Respondents were asked if they would support a toll road, use a toll road or would not support a toll road, and why. Some respondents marked that they would both use and support a toll road.

Table 5. Toll Road Preferences

Will support	14		
Will use	14		
Will support and use	49		
<b>Total support/use</b>	<b>77</b>	<b>Will not support or use</b>	<b>102</b>

## Themes

Sixty-nine respondents included a reason for their answer.

- Depends on the cost of the toll – 13
- They already pay taxes/it would be an additional cost – 10
- Would divert traffic, causing more congestion elsewhere – 8
- Potential for corruption – 6
- Would be better than nothing – 5
- Toll would never go away – 5
- Foreign investors – 3

A summary of the comments received regarding the toll road is in Appendix F.

## Public Workshop Segment Preferences

Table 6. Public Workshop Segment Preferences

SEGMENT	FAVORABLE	UNFAVORABLE	NO RESPONSE
A	86	73	39
B	54	107	37
C	23	108	67
D	68	78	52
E	52	83	63
F	46	91	61
G	65	68	65
H	60	80	58
I	100	42	56
J	81	51	66
K	36	84	78
L	44	81	74
M	33	73	92
N	22	77	99
O	71	52	75
P	39	81	78
Q	67	67	64
R	24	82	92
S	34	78	86
T	24	89	85
U	28	82	88
V	32	77	89
W	30	83	85
X	63	58	77
Y	54	61	83
Z	61	52	85

AA	59	49	<b>90</b>
AB	51	41	<b>107</b>
AC	37	50	<b>111</b>
AD	77	23	<b>98</b>
AE	29	61	<b>108</b>
AF	21	62	<b>115</b>
AG	18	65	<b>115</b>
AH	62	34	<b>103</b>
AI	31	55	<b>112</b>
AJ	32	53	<b>113</b>
AK	52	36	<b>110</b>
AL	69	29	<b>100</b>
AM	45	42	<b>111</b>
AN	60	35	<b>103</b>
AO	27	53	<b>118</b>
<b>SEGMENT</b>	<b>FAVORABLE</b>	<b>UNFAVORABLE</b>	<b>NO RESPONSE</b>

### ***Segment Themes***

Respondents gave varying opinions on why they found a segment favorable or unfavorable.

When respondents found a segment favorable, the most common reasons were:

- Less impact to existing residents, businesses, farms – 227
- Provides a direct connection to major highways – 188
- Provides good access for local residents – 64
- Uses existing routes – 52
- Aligns with local government preferences – 48
- Good for economic development – 38
- Less cost – 34
- Relieves traffic – 24


When respondents found a segment unfavorable, the most common reasons were:

- More impact to existing residents, businesses, farms – 265
- Less direct route – 112
- Unnecessary or redundant – 62
- Too much cost – 42
- Uses existing route – 28
- Preserves current surface roads – 28

Figure 4 (below) represents the public's segment preferences. The preferences range from red (unfavorable) to green (favorable).

A summary of the comments received per segment is in Appendix G.

Figure 4. Public Preferences



### ***Additional Comment Themes***

In the section for additional comments on the comment form, respondents provided additional information.

- Avoid existing roads and neighborhoods/use open lands – 29
- Use existing roadways – 18
- Think about economic development – 13
- Follow input from local government – 10
- Concern about environmental factors – 9
- Keep construction costs low – 8
- Use mass transit or multimodal options – 7
- Don't build the road – 6

A summary of all comment forms received is in Appendix H.

### **Other Comments Received**

In addition to the comment form, the team received 44 comments by telephone and email between Nov. 15, 2011 (when the first notification was published), and Jan. 12, 2012 (the end of the comment period).

### ***Themes***

- Avoid existing roads and neighborhoods/use open lands – 17
- Request more information – 9
- Supports project – 7
- Use existing roadways – 5
- Use the most direct route – 4

A summary of those comments is in Appendix I.

## **APPENDIX A**

### **Nov. 1, 2011, Agency Stakeholder Progress Meeting Minutes**

Subject:	North-South Stakeholder Progress Meeting #8
Date and time:	November 1, 2011, 1:00 pm
Location:	HDR—Grand Canyon Conference Room, 3200 E. Camelback, Suite 350, Phoenix
Project:	North–South Corridor Study I-10 to US 60, Pinal County, Arizona Federal Aid No. STP-999-A(BBM) ADOT Project No. 999 PN 000 H7454 01L

*Corrections/Updates to this document should be submitted to Trent Kelso (trent.kelso@hdrinc.com)*

## Introductions and Attendees (See attached sign-in sheet)

1. J. Gurrola said that the meeting handouts were sent via email to those individuals telephoning into the meeting. Attendees proceeded with self-introductions.

## Public Involvement

### 1. Upcoming Public Meetings

- a. A. Brown said that four meetings are being planned at the locations listed below. The team made the decision to add a fourth meeting in the San Tan Valley area.
  - i. Tuesday, December 6<sup>th</sup>, Eloy  
Santa Cruz Valley Union High School
  - ii. Wednesday, December 7<sup>th</sup>, Apache Junction  
Moose Lodge Large Meeting Room
  - iii. Thursday, December 8<sup>th</sup>, Coolidge/Florence area  
Elks Lodge Banquet Room
  - iv. **Monday, December 12<sup>th</sup>, San Tan Valley  
Walker Butte Elementary School**
- b. Official public notification will occur during the week of November 14<sup>th</sup>.
- c. A comprehensive public comment form is being developed to obtain input on the route alternatives.

## Stage 1 Modal Alternatives Screening (See Handout)

1. T. Kelso reviewed the preliminary results of the Stage 1 Modal screening that included Transportation Systems Management (TSM), Travel Demand Management (TDM), Transit, and upgrading the arterials within the study area.
  - a. The team estimates that approximately 51% of future study area travel demand will be addressed by the base transportation network.
  - b. The team estimates that approximately 3% of future study area travel demand could be addressed by TDM/TSM. Examples of TDM include telecommuting and flexible work week schedules. Examples of TSM include synchronizing traffic signals and HOV lanes.
  - c. The team estimates that approximately 4% of future study area travel demand could be addressed by transit. This is consistent with the assumed transit use in the Statewide Framework Program.



- d. To evaluate the impact of upgrading the arterial network, the team assumed that the 2040 CAAG most optimistic revenue scenario roadway scenario would be implemented. The model showed that these improvements would satisfy approximately 16% of future travel demand.
- e. The analysis shows that the future transportation network with the modal alternatives (TDM/TSM, transit, arterial improvements) will not be able to accommodate approximately 25% of the projected demand in the study area. Modeling of a high-capacity transportation facility demonstrates that it would satisfy approximately 16% of the unmet demand, demonstrating that even with all of these modal alternatives, there would still be approximately 10% unmet demand in the study area.
- f. S. Boggs stated that there might be a different capture rate of transit depending on whether the transportation facility is included or not included. S. Boggs stated that transit capture might be a little lower in the "TSM/TDM/Transit without a Major Transportation Facility" than the 4% assumed.
- g. M. Kies suggested that the transit component would not only include High Capacity Transit, but that the local jurisdictions also need to plan a need for local transit facilities.
- h. A. Smith asked whether this analysis supports a need for improvements to existing facilities such as SR 79. T. Kelso responded in the affirmative, and stated that the baseline 2050 roadway network assumes that improvements to existing state highways, such as providing 6-lanes on SR 79 and 10 lanes on I-10, would already be in place.
- i. M. Lucero asked whether the modal percentages were held constant for each analysis. T. Kelso agreed that there may be minor differences in percentages allocated to each travel mode; however, for this exercise the modal percentages were held constant.
- j. K. Killough emphasized that a gravity model was not used for this process. The analysis was based on the 2050 sketch planning tool.

## **Review Updated Route Alternatives**

---

- 1. D. Perkins stated that the route alternatives were revised per input received since the October, 2011 Stakeholder meeting.
  - a. The Town of Florence requested adding an alternative north of the CAP near the town to address concerns of area land owners. The Town of Florence also requested some modifications to alignments that were shown west of Attaway to be shifted to Quail Run Lane.
  - b. A connection from SR 24 to Ironwood Drive, west of the CAP was added to address FHWA comments.
  - c. Connections between the eastern alternatives and the western alternative along Ironwood Drive were added to address FHWA comments.
  - d. S. Boggs asked why the alternative along Hunt Highway has a bump in it. D. Perkins stated that the Core Team decided that an alternative on the Gila River Indian Community would not be developed unless specifically requested by the Community.
  - e. B. Wilbrink asked whether there should be a gap between the east and west alternatives within the SR 24 study area. D. Perkins replied that the gap was intentional since none of the route alternatives were located in the area.

## **Agency/Stakeholder Route Alternative Input (See Handouts)**

---

- 1. D. Perkins distributed an 8-page Stakeholder Agency Input Form and two 11x17 color plots of the final route alternatives.
  - a. D. Perkins explained that the stakeholders/agencies should provide input on route alternative segments using the distributed 8-page form. The form includes each segment of the route alternatives and asks whether the agency finds a particular segment favorable or unfavorable. There is also room on the form to tell the team why a segment is considered favorable or unfavorable. Only one form will be accepted

per agency; therefore, it is assumed that the study representatives for each agency will obtain the input necessary to complete the form. [Subsequent to the meeting, a revised electronic form was sent out to all stakeholders for use in providing comments electronically instead of hand-written.]

- b. The agenda said that completed forms were due back to the project team by November 15<sup>th</sup>. After much discussion, the study team agreed to allow additional time for local agencies to present this information to their respective councils/management/supervisors and obtain their feedback. Subsequent to the meeting, the team supplied a revised Stakeholder Agency Input Form with a new due date of December 12, 2011.
- c. G. Pham asked whether agencies are allowed to rate segments beyond jurisdictional boundaries. D. Perkins stated that segment ratings outside jurisdictional boundaries would be accepted. K. Hall stated that segment ratings should be limited to jurisdictional boundaries. The group agreed to discuss this issue further upon receipt of the agency input, probably at the January progress meeting.
- d. The intent of the upcoming public meetings, scheduled for early December, is to obtain input from the public on the complete set of route alternatives. ADOT will not show preference to any of the route alternatives presented at the public meetings.
- e. D. Perkins said that detailed maps will be made available via the project FTP site to help the agencies identify, if needed. [Subsequent to the meeting, the FTP site link was sent to all stakeholders.]
- f. T. Condit asked whether all of the public input would be consolidated into a single input. D. Perkins said that the project team will condense all public input into a single rating for each route alternative.
- g. S. Hoffman said that, last year, ADOT conducted some of the council briefings. J. Gurrola asked that the agency representatives brief their own councils this year if at all possible.

**Next Meeting:** Scheduled for the first public meeting date of December 6<sup>th</sup> so the December progress meeting will not be held. The next stakeholder progress meeting will be in January.

Subject:	North-South Stakeholder Progress Meeting #8
Date and time:	November 1, 2011, 1:00 pm
Location:	HDR—Grand Canyon Conference Room, 3200 E. Camelback, Suite 350, Phoenix
Project:	North–South Corridor Study I-10 to US 60, Pinal County, Arizona Federal Aid No. STP-999-A(BBM) ADOT Project No. 999 PN 000 H7454 01L

## 1. Introductions/Sign-In Sheet

## 2. Public Involvement

- Upcoming Public Meetings
  - i. Tuesday, December 6<sup>th</sup>, Eloy-Santa Cruz Valley Union High School
  - ii. Wednesday, December 7<sup>th</sup>, Apache Junction-Moose Lodge Large Meeting Room
  - iii. Thursday, December 8<sup>th</sup>, Coolidge/Florence area-Elks Lodge Banquet Room
  - iv. **Added Meeting: Monday, December 12<sup>th</sup>, San Tan Valley-Walker Butte Elementary**
- Preview Public Outreach Process (Public Comment Form)

## 3. Stage 1 Modal Alternatives Screening (See Handout)

- TDM/TSM, Transit, Arterial Upgrades
- High Capacity Transportation Facility

## 4. Review Updated Route Alternatives

## 5. Agency/Stakeholder Route Alternative Input (See Handout)


- Completed forms due to project team on November 15, 2011

## 6. Open Discussion

## 7. Next Steps

**Next Meeting: TBD; Next scheduled meeting falls on same day as first public meeting, December 6<sup>th</sup>**

## North-South Corridor Study, Stage 1 (Modal Alternatives) Screening



**Date:** November 3, 2011 (Revised)  
**Subject:** Stakeholder Input to Route Alternatives Screening  
**Project:** North–South Corridor Study (NSCS)  
US 60 to I-10, Pinal County, Arizona  
Federal Aid No. STP-999-A (BBM), ADOT Project No. 999 PN 000 H7454 01L

Please submit this comment form by **December 12, 2011**, to a member of the study team. You may mail, fax, or email to:

*Trent Kelso*  
*HDR Engineering*  
*3200 E. Camelback Road*  
*Suite 350*  
*Phoenix, AZ 85018-2311*  
[Trent.Kelso@hdrinc.com](mailto:Trent.Kelso@hdrinc.com)  
*Fax (602) 522-7707*

Please fill out the contact information below. Only one comment form should be submitted per stakeholder agency.

<b>Name:</b>	
<b>Agency:</b>	
<b>Address:</b>	
<b>Email:</b>	
<b>Telephone:</b>	

1. Attached you will find maps with various possible route alternatives for your review. **For route alternatives segments that you have the most interest in, please highlight or circle the segments you find “favorable.” Please cross or “x” out the segments that you find “Unfavorable.”** You don’t have to rate all of the segments. The segments that you don’t indicate as “favorable” or “Unfavorable” will be rated as “neutral”.

2. Please tell us why you “favor” the segments, or find them “unfavorable.” You may use the letters in the circles on the possible route alternatives map to reference segments in your comments.

Terminus/ Segment	Agency Rating	Please tell us specific reasons why you find the possible route alternatives segments “favorable” or “unfavorable”. You don’t have to rate or comment on all of the segments.
Terminus 1 (Ironwood Drive/US 60)	<input type="checkbox"/> Favorable <input type="checkbox"/> Unfavorable	
Terminus 2 (Mountain View/US 60)	<input type="checkbox"/> Favorable <input type="checkbox"/> Unfavorable	
Terminus 3 (Peralta/US 60)	<input type="checkbox"/> Favorable <input type="checkbox"/> Unfavorable	
Terminus 4 (SR 87/I-10)	<input type="checkbox"/> Favorable <input type="checkbox"/> Unfavorable	
Terminus 5 (Fast Track Road/I-10)	<input type="checkbox"/> Favorable <input type="checkbox"/> Unfavorable	
Segment A	<input type="checkbox"/> Favorable <input type="checkbox"/> Unfavorable	
Segment B	<input type="checkbox"/> Favorable <input type="checkbox"/> Unfavorable	

Terminus/ Segment	Agency Rating	Please tell us specific reasons why you find the possible route alternatives segments “favorable” or “unfavorable”. You don’t have to rate or comment on all of the segments.
Segment C	<input type="checkbox"/> Favorable <input type="checkbox"/> Unfavorable	
Segment D	<input type="checkbox"/> Favorable <input type="checkbox"/> Unfavorable	
Segment E	<input type="checkbox"/> Favorable <input type="checkbox"/> Unfavorable	
Segment F	<input type="checkbox"/> Favorable <input type="checkbox"/> Unfavorable	
Segment G	<input type="checkbox"/> Favorable <input type="checkbox"/> Unfavorable	
Segment H	<input type="checkbox"/> Favorable <input type="checkbox"/> Unfavorable	
Segment I	<input type="checkbox"/> Favorable <input type="checkbox"/> Unfavorable	
Segment J	<input type="checkbox"/> Favorable <input type="checkbox"/> Unfavorable	

Terminus/ Segment	Agency Rating	Please tell us specific reasons why you find the possible route alternatives segments “favorable” or “unfavorable”. You don’t have to rate or comment on all of the segments.
Segment K	<input type="checkbox"/> Favorable <input type="checkbox"/> Unfavorable	
Segment L	<input type="checkbox"/> Favorable <input type="checkbox"/> Unfavorable	
Segment M	<input type="checkbox"/> Favorable <input type="checkbox"/> Unfavorable	
Segment N	<input type="checkbox"/> Favorable <input type="checkbox"/> Unfavorable	
Segment O	<input type="checkbox"/> Favorable <input type="checkbox"/> Unfavorable	
Segment P	<input type="checkbox"/> Favorable <input type="checkbox"/> Unfavorable	
Segment Q	<input type="checkbox"/> Favorable <input type="checkbox"/> Unfavorable	
Segment R	<input type="checkbox"/> Favorable <input type="checkbox"/> Unfavorable	



Terminus/ Segment	Agency Rating	Please tell us specific reasons why you find the possible route alternatives segments “favorable” or “unfavorable”. You don’t have to rate or comment on all of the segments.
Segment S	<input type="checkbox"/> Favorable <input type="checkbox"/> Unfavorable	
Segment T	<input type="checkbox"/> Favorable <input type="checkbox"/> Unfavorable	
Segment U	<input type="checkbox"/> Favorable <input type="checkbox"/> Unfavorable	
Segment V	<input type="checkbox"/> Favorable <input type="checkbox"/> Unfavorable	
Segment W	<input type="checkbox"/> Favorable <input type="checkbox"/> Unfavorable	
Segment X	<input type="checkbox"/> Favorable <input type="checkbox"/> Unfavorable	
Segment Y	<input type="checkbox"/> Favorable <input type="checkbox"/> Unfavorable	
Segment Z	<input type="checkbox"/> Favorable <input type="checkbox"/> Unfavorable	

Terminus/ Segment	Agency Rating	Please tell us specific reasons why you find the possible route alternatives segments “favorable” or “unfavorable”. You don’t have to rate or comment on all of the segments.
Segment AA	<input type="checkbox"/> Favorable <input type="checkbox"/> Unfavorable	
Segment AB	<input type="checkbox"/> Favorable <input type="checkbox"/> Unfavorable	
Segment AC	<input type="checkbox"/> Favorable <input type="checkbox"/> Unfavorable	
Segment AD	<input type="checkbox"/> Favorable <input type="checkbox"/> Unfavorable	
Segment AE	<input type="checkbox"/> Favorable <input type="checkbox"/> Unfavorable	
Segment AF	<input type="checkbox"/> Favorable <input type="checkbox"/> Unfavorable	
Segment AG	<input type="checkbox"/> Favorable <input type="checkbox"/> Unfavorable	
Segment AH	<input type="checkbox"/> Favorable <input type="checkbox"/> Unfavorable	

Terminus/ Segment	Agency Rating	Please tell us specific reasons why you find the possible route alternatives segments “favorable” or “unfavorable”. You don’t have to rate or comment on all of the segments.
Segment AI	<input type="checkbox"/> Favorable <input type="checkbox"/> Unfavorable	
Segment AJ	<input type="checkbox"/> Favorable <input type="checkbox"/> Unfavorable	
Segment AK	<input type="checkbox"/> Favorable <input type="checkbox"/> Unfavorable	
Segment AL	<input type="checkbox"/> Favorable <input type="checkbox"/> Unfavorable	
Segment AM	<input type="checkbox"/> Favorable <input type="checkbox"/> Unfavorable	
Segment AN	<input type="checkbox"/> Favorable <input type="checkbox"/> Unfavorable	
Segment AO	<input type="checkbox"/> Favorable <input type="checkbox"/> Unfavorable	


3. What is most important to you in determining where a possible route alternative may go? Please place a check next to the three you consider most important.

- ☐ Best relieves traffic on local streets
- ☐ Best relieves traffic on other highways and freeways
- ☐ Best connects to employment centers
- ☐ Best connects to other destinations (e.g. school/shopping/recreation)
- ☐ Best connects to cities and towns
- ☐ Best connects to other major routes (I-10, US 60, etc.)
- ☐ Lowest cost
- ☐ Least impact to existing development
- ☐ Least impact to planned future development
- ☐ Least impact to natural areas and open space
- ☐ Makes best use of existing roads
- ☐ Based on input received from agencies and jurisdictions
- ☐ Based on input received from the public

4. Other Comments

# COMMENT FORM MAP

## Northern Possible Route Alternatives



### Legend

- North-South Corridor Study Area
- Possible Route Alternatives
- Segment Begin/End
- Segment ID
- Route Alternative Start/End Point
- CAP Canal
- Railroad
- SR 24 Selected Alignment (MAG)
- SR 24 Study Area (In Pinal County)
- US 60 Selected Alignment
- 100-yr Floodplain

DRAFT, November 1, 2011  
Federal Aid No. STP-99-A(BBM)  
ADOT Project NO. H745401L


Possible route alternatives are preliminary and are subject to modification.

0 1 2 3 4 5 Miles



# COMMENT FORM MAP

## Southern Possible Route Alternatives



### Legend

- North-South Corridor Study Area
- Possible Route Alternatives
- Segment Begin/End
- Segment ID
- Route Alternative Start/End Point
- CAP Canal
- Railroad
- 100-yr Floodplain

DRAFT, November 1, 2011  
Federal Aid No. STP-99-A(BBM)  
ADOT Project NO. H745401L

Possible route alternatives are preliminary  
and are subject to modification.

0 1 2 3 4 5 Miles

## **APPENDIX B**

### **Summary of Agency Stakeholder Preferences Regarding Possible Route Alternatives**

Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT), Roadway		
Segment No.	Rating	Comments
Terminus 1	Unfavorable	Will Ironwood remain a diamond? If so, it doesn't seem to be an effective junction of two freeways. On the other hand, there will be two system TI's in close proximity.
Terminus 2	Favorable	This terminus seems to make a more natural free flowing connection. I don't know what the connection to the US60 Reroute will look like.
Terminus 3	Unfavorable	Comments similar to Terminus 1.
Terminus 4	No Response	Will have to deal with the presence of railroad.
Terminus 5	No Response	Will have to deal with the presence of the railroad.
A	Unfavorable	Viability depends in part on the effectiveness of a Terminus 1 connection.
B	Unfavorable	Viability depends in part on the effectiveness of a Terminus 1 connection and how to deal with the presence of the railroad.
C	No Response	
D	No Response	
E	No Response	Depends on how close you are to the CAP where TI's would be more challenging.
F	No Response	TI's would be more challenging the closer you are to the railroad. Is the farm land prime or unique?
G	No Response	Is the farm land prime or unique?
H	No Response	Is the farm land prime or unique?
I	No Response	



Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT), Roadway		
Segment No.	Rating	Comments
J	No Response	
K	No Response	
L	No Response	Is farm land prime or unique?
M	No Response	
N	Unfavorable	Depends in part on the viability of Terminus 3 connection.
O	No Response	Is fam land prime or unique?
P	No Response	
Q	No Response	Looks to be the widest crossing of the Gila River.
R	Unfavorable	Depends in part on the viability of Terminus 3 connection.
S	Unfavorable	Depends in part on the viability of Terminus 3 connection.
T	No Response	
U	No Response	
V	No Response	
W	Unfavorable	Seems like there would be a lot more drainage issues with being behind the FRS.

Segment No.	Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT), Roadway	
	Rating	Comments
X	No Response	
Y	No Response	Is the farm land prime or unique? Must maintain traffic on SR87 while building N-S Corridor.
Z	No Response	Same comments as for segment Y.
AA	No Response	Same comments as segment Y.
AB	No Response	
AC	No Response	Is farm land prime or unique?
AD	No Response	Is farm land prime or unique?
AE	No Response	Is farm land prime or unique?
AF	No Response	
AG	No Response	
AH	No Response	Is farm land prime or unique?
AI	No Response	Is farm land prime or unique?
AJ	No Response	Is farm land prime or unique?
AK	No Response	
AL	No Response	Is farm land prime or unique?
AM	No Response	Is farm land prime or unique?

Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT), Roadway		
<i>Segment No.</i>	<i>Rating</i>	<i>Comments</i>
AN	No Response	Is farm land prime or unique?
AO	No Response	Is farm land prime or unique?
Q3		Best relieves traffic on other highways and freeways; Best connects to other major routes (I-10, US 60, etc.); Based on input received from agencies and jurisdictions
Q4		Sometimes I made comments but didn't consider the segment favorable or unfavorable.

Arizona Game and Fish Department (AZGFD)		
Segment No.	Rating	Comments
Terminus 1	Favorable	The Department favors the Ironwood Drive/US 60 Terminus. We prefer keeping the alignments west of the CAP Canal to minimize further impacts to natural resources.
Terminus 2	Unfavorable	The Department prefers keeping the alignments west of the CAP Canal, in order to avoid additional habitat loss east of the CAP. Also, to avoid the loss of access for recreation and the economic impacts from that loss.
Terminus 3	Unfavorable	The Department prefers keeping the alignments west of the CAP canal.
Terminus 4	Favorable	The Department prefers terminus 4 (SR87/I-10). This alignment utilizes existing infrastructure, therefore decreasing new negative impacts to natural resources and habitat.
Terminus 5	Unfavorable	No comment
A	Favorable	The Department favors keeping the alignments west of the CAP Canal to minimize impacts.
B	Favorable	The Department favors keeping the alignments west of the CAP Canal to minimize impacts.
C	Favorable	The Department favors keeping the alignments west of the CAP Canal to minimize impacts.
D	Favorable	The Department favors keeping the alignments west of the CAP Canal to minimize impacts.
E	Favorable	The Department favors keeping the alignments west of the CAP Canal to minimize impacts.
F	Favorable	The Department favors keeping the alignments west of the CAP Canal to minimize impacts.
G	Favorable	The Department favors keeping the alignments west of the CAP Canal to minimize impacts.
H	Favorable	The Department favors keeping the alignments west of the CAP Canal to minimize impacts.
I	Unfavorable	The Department prefers alignment options west of the CAP Canal. We find segments east of the CAP Canal to have negative habitat impacts, along with the risk of recreational access and revenue losses.

Arizona Game and Fish Department (AZGFD)		
Segment No.	Rating	Comments
J	Unfavorable	The Department prefers alignment options west of the CAP Canal. We find segments east of the CAP Canal to have negative habitat impacts, along with the risk of recreational access and revenue losses.
K	Unfavorable	The Department prefers alignment options west of the CAP Canal. We find segments east of the CAP Canal to have negative habitat impacts, along with the risk of recreational access and revenue losses.
L	Unfavorable	The Department prefers alignment options west of the CAP Canal. We find segments east of the CAP Canal to have negative habitat impacts, along with the risk of recreational access and revenue losses.
M	Unfavorable	The Department prefers alignment options west of the CAP Canal. We find segments east of the CAP Canal to have negative habitat impacts, along with the risk of recreational access and revenue losses.
N	Unfavorable	The Department prefers alignment options west of the CAP Canal. We find segments east of the CAP Canal to have negative habitat impacts, along with the risk of recreational access and revenue losses.
O	Unfavorable	The Department prefers alignment options west of the CAP Canal. We find segments east of the CAP Canal to have negative habitat impacts, along with the risk of recreational access and revenue losses.
P	Unfavorable	The Department prefers alignment options west of the CAP Canal. We find segments east of the CAP Canal to have negative habitat impacts, along with the risk of recreational access and revenue losses.
Q	Unfavorable	The Department prefers "Segment D" over "Segment G" as it will have less impact on the riparian habitat of the Gila River.
R	Unfavorable	(same as "Segment I" comments)
S	Unfavorable	(same as "Segment I" comments)
T	Unfavorable	(same as "Segment I" comments)
U	Unfavorable	(same as "Segment I" comments)
V	Unfavorable	(same as "Segment I" comments)
W	Unfavorable	(same as "Segment I" comments)

Arizona Game and Fish Department (AZGFD)		
<i>Segment No.</i>	<i>Rating</i>	<i>Comments</i>
X	Unfavorable	The Department prefers "Segment D" over "Segment X" as it will have less impact on the riparian habitat of the Gila River.
Y	Favorable	The Department prefers "Segment Y, Z, and AA" as they utilize existing infrastructure and will, in turn, have less new impact upon natural resources and habitat.
Z	Favorable	The Department prefers "Segment Y, Z, and AA" as they utilize existing infrastructure and will, in turn, have less new impact upon natural resources and habitat.
AA	Favorable	The Department prefers "Segment Y, Z, and AA" as they utilize existing infrastructure and will, in turn, have less new impact upon natural resources and habitat.
AB	Unfavorable	The Department prefers that the alignment continues south through "Section D" of erminus 1 (Ironwood Drive/US 60), therefore, "Section Y" would be preferred.
AC	Unfavorable	The Department prefers that the alignment continues south through "Section D" of erminus 1 (Ironwood Drive/US 60), therefore, "Section Y" would be preferred.
AD	Unfavorable	The Department prefers that the alignment continues south through "Section D" of erminus 1 (Ironwood Drive/US 60), therefore, "Section Y" would be preferred.
AE	Unfavorable	The Department prefers that the alignment continues south through "Section D" of erminus 1 (Ironwood Drive/US 60), therefore, "Section Y" would be preferred.
AF	Unfavorable	The Department prefers that the alignment continues south through "Section D" of erminus 1 (Ironwood Drive/US 60), therefore, "Section Y" would be preferred.
AG	Unfavorable	The Department prefers that the alignment continues south through "Section D" of erminus 1 (Ironwood Drive/US 60), therefore, "Section Y" would be preferred.
AH	Unfavorable	The Department prefers that the alignment continues south through "Section D" of erminus 1 (Ironwood Drive/US 60), therefore, "Section Y" would be preferred.
AI	Unfavorable	The Department prefers that the alignment continues south through "Section D" of Terminus 1 (Ironwood Drive/US 60), therefore, "Section Y" would be preferred.
AJ	Unfavorable	The Department prefers that the alignment continues south through "Section D" of erminus 1 (Ironwood Drive/US 60), therefore, "Section Y" would be preferred.
AK	Unfavorable	The Department prefers that the alignment continues south through "Section D" of erminus 1 (Ironwood Drive/US 60), therefore, "Section Y" would be preferred.
AL	Unfavorable	The Department prefers that the alignment continues south through "Section D" of erminus 1 (Ironwood Drive/US 60), therefore, "Section Y" would be preferred.
AM	Unfavorable	The Department prefers that the alignment continues south through "Section D" of erminus 1 (Ironwood Drive/US 60), therefore, "Section Y" would be preferred.

Arizona Game and Fish Department (AZGFD)		
<i>Segment No.</i>	<i>Rating</i>	<i>Comments</i>
AN	Unfavorable	The Department prefers that the alignment continues south through "Section D" of erminus 1 (Ironwood Drive/US 60), therefore, "Section Y" would be preferred.
AO	Unfavorable	The Department prefers that the alignment continues south through "Section D" of erminus 1 (Ironwood Drive/US 60), therefore, "Section Y" would be preferred.
Q3		Least impact to natural areas and open space; Makes best use of existing roads; Based on input received from agencies and jurisdictions
Q4		The Department appreciates the opportunity to provide input in this study. We look forward to continue to provide an evaluation of impacts to wildlife or wildlife habitats associated with the project activities. If you have any questions or concerns regarding this input form or other projects, please contact me at (623) 236-7486. Thank you, Chip Young - Project Evaluation Prog. AZGFD (11-14-11)

Arizona National Guard		
<i>Segment No.</i>	<i>Rating</i>	<i>Comments</i>
Terminus 1	Favorable	
Terminus 2	Favorable	
Terminus 3	Favorable	
Terminus 4	Favorable	
Terminus 5	Favorable	
A	Favorable	
B	Favorable	
C	Favorable	
D	Favorable	
E	Unfavorable	This segment has potential impact to AZ Army National Guard Aviation training @ Rittenhouse Aux Airfield.
F	Favorable	
G	Favorable	
H	Favorable	
I	Favorable	



Arizona National Guard		
Segment No.	Rating	Comments
J	Favorable	
K	Favorable	
L	Favorable	
M	Favorable	
N	Favorable	
O	Favorable	
P	Favorable	
Q	Favorable	
R	Favorable	
S	Favorable	
T	Favorable	
U	Favorable	
V	Favorable	
W	Unfavorable	As mentioned before, W has impact on Army National Guard's limited training areas. It will take away valuable training land & ranges. This route also encroaches upon an ammunition storage bunker's explosive arc, which means that in order to store training munitions and keep the highway safe it would need to be moved.

Arizona National Guard		
<i>Segment No.</i>	<i>Rating</i>	<i>Comments</i>
X	Favorable	
Y	Favorable	
Z	Favorable	
AA	Favorable	
AB	Favorable	
AC	Favorable	
AD	Favorable	
AE	Favorable	
AF	Favorable	
AG	Favorable	
AH	Favorable	
AI	Favorable	
AJ	Favorable	
AK	Favorable	
AL	Favorable	
AM	Favorable	

	<b>Arizona National Guard</b>	
<i>Segment No.</i>	<i>Rating</i>	<i>Comments</i>
AN	Favorable	
AO	Favorable	
Q3	No Response	
Q4	No Response	

Arizona State Land Department		
Segment No.		
Terminus 1	Unfavorable	This alternative does not fit with the Department's Conceptual Plan for the area commonly referred to as Superstition Vistas. This alternative also removes an arterial from the existing roadway network thereby reducing capacity. A copy of the Superstition Vistas Conceptual Plan is enclosed with these comments for your reference.
Terminus 2	Favorable	This alternative is consistent with the Department's Conceptual Plan for Superstition Vistas, and provides a good alternative for mobility in the region.
Terminus 3	Unfavorable	This alternative is not consistent with the Department's Conceptual Plan for Superstition Vistas.
Terminus 4	Unfavorable	This terminus is not preferred because Terminus 5 provides better access to State Trust land.
Terminus 5	Favorable	This terminus is preferred because it provides for better access to State Trust land.
A	Unfavorable	This alternative is not consistent with the Department's Conceptual Plan for Superstition Vistas, and it removes a major roadway from the network.
B	Unfavorable	This alternative is not consistent with the Department's Conceptual Plan for Superstition Vistas, and it removes a major roadway from the network.
C	Unfavorable	This alternative is not consistent with the Department's Conceptual Plan for Superstition Vistas. It is also not consistent with the zoning for the State land that falls within the Town of Florence corporate limits.
D	Unfavorable	This alternative is not consistent with the zoning for the State land in Florence corporate limits.
E	Unfavorable	This alternative is not consistent with the Department's Conceptual Plan for Superstition Vistas. It also negatively affects a site that is planned for solar generation adjacent to the canal and the Dinosaur substation. This alternative is too close to the CAP and dam structures to provide adequate access and opportunities for economic development.
F	Unfavorable	This alternative is not consistent with the Department's Conceptual Plan for Superstition Vistas.
G	No Response	No strong preference
H	Unfavorable	An alignment further east is preferred.
I	Favorable	This alternative is consistent with the Department's Conceptual Plan for Superstition Vistas.

	Arizona State Land Department	
Segment No.		
J	No Response	This is reasonably consistent with the Department's Conceptual Plan for Superstition Vistas.
K	Favorable	If the alignment must cross the CAP canal this appears to be the most logical crossing point presented thus far because it crosses at a right angle.
L	Favorable	Moves the alignment further east which is preferable for access.
M	No Response	This alignment is reasonably consistent with the Department's Conceptual Plan for Superstition Vistas.
N	Unfavorable	This alternative is not consistent with the Department's Conceptual Plan for Superstition Vistas.
O	Unfavorable	This alignment does not cross the CAP canal at a good angle and creates issues related to access, severance parcels and cost.
P	No Response	No Comment
Q	Unfavorable	This alignment appears to run close to a State Land site with mining potential and significant cultural resources.
R	Unfavorable	This alternative is not consistent with the Department's Conceptual Plan for Superstition Vistas.
S	Unfavorable	This alternative is could be consistent with the Department's Conceptual Plan for Superstition Vistas, but it leads to alignments that are not preferred.
T	Unfavorable	This segment is along a dam structure making access difficult for a significant portion of adjacent State Trust land.
U	Unfavorable	This alternative shows two crossings of the CAP canal. This is not only expensive but in this configuration does not provide adequate access.
V	No Response	No comment.
W	Unfavorable	This segment is too far east and developable land in this area is affected by significant drainage that builds up behind the dam.

	Arizona State Land Department	
Segment No.		
X	No Response	No comment.
Y	Unfavorable	Does not provide good access to Trust land and removes an existing road from the roadway network.
Z	Unfavorable	Does not provide good access to Trust land and removes an existing road from the roadway network.
AA	Unfavorable	Does not provide good access to Trust land and removes an existing road from the roadway network, and leads to terminus 4 which is not preferred.
AB	No Response	Not preferred segment AM would provide better access to State Land in this area.
AC	No Response	No comment
AD	Unfavorable	An alignment east of Highway 87 is preferred because it will provide good access to State land without the loss of roadway capacity that would result from an alignment within the existing corridor for State Route 87.
AE	Unfavorable	An alignment further east is preferable.
AF	Unfavorable	An alignment further east is preferable.
AG	Unfavorable	An alignment further east is preferred.
AH	Unfavorable	An alignment further east is preferred.
AI	No Response	No Comment
AJ	No Response	No Comment
AK	Favorable	Preferred because it provides better access to Trust Land and links to the preferred terminus, terminus 5.
AL	Favorable	Preferred because it provides better access to trust land and meets up with the preferred terminus, terminus 5.
AM	Favorable	Preferred, it provides the best access to Trust land

	Arizona State Land Department	
Segment No.		
AN	No Response	No comment.
AO	No Response	No comment.
Q3		Best relieves traffic on local streets; best connects to employment centers; lowest cost
Q4		<p>The potential for the Freeway to provide good access to developable land for economic development should be an important consideration in the location of the freeway.</p> <p>Where segments F &amp; G intersect, the preferred alignment would be to the east because of the potential impact C, H, and D would have on land that the Department has zoned within the Town of Florence.</p> <p>The Pinal County Comprehensive Plan was recently amended to allow for the development of a solar site in the vicinity of Alignment E. The site is located south of the Dinosaur substation east of Schnepf Road and north of Pima Rd.</p>

Army Corps of Engineers		
Segment No.	Rating	Comments
Terminus 1	Favorable	Uses existing transportation corridors. Potential for fewer impacts to drainages and other natural resources. By the way it would have been extremely helpful to include sensitive areas like wildlife corridors, cultural areas, etc.
Terminus 2	Unfavorable	This terminus as well as the connecting alternatives will create impacts to a greater number of natural drainages, create new barriers to wildlife movement, impact undisturbed habitat, and will have greater indirect impacts to natural resources.
Terminus 3	Unfavorable	This terminus as well as the connecting alternatives will create impacts to a greater number of natural drainages, create new barriers to wildlife movement, impact undisturbed habitat, and will have greater indirect impacts to natural resources.
Terminus 4	Favorable	This terminus takes advantage of existing transportation corridors. Potential for fewer impacts to drainages and other natural resources.
Terminus 5	Unfavorable	The alternative connecting to this terminus travels directly through the 100 year flood plain. Creating this terminus with connecting alternative doesn't make sense when existing SR 87 can be improved which is only a few miles away.
A	Favorable	Uses existing transportation corridors and already in an area with existing development. Potential for fewer impacts to drainages and other natural resources. The CAP is already a barrier to wildlife so this would not create any new barriers between the CAP and Superstition Mountains.
B	Favorable	Uses existing transportation corridors and already in an area with existing development. Potential for fewer impacts to drainages and other natural resources. The CAP is already a barrier to wildlife so this would not create any new barriers between the CAP and Superstition Mountains.
C	Favorable	Uses existing transportation corridors and already in an area with existing development. Potential for fewer impacts to drainages and other natural resources. The CAP is already a barrier to wildlife so this would not create any new barriers between the CAP and Superstition Mountains.
D	Favorable	Uses existing transportation corridors and already in an area with existing development. Potential for fewer impacts to drainages and other natural resources. The CAP is already a barrier to wildlife so this would not create any new barriers between the CAP and Superstition Mountains/existing undisturbed natural areas.
E	Favorable	Potential for fewer impacts to drainages (crossing perpendicular) and other natural resources. The CAP is already a barrier to wildlife so this would not create any new barriers between the CAP and Superstition Mountains.
F	Favorable	Uses existing transportation corridors and already in an area with existing development. Potential for fewer impacts to drainages and other natural resources. The CAP is already a barrier to wildlife so this would not create any new barriers between the CAP and Superstition Mountains/existing undisturbed natural areas.
G	Favorable	Uses existing transportation corridors and already in an area with existing development. Potential for fewer impacts to drainages and other natural resources. The CAP is already a barrier to wildlife so this would not create any new barriers between the CAP and Superstition Mountains/existing undisturbed natural areas.
H	Favorable	Uses existing transportation corridors and already in an area with existing development. Potential for fewer impacts to drainages and other natural resources. The CAP is already a barrier to wildlife so this would not create any new barriers between the CAP and Superstition Mountains/existing undisturbed natural areas.
I	Unfavorable	This alternative will create impacts to a greater number of natural drainages, create new barriers to wildlife movement, impact undisturbed habitat, and will have greater indirect impacts to natural resources.



Army Corps of Engineers		
Segment No.	Rating	Comments
J	Unfavorable	This alternative will create impacts to a greater number of natural drainages, create new barriers to wildlife movement, impact undisturbed habitat, and will have greater indirect impacts to natural resources.
K	Unfavorable	This alternative will create impacts to a greater number of natural drainages, create new barriers to wildlife movement, impact undisturbed habitat, and will have greater indirect impacts to natural resources.
L	Unfavorable	Impacts to farmland. Doesn't follow an existing transportation facility.
M	Unfavorable	This alternative will create impacts to a greater number of natural drainages, create new barriers to wildlife movement, impact undisturbed habitat, and will have greater indirect impacts to natural resources.
N	Unfavorable	This alternative will create impacts to a greater number of natural drainages, create new barriers to wildlife movement, impact undisturbed habitat, and will have greater indirect impacts to natural resources.
O	Unfavorable	This alternative will create impacts to a greater number of natural drainages, create new barriers to wildlife movement, impact undisturbed habitat, and will have greater indirect impacts to natural resources.
P	Unfavorable	Impacts to farmland. Doesn't follow an existing transportation facility.
Q	Unfavorable	Impacts to farmland, drainages and undisturbed area. Doesn't follow an existing transportation facility.
R	Unfavorable	This alternative will create impacts to a greater number of natural drainages, create new barriers to wildlife movement, impact undisturbed habitat, and will have greater indirect impacts to natural resources.
S	Unfavorable	This alternative will create impacts to a greater number of natural drainages, create new barriers to wildlife movement, impact undisturbed habitat, and will have greater indirect impacts to natural resources.
T	Unfavorable	This alternative will create impacts to a greater number of natural drainages, farmland, create new barriers to wildlife movement, impact undisturbed habitat, and will have greater indirect impacts to natural resources.
U	Unfavorable	Impacts to drainages and undisturbed area. Doesn't follow an existing transportation facility.
V	Unfavorable	Impacts to drainages and undisturbed area. Doesn't follow an existing transportation facility.
W	Unfavorable	This alternative will create impacts to a greater number of natural drainages, create new barriers to wildlife movement, impact undisturbed habitat, and will have greater indirect impacts to natural resources.

Army Corps of Engineers		
Segment No.	Rating	Comments
X	Unfavorable	Impacts to natural drainages and undisturbed land. Connecting alternatives also have greater impacts to natural drainages, 100-year floodplain, and greater potential for indirect impacts to natural resources.
Y	Unfavorable	Uses existing transportation corridors and already in an area with existing development. Potential for fewer impacts to drainages and other natural resources. The CAP is already a barrier to wildlife so this would not create any new barriers between the CAP and Superstition Mountains/existing undisturbed natural areas.
Z	Unfavorable	Uses existing transportation corridors and already in an area with existing development. Potential for fewer impacts to drainages and other natural resources. The CAP is already a barrier to wildlife so this would not create any new barriers between the CAP and Superstition Mountains/existing undisturbed natural areas.
AA	Unfavorable	Uses existing transportation corridors and already in an area with existing development. Potential for fewer impacts to drainages and other natural resources. The CAP is already a barrier to wildlife so this would not create any new barriers between the CAP and Superstition Mountains/existing undisturbed natural areas.
AB	Unfavorable	Impacts to drainages and 100-year floodplain. Impacts to farmland and greater potential for indirect impacts to natural resources. Doesn't cleanly following existing transportation facilities. Seems like it would be more costly construct and doesn't follow the 'grid' system of roads that is the dominant layout.
AC	Unfavorable	Impacts to farmland and greater potential for indirect impacts to natural resources. Creating this alternative doesn't make sense when existing SR 87 can be improved which is only a few miles away.
AD	Unfavorable	Impacts to farmland and greater potential for indirect impacts to natural resources. Creating this alternative doesn't make sense when existing SR 87 can be improved which is only a few miles away.
AE	Unfavorable	Impacts to farmland and greater potential for indirect impacts to natural resources. Creating this alternative doesn't make sense when existing SR 87 can be improved which is only a few miles away.
AF	Unfavorable	Impacts to farmland and greater potential for indirect impacts to natural resources. Creating this alternative doesn't make sense when existing SR 87 can be improved which adjacent to this alternative.
AG	Unfavorable	Impacts to farmland and greater potential for indirect impacts to natural resources. Creating this alternative doesn't make sense when existing SR 87 can be improved which adjacent to this alternative.
AH	Unfavorable	Impacts to farmland and greater potential for indirect impacts to natural resources. Creating this alternative doesn't make sense when existing SR 87 can be improved which is only a mile away.
AI	Unfavorable	Impacts to farmland and greater potential for indirect impacts to natural resources. Creating this alternative doesn't make sense when existing SR 87 can be improved which is only a mile away.
AJ	Unfavorable	Impacts to farmland and greater potential for indirect impacts to natural resources. Creating this alternative doesn't make sense when existing SR 87 can be improved which is only a mile away.
AK	Unfavorable	Impacts to undisturbed areas. Creating this alternative doesn't make sense when existing SR 87 can be improved which is only a few miles away.
AL	Unfavorable	Travels through 100-year floodplain which could be avoided using the 87 alignment.
AM	Unfavorable	Impacts to drainages and 100-year floodplain. Impacts to farmland and greater potential for indirect impacts to natural resources. Doesn't cleanly following existing transportation facilities. Seems like it would be more costly construct and doesn't follow the 'grid' system of roads that is the dominant layout.

Army Corps of Engineers		
<i>Segment No.</i>	<i>Rating</i>	<i>Comments</i>
AN	Unfavorable	Impacts to drainages and 100-year floodplain. Impacts to farmland and greater potential for indirect impacts to natural resources. Doesn't cleanly following existing transportation facilities. Seems like it would be more costly construct and doesn't follow the 'grid' system of roads that is the dominant layout.
AO	Unfavorable	Impacts to drainages and 100-year floodplain. Impacts to farmland and greater potential for indirect impacts to natural resources. Doesn't cleanly following existing transportation facilities. Seems like it would be more costly construct and doesn't follow the 'grid' system of roads that is the dominant layout.
Q3		Best relieves traffic on other highways and freeways; Least impact to natural areas and open space; Makes best use of existing roads
Q4		See U.S. EPA scoping comments dated November 2, 2010

Central Arizona Project (CAP)		
<i>Segment No.</i>	<i>Rating</i>	<i>Comments</i>
Terminus 1	Favorable	This segment uses a new bridge to cross CAP land.
Terminus 2	Favorable	This segment does not cross CAP land.
Terminus 3	Favorable	This segment does not cross CAP land.
Terminus 4	Favorable	This segment does not cross CAP land.
Terminus 5	Favorable	This segment does not cross CAP land.
A	Favorable	This segment does not cross CAP land.
B	Favorable	This segment does not cross CAP land.
C	Favorable	This segment does not cross CAP land.
D	Favorable	This segment does not cross CAP land.
E	Unfavorable	This segment runs parallel to the CAP canal and will cause any crossing roads in the future to cost more in order to cross the new highway and the canal.
F	Favorable	This segment does not cross CAP land.
G	Favorable	This segment does not cross CAP land.
H	Favorable	This segment does not cross CAP land.
I	Favorable	This segment does not cross CAP land.

Central Arizona Project (CAP)		
Segment No.	Rating	Comments
J	Favorable	This segment does not cross CAP land.
K	Unfavorable	This segment crosses the CAP canal and green-up area. This option will cause increased cost to the project and CAP in the future.
L	Favorable	This segment does not cross CAP land.
M	Favorable	This segment does not cross CAP land.
N	Favorable	This segment does not cross CAP land.
O	Unfavorable	This segment crosses and runs parallel to the canal, crosses the Magma railroad and crosses the green-up area. This crossing would limit CAP access and be very expensive to build.
P	Favorable	This segment does not cross CAP land.
Q	Favorable	This segment does not cross CAP land.
R	Unfavorable	This segment leads to segments that cross CAP land.
S	Unfavorable	This segment leads to segments that cross CAP land.
T	Unfavorable	This segment crosses the CAP canal.
U	Unfavorable	This segment crosses the CAP canal twice in a short distance. These two bridges will be expensive to build.
V	Favorable	This segment runs parallel to the CAP canal and will cause any crossing roads in the future to cost more in order to cross the new highway and the canal.
W	Unfavorable	This segment crosses the CAP canal.

<i>Segment No.</i>	<b>Central Arizona Project (CAP)</b>	
	<i>Rating</i>	<i>Comments</i>
X	Favorable	This segment does not cross CAP land.
Y	Favorable	This segment does not cross CAP land.
Z	Favorable	This segment does not cross CAP land.
AA	Favorable	This segment does not cross CAP land.
AB	Favorable	This segment does not cross CAP land.
AC	Favorable	This segment does not cross CAP land.
AD	Favorable	This segment does not cross CAP land.
AE	Favorable	This segment does not cross CAP land.
AF	Favorable	This segment does not cross CAP land.
AG	Favorable	This segment does not cross CAP land.
AH	Favorable	This segment does not cross CAP land.
AI	Favorable	This segment does not cross CAP land.
AJ	Favorable	This segment does not cross CAP land.
AK	Favorable	This segment does not cross CAP land.
AL	Favorable	This segment does not cross CAP land.
AM	Favorable	This segment does not cross CAP land.

	<b>Central Arizona Project (CAP)</b>	
<i>Segment No.</i>	<i>Rating</i>	<i>Comments</i>
AN	Favorable	This segment does not cross CAP land.
AO	Favorable	This segment does not cross CAP land.
Q3		Lowest cost; Least impact to existing development; Least impact to natural areas and open space.
Q4		No comments

<b>Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)</b>		
<i>Segment No.</i>	<i>Rating</i>	<i>Comments</i>
Terminus 1	Favorable	Connecting alternatives take greatest advantage of existing transportation corridors. Least potential for impacts, both direct and indirect, to drainages and other natural resources. Does not create a new barrier to wildlife movement.
Terminus 2	Unfavorable	Connecting alternatives east/north of the CAP impact greater number of natural drainages, create new barrier to wildlife movement in relatively undisturbed territory, impact more valuable habitat for sensitive species, and will have greater indirect impacts to natural resources. Least potential to support existing development.
Terminus 3	Unfavorable	Connecting alternatives east/north of the CAP impact greater number of natural drainages, create new barrier to wildlife movement in relatively undisturbed territory, impact more valuable habitat for sensitive species, and will have greater indirect impacts to natural resources. Least potential to support existing development.
Terminus 4	Favorable	Connecting alternatives take greatest advantage of existing transportation corridors. Least potential for impacts, both direct and indirect, to drainages and other natural resources. Does not create a new barrier to wildlife movement.
Terminus 5	Unfavorable	Connecting alternative travels directly through the 100 year flood plain prior to connecting with Terminus 5. Need for new north-south freeway corridor in such close proximity to SR-87 is unclear.
A	Favorable	Greatest potential to support existing development. Takes advantage of existing transportation corridors and development patterns. Least potential for impacts, both direct and indirect, to drainages and other natural resources. Does not create a new barrier to wildlife movement.
B	Favorable	Greatest potential to support existing development. Takes advantage of existing transportation corridors and development patterns. Least potential for impacts, both direct and indirect, to drainages and other natural resources. Does not create a new barrier to wildlife movement.
C	Favorable	Greatest potential to support existing development. Takes greatest advantage of existing/planned roads and development patterns. Least potential for impacts, both direct and indirect, to drainages and other natural resources. Less likely to create a new barrier to wildlife movement.
D	Favorable	Greatest potential to support existing development. Takes greatest advantage of existing/planned roads and development patterns. Least potential for impacts, both direct and indirect, to drainages and other natural resources. Less likely to create a new barrier to wildlife.
E	No Response	Greatest potential to support existing development. Less likely than alternatives on the east of CAP to create new barrier to wildlife movement.
F	Favorable	Greatest potential to support existing development. Takes advantage of existing transportation corridors and and development patterns. Least potential for impacts, both direct and indirect, to drainages and other natural resources. Does not create a new barrier to wildlife movement.
G	Favorable	Greatest potential to support existing development. Takes advantage of existing roads and development patterns. Least potential for impacts, both direct and indirect, to drainages and other natural resources. Less likely to create a new barrier to wildlife movement.
H	Favorable	Greatest potential to support existing development. Takes advantage of existing roads and development patterns. Least potential for impacts, both direct and indirect, to drainages and other natural resources. Less likely to create a new barrier to wildlife movement.
I	Unfavorable	Alternatives east/north of the CAP impact greater number of natural drainages, create new barrier to wildlife movement in relatively undisturbed territory, impact more valuable habitat for sensitive species, and will have greater indirect impacts to natural resources. Little potential to support existing development.



Segment No.	Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)	
	Rating	Comments
J	Unfavorable	Alternatives east/north of the CAP impact greater number of natural drainages, create new barrier to wildlife movement in relatively undisturbed territory, impact more valuable habitat for sensitive species, and will have greater indirect impacts to natural resources. Little potential to support existing development.
K	Unfavorable	Alternatives east/north of the CAP impact greater number of natural drainages, create new barrier to wildlife movement in relatively undisturbed territory, impact more valuable habitat for sensitive species, and will have greater indirect impacts to natural resources. Little potential to support existing development.
L	Unfavorable	Impacts to farmland. Connecting alternatives have greater impacts to natural drainages, 100-year floodplain, farmland, and greater potential for indirect impacts to natural resources. Does not take advantage of existing transportation corridors or development patterns.
M	Unfavorable	Alternatives east/north of the CAP impact greater number of natural drainages, create new barrier to wildlife movement in relatively undisturbed territory, impact more valuable habitat for sensitive species, and will have greater indirect impacts to natural resources. Little potential to support existing development..
N	Unfavorable	Alternatives east/north of the CAP impact greater number of natural drainages, create new barrier to wildlife movement in relatively undisturbed territory, impact more valuable habitat for sensitive species, and will have greater indirect impacts to natural resources. Little potential to support existing development.
O	Unfavorable	Alternatives east/north of the CAP impact greater number of natural drainages, create new barrier to wildlife movement in relatively undisturbed territory, impact more valuable habitat for sensitive species, and will have greater indirect impacts to natural resources. Little potential to support existing development.
P	Unfavorable	Connecting alternatives have greater impacts to natural drainages, 100- year floodplain, farmland, and greater potential for indirect impacts to natural resources. Does not take advantage of existing transportation corridors or development patterns.
Q	Unfavorable	Impacts to drainages and undisturbed land. Connecting alternatives also have greater impacts to natural drainages, 100-year floodplain, farmland, and greater potential for indirect impacts to natural resources. Does not take advantage of existing transportation corridors or development patterns.
R	Unfavorable	Alternatives east/north of the CAP impact greater number of natural drainages, create new barrier to wildlife movement in relatively undisturbed territory, impact more valuable habitat for sensitive species, and will have greater indirect impacts to natural resources. Little potential to support existing development.
S	Unfavorable	Alternatives east/north of the CAP impact greater number of natural drainages, create new barrier to wildlife movement in relatively undisturbed territory, impact more valuable habitat for sensitive species, and will have greater indirect impacts to natural resources. Little potential to support existing development.
T	Unfavorable	Alternatives east/north of the CAP impact greater number of natural drainages, create new barrier to wildlife movement in relatively undisturbed territory, impact more valuable habitat for sensitive species, and will have greater indirect impacts to natural resources. Little potential to support existing development.
U	Unfavorable	Impacts to natural drainages and undisturbed land. Connecting alternatives also have greater impacts to natural drainages, 100-year floodplain, farmland, and greater potential for indirect impacts to natural resources. Does not take advantage of existing transportation corridors or development patterns.
V	Unfavorable	Impacts to natural drainages and undisturbed land. Connecting alternatives also have greater impacts to natural drainages, 100-year floodplain, farmland, and greater potential for indirect impacts to natural resources. Does not take advantage of existing transportation corridors or development patterns.
W	Unfavorable	Alternatives east/north of the CAP impact greater number of natural drainages, create new barrier to wildlife movement in relatively undisturbed territory, impact more valuable habitat for sensitive species, and will have greater indirect impacts to natural resources. Little potential to support existing development.

<i>Segment No.</i>	<b>Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)</b>	
	<i>Rating</i>	<i>Comments</i>
X	Unfavorable	Impacts to natural drainages and undisturbed land. Connecting alternatives also have greater impacts to natural drainages, 100-year floodplain, farmland, and greater potential for indirect impacts to natural resources. Does not take advantage of existing transportation corridors or development patterns.
Y	Favorable	Greatest potential to support existing development. Takes advantage of existing roads and development patterns. Least potential for impacts, both direct and indirect, to drainages and other natural resources. Less likely to create a new barrier to wildlife movement.
Z	Favorable	Takes advantage of existing transportation corridors and development patterns. Least potential for impacts, both direct and indirect, to drainages and other natural resources. Does not create a new barrier to wildlife movement.
AA	Favorable	Takes advantage of existing transportation corridors and development patterns. Least potential for impacts, both direct and indirect, to drainages and other natural resources. Does not create a new barrier to wildlife movement
AB	Unfavorable	Impacts to drainages and 100-year floodplain. Impacts to farmland and greater potential for indirect impacts to natural resources.
AC	Unfavorable	Impacts to farmland and greater potential for indirect impacts to natural resources. Need for new north-south freeway corridor in such close proximity to SR-87 is unclear.
AD	Unfavorable	Impacts to farmland and greater potential for indirect impacts to natural resources. Need for new north-south freeway corridor in such close proximity to SR-87 is unclear.
AE	Unfavorable	Impacts to farmland and greater potential for indirect impacts to natural resources. Need for new north-south freeway corridor in such close proximity to SR-87 is unclear.
AF	Unfavorable	Impacts to farmland and greater potential for indirect impacts to natural resources. Need for new north-south freeway corridor in such close proximity to SR-87 is unclear.
AG	Unfavorable	Impacts to farmland and greater potential for indirect impacts to natural resources. Need for new north-south freeway corridor in such close proximity to SR-87 is unclear.
AH	Unfavorable	Impacts to farmland and greater potential for indirect impacts to natural resources. Need for new north-south freeway corridor in such close proximity to SR-87 is unclear.
AI	Unfavorable	Impacts to farmland and greater potential for indirect impacts to natural resources. Need for new north-south freeway corridor in such close proximity to SR-87 is unclear.
AJ	Unfavorable	Impacts to farmland and greater potential for indirect impacts to natural resources. Need for new north-south freeway corridor in such close proximity to SR-87 is unclear.
AK	Unfavorable	Impacts to farmland and greater potential for indirect impacts to natural resources. Need for new north-south freeway corridor in such close proximity to SR-87 is unclear.
AL	Unfavorable	Travels through 100-year floodplain. Impacts to farmland and greater potential for indirect impacts to natural resources. Need for new north-south freeway corridor in such close proximity to SR-87 is unclear.
AM	Unfavorable	Impacts to drainages and 100-year floodplain. Impacts to farmland and greater potential for indirect impacts to natural resources.

<b>Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)</b>		
<i>Segment No.</i>	<i>Rating</i>	<i>Comments</i>
AN	Unfavorable	Impacts to farmland and greater potential for indirect impacts to natural resources. Need for new north-south freeway corridor in such close proximity to SR-87 is unclear.
AO	Unfavorable	Impacts to drainages and 100-year floodplain. Impacts to farmland and greater potential for indirect impacts to natural resources.
Q3		Least impact to natural areas and open space; Makes best use of existing roads; Based on input received from agencies and jurisdictions.
Q4		If you have any questions or concerns regarding the comments provided above, please contact me at 415-972-3370 or meek.clifton@epa.gov

Flood Control District of Maricopa County (FCDMC)		
<i>Segment No.</i>	<i>Rating</i>	<i>Comments</i>
Terminus 1	No Response	
Terminus 2	No Response	
Terminus 3	No Response	
Terminus 4	No Response	
Terminus 5	No Response	
A	Favorable	Does not impact the Powerline, Vineyard Road, or Rittenhouse Flood Retarding Structures (PVR). However, the alignment does cross the Powerline Floodway. The freeway will need to span the Powerline Floodway. This area is prone to earth fissures and subsidence. Alignment would be protected from flows by PVR.
B	Favorable	Does not impact the PVR Structures. Possible fissures and subsidence in the upper portion. Alignment would be protected from flows by PVR
C	No Response	
D	No Response	
E	Unfavorable	Close to PVR structures. TI's might impact PVR. CAP would be impacted. Flows from the Auxilliary Spillways would impact the freeway.
F	No Response	
G	No Response	
H	No Response	
I	Favorable	Does not impact the PVR structures.

Flood Control District of Maricopa County (FCDMC)		
<i>Segment No.</i>	<i>Rating</i>	<i>Comments</i>
J	Unfavorable	Close to PVR structures. Freeway structures may impact PVR or its flood pools.
K	No Response	
L	No Response	
M	Favorable	Away from the PVR Structures
N	Unfavorable	Close to PVR Structures. Freeway or TI's may impact PVR or the flood pools.
O	No Response	
P	No Response	
Q	No Response	
R	Favorable	Away from the PVR structures
S	No Response	
T	No Response	
U	No Response	
V	No Response	
W	No Response	

Flood Control District of Maricopa County (FCDMC)		
<i>Segment No.</i>	<i>Rating</i>	<i>Comments</i>
X	No Response	
Y	No Response	
Z	No Response	
AA	No Response	
AB	No Response	
AC	No Response	
AD	No Response	
AE	No Response	
AF	No Response	
AG	No Response	
AH	No Response	
AI	No Response	
AJ	No Response	
AK	No Response	
AL	No Response	
AM	No Response	

Flood Control District of Maricopa County (FCDMC)		
<i>Segment No.</i>	<i>Rating</i>	<i>Comments</i>
AN	No Response	
AO	No Response	
Q3		Least impact to existing development / infrastructure
Q4		FCD only looked at the alignments that were in the vicinity of the PVR structures. The area to the northwest is more prone to earth fissures and subsidence. Any crossings of the Powerline Floodway would need to be spanned. For storms larger than the 100 yr storm, flows may begin to be discharged from the PVR auxiliary spillways. These flows may impact the alignments west of the PVR. PVR would help to provide flooding protection for the alignments to the west.

	<b>Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS)</b>	
<i>Segment No.</i>	<i>Rating</i>	<i>Comments</i>
Terminus 1	Favorable	Least impact to actively farmed land and lands receiving USDA-NRCS cost-share assistance
Terminus 2	Unfavorable	Leads to other segments that impact actively farmed land and lands receiving USDA-NRCS cost-share assistance
Terminus 3	Unfavorable	Leads to other segments that impact actively farmed land and lands receiving USDA-NRCS cost-share assistance
Terminus 4	Favorable	Avoids actively farmed land and lands receiving USDA-NRCS cost-share assistance.
Terminus 5	Unfavorable	Impacts actively farmed land including USDA-NRCS cost-share assisted irrigation structures
A	Favorable	Avoids actively farmed land and lands receiving USDA-NRCS cost-share assistance.
B	No Response	Neutral - minimal impact to actively farmed land
C	Favorable	Minimal impact to actively farmed land
D	Favorable	Minimal impact to actively farmed land
E	No Response	Neutral - minimal impact to actively farmed land
F	No Response	Neutral - minimal impact to actively farmed land
G	No Response	Neutral - minimal impact to actively farmed land
H	No Response	Neutral - minimal impact to actively farmed land
I	Unfavorable	Avoids actively farmed land but leads to other segments that impact actively farmed land and lands receiving USDA-NRCS cost-share assistance



Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS)		
<i>Segment No.</i>	<i>Rating</i>	<i>Comments</i>
J	Unfavorable	Avoids actively farmed land but leads to other segments that impact actively farmed land and lands receiving USDA-NRCS cost-share assistance
K	Unfavorable	Minimal impact to actively farmed land but leads to other segments that impact actively farmed land and lands receiving USDA-NRCS cost-share assistance
L	No Response	Neutral
M	Unfavorable	Segment leads to other segments that impact actively farmed land and lands receiving USDA-NRCS cost-share assistance
N	Unfavorable	Segment leads to other segments that impact actively farmed land and lands receiving USDA-NRCS cost-share assistance
O	Unfavorable	Segment leads to other segments that impact actively farmed land and lands receiving USDA-NRCS cost-share assistance
P	Unfavorable	Minimal impact to actively farmed land but leads to other segments that impact actively farmed land and lands receiving USDA-NRCS cost-share assistance
Q	Unfavorable	Impacts actively farmed land including substantial USDA-NRCS cost-share assisted irrigation structures
R	Unfavorable	Avoids actively farmed land but leads to other segments that impact actively farmed land and lands receiving USDA-NRCS cost-share assistance
S	Unfavorable	Avoids actively farmed land but leads to other segments that impact actively farmed land and lands receiving USDA-NRCS cost-share assistance
T	Unfavorable	Minimal impact to actively farmed land but leads to other segments that impact actively farmed land and lands receiving USDA-NRCS cost-share assistance
U	Unfavorable	Minimal impact to actively farmed land but leads to other segments that impact actively farmed land and lands receiving USDA-NRCS cost-share assistance
V	Unfavorable	Minimal impact to actively farmed land but leads to other segments that impact actively farmed land and lands receiving USDA-NRCS cost-share assistance
W	Unfavorable	Avoids actively farmed land but leads to other segments that impact actively farmed land and lands receiving USDA-NRCS cost-share assistance

<i>Segment No.</i>	<b>Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS)</b>	
	<i>Rating</i>	<i>Comments</i>
X	Unfavorable	Impacts actively farmed land including substantial USDA-NRCS cost-share assisted irrigation structures
Y	No Response	Neutral - minimal impact to farmland as it maximizes use of existing transportation routes. Does impact farms that have received. substantial USDA-NRCS cost-share assisted irrigation structures
Z	Favorable	Minimal impact to farmland as it uses existing transportation routes
AA	Favorable	Minimal impact to farmland as it uses existing transportation routes
AB	Unfavorable	Impacts actively farmed land.
AC	Unfavorable	Impacts actively farmed land including substantial USDA-NRCS cost-share assisted irrigation structures
AD	Unfavorable	Impacts actively farmed land including substantial USDA-NRCS cost-share assisted irrigation structures
AE	Unfavorable	Impacts actively farmed land including substantial USDA-NRCS cost-share assisted irrigation structures
AF	Unfavorable	Impacts actively farmed land including substantial USDA-NRCS cost-share assisted irrigation structures
AG	Unfavorable	Impacts actively farmed land including substantial USDA-NRCS cost-share assisted irrigation structures
AH	Unfavorable	Impacts actively farmed land including substantial USDA-NRCS cost-share assisted irrigation structures
AI	Unfavorable	Impacts actively farmed land
AJ	Unfavorable	Impacts actively farmed land including substantial USDA-NRCS cost-share assisted irrigation structures
AK	Unfavorable	Impacts actively farmed land
AL	Unfavorable	Impacts actively farmed land including substantial USDA-NRCS cost-share assisted irrigation structures
AM	Unfavorable	Impacts actively farmed land including substantial USDA-NRCS cost-share assisted irrigation structures

Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS)		
<i>Segment No.</i>	<i>Rating</i>	<i>Comments</i>
AN	Unfavorable	Impacts actively farmed land including substantial USDA-NRCS cost-share assisted irrigation structures
AO	Unfavorable	Impacts actively farmed land including substantial USDA-NRCS cost-share assisted irrigation structures
Q3		Best connects to other major routes (I-10, US 60, etc.); Least impact to natural areas and open space; Makes best use of existing roads
Q4		Farmers receiving cost-share financial assistance from USDA-NRCS through Farm Bill Programs may be required to refund all or a portion of any dollars earned under our programs if they sell or lose control of their lands. They may also be required to pay liquidated damages for recovery of administrative costs and technical services passed to USDA-NRCS. This added expense needs to be taken into consideration in addition to the fact that many of the proposed segments cut a number of farms into multiple smaller farms. When this is done the farmers will likely be faced with many hardships in how they move water around their farms to irrigate their crops. USDA-NRCS continues to work with farmers in the study area and provide cost-share assistance on multiple irrigation structures each year (irrigation ditches, turn out structures, etc).

	<b>Pima Association of Governments (PAG)</b>	
<i>Segment No.</i>	<i>Rating</i>	<i>Comments</i>
Terminus 1	Favorable	Most accessible to greatest amount of current and future population. Nearest major generators/attractors.
Terminus 2	No Response	
Terminus 3	No Response	
Terminus 4	Favorable	Same as above. Most closely aligned with Long Range Transportation Plans of various organizations. Make use of existing infrastructure.
Terminus 5	No Response	
A	Favorable	Closest to current and future population clusters.
B	Favorable	Same as above.
C	No Response	
D	Favorable	
E	No Response	
F	Favorable	Would cause less "disturbance" than other potential routes.
G	No Response	
H	Favorable	Most direct route.
I	No Response	

Pima Association of Governments (PAG)		
<i>Segment No.</i>	<i>Rating</i>	<i>Comments</i>
J	No Response	
K	No Response	
L	No Response	
M	No Response	
N	No Response	
O	No Response	
P	No Response	
Q	No Response	
R	No Response	
S	No Response	
T	No Response	
U	No Response	
V	No Response	
W	No Response	

Pima Association of Governments (PAG)		
<i>Segment No.</i>	<i>Rating</i>	<i>Comments</i>
X	No Response	
Y	Favorable	Most direct connection to SR 87.
Z	Favorable	Most efficient use of existing infrastructure.
AA	Favorable	
AB	No Response	
AC	No Response	
AD	No Response	
AE	No Response	
AF	No Response	
AG	No Response	
AH	No Response	
AI	No Response	
AJ	No Response	
AK	No Response	
AL	No Response	
AM	No Response	

	Pima Association of Governments (PAG)	
<i>Segment No.</i>	<i>Rating</i>	<i>Comments</i>
AN	No Response	
AO	No Response	
Q3		Best connects to other major routes (I-10, US 60, etc.); Makes best use of existing roads; Based on input received from the public.
Q4		PAG has some preferred route alignment base on criteria mentioned in the textboxes above. However, at this point, PAG has not determined any route alignment as "unfavorable". PAG would suggest the study team re-evaluate growth projections to take into consideration more recent trends in the economy and political environment. A higher degree of coordination with the Town of Marana and their multiple transportation plans. Consideration of using LOS D for peak hours at build out for design. A larger focus on Access to regional transportation "attractors" and generators as opposed to general "mobility". Clarification in the draft Purpose and Need as to the term "significant". Does it mean "statistically significant"? If so, what analysis has been performed?

Valley Metro Regional Public Transportation Authority (RPTA)		
<i>Segment No.</i>	<i>Rating</i>	<i>Comments</i>
Terminus 1	Favorable	
Terminus 2	No Response	Would suggest terminating this alignment at SR 24 (Williams Gateway Freeway) instead of at US 60. Access to US 60 would still occur via the connection to Loop 202 (Santan Freeway).
Terminus 3	No Response	
Terminus 4	No Response	
Terminus 5	No Response	
A	Unfavorable	Suggest terminating this alignment at connection to future SR 24 to reduce impacts to Ironwood Drive.
B	Favorable	Southern end of this segment parallels UPRR and would provide an opportunity to develop a multi-modal alignment in this corridor that would support future passenger rail (commuter and inter-city) along this line.
C	No Response	
D	No Response	Suggest moving this segment farther west to parallel UPRR corridor.
E	No Response	
F	Favorable	Portion of this route parallels UPRR right of way. Could provide a opportunity to develop a multi-modal corridor that would include both freeway investments and passenger rail investments as part of the development of high speed rail service between Phoenix and Tucson.
G	No Response	
H	No Response	Suggest moving this segment farther west to parallel UPRR corridor.
I	No Response	



Valley Metro Regional Public Transportation Authority (RPTA)		
Segment No.	Rating	Comments
J	No Response	
K	No Response	
L	No Response	
M	No Response	
N	No Response	
O	No Response	
P	No Response	
Q	No Response	
R	Unfavorable	Proximity to AZ 79
S	Unfavorable	Proximity to AZ 79
T	Unfavorable	Proximity to AZ 79
U	Favorable	
V	Unfavorable	Proximity to AZ 79
W	Unfavorable	Proximity to AZ 79

Valley Metro Regional Public Transportation Authority (RPTA)		
<i>Segment No.</i>	<i>Rating</i>	<i>Comments</i>
X	Unfavorable	Proximity to AZ 79
Y	No Response	
Z	Favorable	Due to proximity of UPRR corridor, this alignment provides the greatest potential for doing a multi-modal facility that would address more than just road based modes (cars and trucks).
AA	Favorable	Due to proximity of UPRR corridor, this alignment provides the greatest potential for doing a multi-modal facility that would address more than just road based modes (cars and trucks).
AB	No Response	
AC	No Response	
AD	No Response	
AE	No Response	
AF	Favorable	Portion of this route parallels UPRR right of way. Could provide an opportunity to develop a multi-modal corridor that would include both freeway investments and passenger rail investments as part of the development of high speed rail service between Phoenix and Tucson.
AG	No Response	
AH	No Response	
AI	No Response	
AJ	No Response	
AK	No Response	
AL	No Response	
AM	No Response	

Valley Metro Regional Public Transportation Authority (RPTA)		
<i>Segment No.</i>	<i>Rating</i>	<i>Comments</i>
AN	No Response	
AO	No Response	
Q3		Best connects to employment centers; Based on input received from agencies and jurisdictions; Based on input received from the public.
Q4		Route alternative be designed as a multi-modal corridor from the start. Alignment and cross section should allow for the implementation of dedicated transit corridors and HOV lanes as future needs warrant. To reduce congestion attributed to weaving at TIs, the route should include direct HOV and/or transit connections from the corridor to park & rides lots, transit centers, and intersecting transit services.

Apache Junction		
<i>Segment No.</i>	<i>Rating</i>	<i>Comments</i>
Terminus 1	Unfavorable	
Terminus 2	Favorable	
Terminus 3	Unfavorable	
Terminus 4	No Response	
Terminus 5	No Response	
A	Unfavorable	
B	No Response	
C	No Response	
D	No Response	
E	No Response	
F	No Response	
G	No Response	
H	No Response	
I	Favorable	

Segment No.	Apache Junction	
	Rating	Comments
J	Favorable	
K	No Response	
L	No Response	
M	No Response	
N	No Response	
O	No Response	
P	No Response	
Q	No Response	
R	No Response	
S	No Response	
T	No Response	
U	No Response	
V	No Response	
W	No Response	

Apache Junction		
<i>Segment No.</i>	<i>Rating</i>	<i>Comments</i>
X	No Response	
Y	No Response	
Z	No Response	
AA	No Response	
AB	No Response	
AC	No Response	
AD	No Response	
AE	No Response	
AF	No Response	
AG	No Response	
AH	No Response	
AI	No Response	
AJ	No Response	
AK	No Response	
AL	No Response	
AM	No Response	

	Apache Junction	
<i>Segment No.</i>	<i>Rating</i>	<i>Comments</i>
AN	No Response	
AO	No Response	
Q3		Best relieves traffic on other highways and freeways; Best connects to other major routes (I-10, US 60, etc.), Based on input received from agencies and jurisdictions
Q4		No comments

	Coolidge	
<i>Segment No.</i>	<i>Rating</i>	<i>Comments</i>
Terminus 1	No Response	
Terminus 2	No Response	
Terminus 3	No Response	
Terminus 4	No Response	
Terminus 5	No Response	
A	No Response	
B	No Response	
C	No Response	
D	No Response	
E	No Response	
F	No Response	
G	No Response	
H	No Response	
I	No Response	



	Coolidge	
<i>Segment No.</i>	<i>Rating</i>	<i>Comments</i>
J	No Response	
K	No Response	
L	No Response	
M	No Response	
N	No Response	
O	No Response	
P	No Response	
Q	No Response	
R	No Response	
S	No Response	
T	No Response	
U	No Response	
V	No Response	
W	No Response	

	Coolidge	
<i>Segment No.</i>	<i>Rating</i>	<i>Comments</i>
X	No Response	
Y	Unfavorable	
Z	Unfavorable	
AA	Unfavorable	
AB	Favorable	
AC	Unfavorable	
AD	Favorable	
AE	Unfavorable	
AF	Unfavorable	
AG	No Response	
AH	Favorable	
AI	No Response	
AJ	No Response	
AK	No Response	
AL	No Response	
AM	No Response	

	<b>Coolidge</b>	
<i>Segment No.</i>	<i>Rating</i>	<i>Comments</i>
AN	Favorable	
AO	No Response	
Q3		Best relieves traffic on other highways and freeways; Best connects to employment centers; Based on input received from the public
Q4		These comments have been reviewed and accepted by the Coolidge City Council at its meeting on November 28, 2011. (See attachments)

	<b>Eloy</b>	
<i>Segment No.</i>	<i>Rating</i>	<i>Comments</i>
Terminus 1	No Response	
Terminus 2	No Response	
Terminus 3	No Response	
Terminus 4	No Response	
Terminus 5	No Response	
A	No Response	
B	No Response	
C	No Response	
D	No Response	
E	No Response	
F	No Response	
G	No Response	
H	No Response	
I	No Response	

Eloy		
<i>Segment No.</i>	<i>Rating</i>	<i>Comments</i>
J	No Response	
K	No Response	
L	No Response	
M	No Response	
N	No Response	
O	No Response	
P	No Response	
Q	No Response	
R	No Response	
S	No Response	
T	No Response	
U	No Response	
V	No Response	
W	No Response	

Eloy		
<i>Segment No.</i>	<i>Rating</i>	<i>Comments</i>
X	No Response	
Y	Unfavorable	
Z	Unfavorable	
AA	Unfavorable	
AB	No Response	
AC	No Response	
AD	No Response	
AE	No Response	
AF	No Response	
AG	No Response	
AH	No Response	
AI	No Response	
AJ	No Response	
AK	Favorable	
AL	Favorable	
AM	No Response	

	<b>Eloy</b>	
<i>Segment No.</i>	<i>Rating</i>	<i>Comments</i>
AN	No Response	
AO	No Response	
Q3		
Q4		

	<b>Florence</b>	
<i>Segment No.</i>	<i>Rating</i>	<i>Comments</i>
Terminus 1	Unfavorable	Okay to continue north to connect to 60, but let's not lose Ironwood in the process.
Terminus 2	Favorable	...but seems more critical how N-S ties into 24 and 202. Would not locate 60 terminus any further east.
Terminus 3	Unfavorable	Does not seem to offer any advantages. Likely inconsistent with current and projected travel patterns.
Terminus 4	Unfavorable	Need to maintain 87, even if turned over to local cities. Inconsistent with Coolidge, Eloy and Pinal County plans.
Terminus 5	Unfavorable	Most logical. Consistent with Eloy, Coolidge and Pinal County plans. Best option for economic development.
A	Unfavorable	See Ironwood comment above. Can't afford to lose a critical, and one of few, N-S surface arterials.
B	Unfavorable	See Ironwood comments above. Ironwood too critical of a surface arterial to lose. Impacts to ex. devel. too great.
C	Unfavorable	Devastating for Florence. Creates a Florence bypass. Negatively impacts that hwy.
D	Unfavorable	Devastating for Florence. Creates a Florence bypass. Negatively impacts ex. And planned developments.
E	Favorable	Only works if proper tie into US 60, 24 and/or 202. Avoid Ironwood.
F	Unfavorable	Moves too far west too soon. Loss of access and econ. Opportunities along railroad. Impacts ex. Development.
G	Favorable	Could work as alternate to approved Florence route. Need to watch how connects to "L", address impacts to Quail Run Road, reduce impacts to ex. devel.
H	Unfavorable	Creates a Florence bypass. Impact on AMR. Does not work under any conditions.
I	Favorable	Logical connection to 60, but still likely more critical to look at how this works with SR24.



<i>Segment No.</i>	<b>Florence</b>	
	<i>Rating</i>	<i>Comments</i>
J	Favorable	Could work with Florence's plans. See comments on "I" above. Would not go any further east w/ the N-S.
K	Favorable	An option that could possibly work with Florence's plans.
L	Favorable	An option that could possibly work with Florence's plans.
M	Unfavorable	Not viable for Florence. Would support a far east route, which would not be consistent with Florence's preferences.
N	Unfavorable	Leads to Unfavorable terminus. Inconsistent with ex. And projected travel patterns.
O	Favorable	Works with Florence General Plan. We would be willing to work with ADOT and others on further refinements.
P	Favorable	Works with Florence General Plan. We would be willing to work with ADOT and others on further refinements.
Q	Unfavorable	Splits AMR and Merrill Ranch. Does not offer as many access and econ. Development opportunities as "A" and "V".
R	Unfavorable	Too far east and poor terminus. Inconsistent with ex. And projected travel patterns.
S	Unfavorable	Too far east. Inconsistent with ex. And project travel patterns. Sup. Vistas growth too far off to support seg.
T	Unfavorable	Horrible for Florence and unrealistic being so close to Magma Dam. High costs, poor access, and loss of econ. Devel. Benefits.
U	Favorable	An option to V. Do need to weigh cost/benefits with extra CAP crossings.
V	Favorable	Avoids extra CAP crossings that V has, but has a greater impact to Merrill Ranch.
W	Unfavorable	See "T". Plus this segment also impacts Florence military reservation and is too close to 79.

	Florence	
<i>Segment No.</i>	<i>Rating</i>	<i>Comments</i>
X	Favorable	The best for Florence and helps us preserve long-term visibility of core Florence. Downtown interchange critical.
Y	Unfavorable	Creates a Florence bypass. Impacts ex. Devel. Lose ex. Surface arterials. Not consistent with County, Florence or Coolidge plans.
Z	Unfavorable	Lose 87, splits core of Coolidge. Inconsistent with County, Eloy and Coolidge plans.
AA	Unfavorable	Lose 87 + too close to railroad. Inconsistent with Eloy and Coolidge plans.
AB	Favorable	Works with Florence's plans. Also consistent with Coolidge's plans.
AC	Unfavorable	AN works better and is more consistent with Coolidge and County preferences.
AD	Favorable	Works with local preferences.
AE	Unfavorable	Too far west. Inconsistent with local plans.
AF	Unfavorable	Too far west. Inconsistent with local plans.
AG	Unfavorable	Too far west. Inconsisten with local plans.
AH	Favorable	Preferred segment that connects to other preferred segments.
AI	Favorable	Alternative to "AK", but AK preferable and more consistent with local plans.
AJ	Favorable	AI alternate if "AI" chosen over preferred "AK".
AK	Favorable	Preferred. Consistent with local plans.
AL	Favorable	Preferred. Consistent with local plans.
AM	Favorable	Our preferred route is AB, but with some tweaks, AM could likley work. Imp. To evaluate impacts to Valley Farms Rd and community, 230kV, etc.

	Florence	
<i>Segment No.</i>	<i>Rating</i>	<i>Comments</i>
AN	Favorable	Works with Florence alignment
AO	Unfavorable	Prefer AB and then AM. AO could impact Waste Management site, some planned developments and development of economically viable 287 TI.
Q3		Best relieves traffic on local streets; Best connects to cities and towns; Based on input received from agencies and jurisdictions
Q4		Thanks for noting our preferences and referring to our preferred and approved corridor alignment. We look forward to working with ADOT and the N-S team on further refinements to the corridor and ultimately the selection of a final N-S alignment that is mutually acceptable to Florence, Pinal County and stakeholders.

	<b>Pinal County</b>	
<i>Segment No.</i>	<i>Rating</i>	<i>Comments</i>
Terminus 1	Unfavorable	This alternative would wipeout Pinal County resident's only continuous north south facility.
Terminus 2	Unfavorable	Begin at Alt 2 moving south westerly crossing CAP terminating the proposed SR 24 study at E/G.
Terminus 3	Unfavorable	
Terminus 4	Unfavorable	
Terminus 5	Unfavorable	Pinal County supports the local cities and towns desires for north south alternatives. See attached pdf.
A	Unfavorable	This alternative would wipeout Pinal County resident's only continuous north south facility.
B	Unfavorable	This alternative would wipeout Pinal County resident's only continuous north south facility.
C	Unfavorable	This alternative would wipeout Pinal County resident's only continuous north south facility.
D	Unfavorable	Pinal County supports the local cities and towns desires for north south alternatives. See attached pdf.
E	Favorable	Only if E alternative begins with in the SR 24 study area as depicted on open house handouts. We would maintain a desire to keep the corridor just west of the CAP canal.
F	No Response	Pinal County supports the local cities and towns desires for north south alternatives. See attached pdf.
G	Favorable	Pinal County supports the local cities and towns desires for north south alternatives. See attached pdf.
H	No Response	Pinal County supports the local cities and towns desires for north south alternatives. See attached pdf.
I	No Response	Begin at Alt 2 moving south westerly crossing CAP terminating the proposed SR 24 study at E/G.

<b>Pinal County</b>		
<i>Segment No.</i>	<i>Rating</i>	<i>Comments</i>
J	Unfavorable	Does appear to have benefit within the next 10-15 years.
K	Unfavorable	Does appear to have benefit within the next 10-15 years.
L	No Response	Pinal County supports the local cities and towns desires for north south alternatives. See attached pdf.
M	Unfavorable	Does appear to have benefit within the next 10-15 years.
N	Unfavorable	Does appear to have benefit within the next 10-15 years.
O	Unfavorable	Does appear to have benefit within the next 10-15 years.
P	No Response	Pinal County supports the local cities and towns desires for north south alternatives. See attached pdf.
Q	No Response	Pinal County supports the local cities and towns desires for north south alternatives. See attached pdf.
R	Unfavorable	Does appear to have benefit within the next 10-15 years.
S	Unfavorable	Does appear to have benefit within the next 10-15 years.
T	Unfavorable	Does appear to have benefit within the next 10-15 years.
U	No Response	Pinal County supports the local cities and towns desires for north south alternatives. See attached pdf.
V	No Response	Pinal County supports the local cities and towns desires for north south alternatives. See attached pdf.
W	Unfavorable	Does appear to have benefit within the next 10-15 years.

<i>Segment No.</i>	<b>Pinal County</b>	
	<i>Rating</i>	<i>Comments</i>
X	No Response	Pinal County supports the local cities and towns desires for north south alternatives. See attached pdf.
Y	No Response	Pinal County supports the local cities and towns desires for north south alternatives. See attached pdf.
Z	No Response	Pinal County supports the local cities and towns desires for north south alternatives. See attached pdf.
AA	No Response	Pinal County supports the local cities and towns desires for north south alternatives. See attached pdf.
AB	No Response	Pinal County supports the local cities and towns desires for north south alternatives. See attached pdf.
AC	No Response	Pinal County supports the local cities and towns desires for north south alternatives. See attached pdf.
AD	No Response	Pinal County supports the local cities and towns desires for north south alternatives. See attached pdf.
AE	No Response	Pinal County supports the local cities and towns desires for north south alternatives. See attached pdf.
AF	No Response	Pinal County supports the local cities and towns desires for north south alternatives. See attached pdf.
AG	No Response	Pinal County supports the local cities and towns desires for north south alternatives. See attached pdf.
AH	No Response	Pinal County supports the local cities and towns desires for north south alternatives. See attached pdf.
AI	No Response	Pinal County supports the local cities and towns desires for north south alternatives. See attached pdf.
AJ	No Response	Pinal County supports the local cities and towns desires for north south alternatives. See attached pdf.
AK	No Response	Pinal County supports the local cities and towns desires for north south alternatives. See attached pdf.
AL	No Response	Pinal County supports the local cities and towns desires for north south alternatives. See attached pdf.
AM	No Response	Pinal County supports the local cities and towns desires for north south alternatives. See attached pdf.

<b>Pinal County</b>		
<i>Segment No.</i>	<i>Rating</i>	<i>Comments</i>
AN	No Response	Pinal County supports the local cities and towns desires for north south alternatives. See attached pdf.
AO	No Response	Pinal County supports the local cities and towns desires for north south alternatives. See attached pdf.
Q3		Best relieves traffic on local streets; Best connects to employment centers; Best connect to cities and towns; Based on input received from agencies and jurisdictions
Q4		I realize we identified four but feel that these are very important. Thank you for your attention and the opportunity to input.

Queen Creek		
Segment No.	Rating	Comments
Terminus 1	Unfavorable	The Town supports Apache Junction's desire for the ultimate terminus to be further east, and we believe the initial connection between the N-S Freeway and other Maricopa County freeways should be via SR-24. This approach would be from northbound N-S freeway to westbound SR-24 to northbound 202 to westbound US-60.
Terminus 2	Favorable	The Town supports this connection as the ultimate connection between US-60 and SR-24, although east of the CAP canal the freeway should be identified as a "Phase 2" project and occur after "Phase 1" of the N-S freeway connects 1_10 to SR-24.
Terminus 3	Unfavorable	The Town does not support this far eastern connection.
Terminus 4	No Response	
Terminus 5	No Response	
A	Unfavorable	The Town does not support Segment A for the same reason we do not support Terminus 1.
B	Unfavorable	The Town does not support the northern portion of Segment B (north of the SR-24 alignment) for the same reason we do not support Terminus 1.
C	No Response	
D	No Response	
E	Favorable	The Town supports the middle portion of Segment E - the portion that overlaps with the SR-24 study area. As previously mentioned, the initial connection between the N-S Freeway and other Maricopa County freeways should be via SR-24. The Town does not support the far northerly portion of Segment E (north of the SR-24 alignment) for the same reason we do not support Terminus 1.
F	No Response	
G	No Response	
H	No Response	
I	Favorable	The Town support Segment I as the northern portion of a "Phase 2" connection between SR-24 and the US-60 Freeways.



Queen Creek		
<i>Segment No.</i>	<i>Rating</i>	<i>Comments</i>
J	Unfavorable	The Town does not support Segments J, M, N, R or S because we favor an alignment not shown on the map - a proposed new Segment that would connec Segment I to Segment E, somewhere between the Germann Road and Ocotillo Road alignments.
K	No Response	
L	No Response	
M	Unfavorable	The Town does not support Segments J, M, N, R or S because we favor an alignment not shown on the map - a proposed new Segment that would connec Segment I to Segment E, somewhere between the Germann Road and Ocotillo Road alignments.
N	Unfavorable	The Town does not support Segments J, M, N, R or S because we favor an alignment not shown on the map - a proposed new Segment that would connec Segment I to Segment E, somewhere between the Germann Road and Ocotillo Road alignments.
O	No Response	
P	No Response	
Q	No Response	
R	Unfavorable	The Town does not support Segments J, M, N, R or S because we favor an alignment not shown on the map - a proposed new Segment that would connec Segment I to Segment E, somewhere between the Germann Road and Ocotillo Road alignments.
S	Unfavorable	The Town does not support Segments J, M, N, R or S because we favor an alignment not shown on the map - a proposed new Segment that would connec Segment I to Segment E, somewhere between the Germann Road and Ocotillo Road alignments.
T	No Response	
U	No Response	
V	No Response	
W	No Response	

Queen Creek		
<i>Segment No.</i>	<i>Rating</i>	<i>Comments</i>
X	No Response	
Y	No Response	
Z	No Response	
AA	No Response	
AB	No Response	
AC	No Response	
AD	No Response	
AE	No Response	
AF	No Response	
AG	No Response	
AH	No Response	
AI	No Response	
AJ	No Response	
AK	No Response	
AL	No Response	
AM	No Response	

Queen Creek		
<i>Segment No.</i>	<i>Rating</i>	<i>Comments</i>
AN	No Response	
AO	No Response	
Q3		Best connects to employment centers; Best connects to cities and towns; Based on input received from agencies and jurisdictions
Q4		Thank you for the opportunity to comment. We recognize that our recommendations are a hybrid approach, but were surprised when the Comment Form Map did not include a connection between Terminus 2 and Segment E. The Town has done our best to coordinate with surrounding jurisdictions (Apache Junction and Pinal County) to develop our ultimate recommendations. We have not commented on alignments south of the SR-24 corridor area, but support the recommendations of those communities that are impacted by the new N-S freeway (Eloy, Coolidge, Florence, Pinal County). Attached for your information and use is a revised map showing our alignment preferences. Thank you again for the opportunity to comment.

## **APPENDIX C**

### **Public Workshop Notification**

# JOIN US AT A PUBLIC WORKSHOP

## NORTH-SOUTH CORRIDOR STUDY

### POSSIBLE ROUTE ALTERNATIVES BETWEEN US 60 AND I-10 IN PINAL COUNTY

The Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) and the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) invite you to attend one of four public workshops for the North-South Corridor Study. Participants will be provided with an update on the study and will have the opportunity to provide their input on possible locations for a potential new transportation route in Pinal County.

Each workshop will begin at 6 p.m. and will be identical in content and format. The study team will give a brief presentation at 6:15 p.m. and attendees will break out into small groups to view and discuss the possible route alternatives on maps. Materials from the Intercity Rail Study will be available.

Since the October 2010 public meetings, possible route alternatives have been identified between US 60 in Apache Junction and I-10 near Eloy and Picacho (see map). The goal of the workshops is to gather specific opinions or concerns from residents or landowners affected by the possible routes. The public's comments will be a factor in determining which route alternatives will be considered for additional study. The team is also evaluating the consequences of not making any improvements (no-build alternative).

If you are unable to attend a workshop, you may visit the study website at [www.azdot.gov/northsouthcorridorstudy](http://www.azdot.gov/northsouthcorridorstudy) to view or download the possible route alternatives, additional project information or a comment form. You may also submit your comments using the following methods:

- Complete the website's electronic comment form
- Email your comments to [northsouthstudy@azdot.gov](mailto:northsouthstudy@azdot.gov)
- Fax your completed comment form to 520-327-4687
- Mail your completed comment form to the ADOT Outreach Team at 2540 N. Tucson Blvd., Tucson, AZ 85716

If you do not have access to the Internet, you may request study information by phone at 520-327-6077, ext. 120. Public comments must be received online or by mail before Dec. 22, 2011, in order to be part of the official public record.

*Este documento está disponible en español llamando al 520-327-6077.*



**TODD EMERY**  
ADOT Tucson District Engineer


**JAVIER GURROLA**  
ADOT Project Manager

**JENNIFER TOTH**  
ADOT State Engineer



THIS NEWSPAPER NOTICE AND OTHER PROJECT INFORMATION ARE AVAILABLE AT [www.azdot.gov/northsouthcorridorstudy](http://www.azdot.gov/northsouthcorridorstudy)

Americans with Disabilities Act: Persons with a disability may request reasonable accommodations by calling 520-327-6077. Requests should be made by Nov. 22, 2011. This document is available in alternative formats. Please contact the ADOT Outreach Team at 520-327-6077 for a copy.



Detailed maps will be available at the workshops.  
The possible route alternatives are preliminary and subject to change.

# JOIN US AT A PUBLIC WORKSHOP

## NORTH-SOUTH CORRIDOR STUDY

### POSSIBLE ROUTE ALTERNATIVES BETWEEN US 60 AND I-10 IN PINAL COUNTY

The Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) and the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) invite you to attend one of four public workshops for the North-South Corridor Study. Participants will be provided with an update on the study and will have the opportunity to provide their input on possible locations for a potential new transportation route in Pinal County.

Each workshop will begin at 6 p.m. and will be identical in content and format. The study team will give a brief presentation at 6:15 p.m. and attendees will break out into small groups to view and discuss the possible route alternatives on maps. Materials from the Intercity Rail Study will be available.

Since the October 2010 public meetings, possible route alternatives have been identified between US 60 and I-10 near Eloy and Picacho (see map). The goal of the workshops is to gather specific opinions or concerns from residents or landowners affected by the possible routes. The public's comments will be a factor in determining which route alternatives will be considered for additional study. The team is also evaluating the consequences of not making any improvements (no-build alternative).

If you are unable to attend a workshop, you may visit the study website at [www.azdot.gov/northsouthcorridorstudy](http://www.azdot.gov/northsouthcorridorstudy) to view or download the possible route alternatives, additional project information or a comment form. You may also submit your comments using the following methods:

- Complete the website's electronic comment form
- Email your comments to [northsouthstudy@azdot.gov](mailto:northsouthstudy@azdot.gov)
- Fax your completed comment form to 520-327-4687
- Mail your completed comment form to the ADOT Outreach Team at 2540 N. Tucson Blvd., Tucson, AZ 85716

If you do not have access to the Internet, you may request study information by phone at 520-327-6077, ext. 120. Public comments must be received online or by mail before Dec. 22, 2011, in order to be part of the official public record.

*Este documento está disponible en español llamando al 520-327-6077.*

**TODD EMERY**  
ADOT Tucson District Engineer

**JAVIER GURROLA**  
ADOT Project Manager

**JENNIFER TOTH**  
ADOT State Engineer

#### FOUR WORKSHOPS TO CHOOSE FROM:

**Tuesday, Dec. 6**

6 to 8 p.m.

Santa Cruz Valley Union  
High School Cafeteria  
900 N. Main St., Eloy, AZ 85131

**Wednesday, Dec. 7**

6 to 8 p.m.

Apache Junction Moose Lodge  
Large Meeting Room  
350 W. 16th Ave., Apache Junction, AZ 85120

**Thursday, Dec. 8**


6 to 8 p.m.

Coolidge-Florence  
Elks Lodge  
2241 N. Attaway Road, Coolidge, AZ 85128

**Monday, Dec. 12**

6 to 8 p.m.

Walker Butte Elementary School  
Cafeteria  
29697 N. Desert Willow Blvd.  
San Tan Valley, AZ 85142



THIS NEWSPAPER NOTICE AND OTHER PROJECT INFORMATION ARE AVAILABLE AT [www.azdot.gov/northsouthcorridorstudy](http://www.azdot.gov/northsouthcorridorstudy)



Americans with Disabilities Act: Persons with a disability may request reasonable accommodations by calling 520-327-6077. Requests should be made by Nov. 22, 2011. This document is available in alternative formats. Please contact the ADOT Outreach Team at 520-327-6077 for a copy.

# JOIN US AT A PUBLIC WORKSHOP

## NORTH-SOUTH CORRIDOR STUDY

### POSSIBLE ROUTE ALTERNATIVES BETWEEN US 60 AND I-10 IN PINAL COUNTY

The Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) and the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) invite you to attend one of four public workshops for the North-South Corridor Study. Participants will be provided with an update on the study and will have the opportunity to provide their input on possible locations for a potential new transportation route in Pinal County.

Each workshop will begin at 6 p.m. and will be identical in content and format. The study team will give a brief presentation at 6:15 p.m. and attendees will break out into small groups to view and discuss the possible route alternatives on maps. Materials for the Intercity Rail Study will be available.

Since the October 2010 public meetings, possible route alternatives have been identified between US 60 in Apache Junction and I-10 near Eloy and Picacho (see map). The goal of the workshops is to gather specific opinions or concerns from residents or landowners affected by the possible routes. The public's comments will be a factor in determining which route alternatives will be considered for additional study. The team is also evaluating the consequences of not making any improvements (no-build alternative).

If you are unable to attend a workshop, you may visit the study website at [www.azdot.gov/northsouthcorridorstudy](http://www.azdot.gov/northsouthcorridorstudy) to view or download the possible route alternatives, additional project information or a comment form. You may also submit your comments using the following methods:

- Complete the website's electronic comment form
- Email your comments to [northsouthstudy@azdot.gov](mailto:northsouthstudy@azdot.gov)
- Fax your completed comment form to 520-327-4687
- Mail your completed comment form to the ADOT Outreach Team at 2540 N. Tucson Blvd., Tucson, AZ 85716

If you do not have access to the Internet, you may request study information by phone at 520-327-6077, ext. 120.

Public comments must be received online or by mail before Dec. 22, 2011, in order to be part of the official public record.

*Este documento está disponible en español llamando al 520-327-6077.*

#### FOUR WORKSHOPS TO CHOOSE FROM:

**Tuesday, Dec. 6**

**6 to 8 p.m.**

Santa Cruz Valley Union  
High School Cafeteria  
900 N. Main St., Eloy, AZ 85131

**Wednesday, Dec. 7**

**6 to 8 p.m.**

Apache Junction Moose Lodge  
Large Meeting Room  
350 W. 16th Ave., Apache Junction, AZ 85120

**Thursday, Dec. 8**


**6 to 8 p.m.**

Coolidge-Florence  
Elks Lodge  
2241 N. Attaway Road, Coolidge, AZ 85128

**Monday, Dec. 12**

**6 to 8 p.m.**

Walker Butte Elementary School  
Cafeteria  
29697 N. Desert Willow Blvd.  
San Tan Valley, AZ 85142



Detailed maps will be available at the workshops. The possible route alternatives are preliminary and subject to change.

**TODD EMERY**

ADOT Tucson District Engineer

**JAVIER GURROLA**

ADOT Project Manager

**JENNIFER TOTH**

ADOT State Engineer



THIS NEWSPAPER NOTICE AND OTHER PROJECT INFORMATION ARE AVAILABLE AT [www.azdot.gov/northsouthcorridorstudy](http://www.azdot.gov/northsouthcorridorstudy)



Americans with Disabilities Act: Persons with a disability may request reasonable accommodations by calling 520-327-6077. Requests should be made by Nov. 22, 2011. This document is available in alternative formats. Please contact the ADOT Outreach Team at 520-327-6077 for a copy.

# JOIN US AT A PUBLIC WORKSHOP

## NORTH-SOUTH CORRIDOR STUDY

### POSSIBLE ROUTE ALTERNATIVES BETWEEN US 60 AND I-10 IN PINAL COUNTY

The Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) and the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) invite you to attend one of four public workshops for the North-South Corridor Study. Participants will be provided with an update on the study and will have the opportunity to provide their input on possible locations for a potential new transportation route in Pinal County.

Each workshop will begin at 6 p.m. and will be identical in content and format. The study team will give a brief presentation at 6:15 p.m. and attendees will break out into small groups to view and discuss the possible route alternatives on maps. Materials from the Intercity Rail Study will be available.

Since the October 2010 public meetings, possible route alternatives have been identified between US 60 in Apache Junction and I-10 near Eloy and Picacho (see map). The goal of the workshops is to gather specific opinions or concerns from residents or landowners affected by the possible routes. The public's comments will be a factor in determining which route alternatives will be considered for additional study. The team is also evaluating the consequences of not making any improvements (no-build alternative).

If you are unable to attend a workshop, you may visit the study website at [www.azdot.gov/northsouthcorridorstudy](http://www.azdot.gov/northsouthcorridorstudy) to view or download the possible route alternatives, additional project information or a comment form. You may also submit your comments using the following methods:

- Complete the website's electronic comment form
- Email your comments to [northsouthstudy@azdot.gov](mailto:northsouthstudy@azdot.gov)
- Fax your completed comment form to 520-327-4687
- Mail your completed comment form to the ADOT Outreach Team at 2540 N. Tucson Blvd., Tucson, AZ 85716

If you do not have access to the Internet, you may request study information by phone at 520-327-6077, ext. 120. Public comments must be received online or by mail before Dec. 22, 2011, in order to be part of the official public record.

*Este documento está disponible en español llamando al 520-327-6077.*

**TODD EMERY**  
ADOT Tucson District Engineer

**JAVIER GURROLA**  
ADOT Project Manager

**JENNIFER TOTH**  
ADOT State Engineer




THIS NEWSPAPER NOTICE AND OTHER PROJECT INFORMATION ARE AVAILABLE AT [www.azdot.gov/northsouthcorridorstudy](http://www.azdot.gov/northsouthcorridorstudy)

**Americans with Disabilities Act:** Persons with a disability may request reasonable accommodations by calling 520-327-6077. Requests should be made by Nov. 22, 2011. This document is available in alternative formats. Please contact the ADOT Outreach Team at 520-327-6077 for a copy.

ADOT Project No.: 999 PN 000 H7454 01L Federal Aid No.: STP-999-A(BBM)

Apache Junction/Gold Canyon Independent - Nov. 16, 2011






## **APPENDIX D**

### **Public Workshop Materials**

# North-South Corridor Study

POTENTIAL NEW TRANSPORTATION ROUTE  
BETWEEN US 60 AND INTERSTATE 10 IN PINAL COUNTY



## WE WANT TO HEAR FROM YOU

Expected growth in Pinal County supports the need for a new transportation route. The Arizona Department of Transportation and the Federal Highway Administration are studying the area between US 60 near Apache Junction and I-10 near Eloy and Picacho.

The purpose of the study is to identify and evaluate a possible route to provide a connection between US 60 and I-10. The study team started evaluating a 900 square-mile study area to identify a Corridor Opportunity Area that was presented at the fall 2010 public and agency scoping meetings.

After receiving input from the public and various agencies, and evaluating technical data, the team has identified possible route alternatives as presented here in this comment form.

The goal of the comment form is to gather specific opinions or concerns from individuals who live, work and travel through the study area. The public's comments will be a factor in determining which route alternatives will be selected for additional study.


Please turn to the next page to provide your comments on the segments that are being evaluated in this phase of the study. Your feedback is important to us!

PLEASE TURN TO THE  
NEXT PAGE TO FILL OUT  
THE COMMENT FORM.

# Northern Route Alternatives

ADOT Project No.: 999 PN 000 H7454 01L

## Instructions:


Each  with a letter inside it represents a segment of the potential North-South Corridor that would connect US 60 and I-10.

**Step 1:** Please circle the segments you find favorable on the two maps.

**Step 2:** Please cross out or X the segments you find unfavorable on the two maps.

**Step 3:** You can also draw a line anywhere on the map to show where you would like a segment or route.

**Step 4:** We want to know why you selected these segments. Please find the segments you marked in the list below and explain why you find them favorable or unfavorable.



## Comments:

**A** Follows Ironwood Dr between US 60 and Elliot Rd—crosses CAP Canal

☐ Favorable ☐ Unfavorable

Why? \_\_\_\_\_

**B** Follows Ironwood Dr/Gantzel Rd between Elliot Rd and Skyline Dr; parallels portion of railroad

☐ Favorable ☐ Unfavorable

Why? \_\_\_\_\_

**C** Follows Gantzel Rd/Hunt Hwy—veers around the Gila River Indian Community

☐ Favorable ☐ Unfavorable

Why? \_\_\_\_\_

**D** Follows Hunt Hwy on the west side of Anthem at Merrill Ranch—crosses Gila River on Christensen Rd

☐ Favorable ☐ Unfavorable

Why? \_\_\_\_\_

**E** New route between Ironwood Dr and Quail Run Ln west of CAP Canal

☐ Favorable ☐ Unfavorable

Why? \_\_\_\_\_

**F** New route between Gantzel Rd and Quail Run Ln; parallels railroad

☐ Favorable ☐ Unfavorable

Why? \_\_\_\_\_

**G** North of Judd Rd, follows Quail Run Ln; new route south of Judd Rd; —crosses the Magma RR, and the SRP 500kV transmission line

☐ Favorable ☐ Unfavorable

Why? \_\_\_\_\_

**H** New route along approximate extension of Quail Run Ln, south of Arizona Farms Rd, and east of Magic Ranch residential community

☐ Favorable ☐ Unfavorable

Why? \_\_\_\_\_

**I** New route south of US 60 along a future extension of Mountain View Rd on State Trust Land—located on possible future US 60 realignment

☐ Favorable ☐ Unfavorable

Why? \_\_\_\_\_

**J** New route between future extension of Williams Field Rd and Ocotillo Rd on State Trust Land—veers around Powerline, Vineyard, Rittenhouse flood structures and CAP Canal

☐ Favorable ☐ Unfavorable

Why? \_\_\_\_\_

**K** New route between Ocotillo Rd and Quail Run Ln—crosses Queen Creek Wash and CAP Canal

☐ Favorable ☐ Unfavorable

Why? \_\_\_\_\_

**L** New route south of Magma Rd connecting western and eastern routes; impacts future Dobson Farms and Arizona Farms developments

☐ Favorable ☐ Unfavorable

Why? \_\_\_\_\_

**M** New route connecting Start/End Point 2 routes with Start/End Point 3 routes

☐ Favorable ☐ Unfavorable

Why? \_\_\_\_\_

**N** New route connecting Start/End Point 3 routes with Start/End Point 2 routes

☐ Favorable ☐ Unfavorable

Why? \_\_\_\_\_

**O** New route between Ocotillo Rd and Felix Rd—crosses Queen Creek Wash, Magma RR and CAP Canal

☐ Favorable ☐ Unfavorable

Why? \_\_\_\_\_

**P** New route east of Felix Rd and Crestfield Manor development; impacts future Aspen Farms and Paloroso developments

☐ Favorable ☐ Unfavorable

Why? \_\_\_\_\_

**Q** New route between Felix Rd and SR 287, parallels railroad between Anthem and future Merrill Ranch development—crosses Gila River along future extension of Valley Farms Rd; Parallels SRP 500kV transmission line

☐ Favorable ☐ Unfavorable

Why? \_\_\_\_\_

**R** New route south from Start/End Point 3 on State Trust Land

☐ Favorable ☐ Unfavorable

Why? \_\_\_\_\_

**S** New route on State Trust Land—crosses Queen Creek Wash

☐ Favorable ☐ Unfavorable

Why? \_\_\_\_\_

**T** New route west of Magma Dam; impacts future Magma Ranch II and Skyview Farms developments

☐ Favorable ☐ Unfavorable

Why? \_\_\_\_\_

**U** New route veers around future Merrill Ranch development—crosses CAP Canal at two locations

☐ Favorable ☐ Unfavorable

Why? \_\_\_\_\_

**V** New route parallels CAP Canal; impacts future north section of Merrill Ranch development

☐ Favorable ☐ Unfavorable

Why? \_\_\_\_\_

**W** New route east of Magma Dam; crosses US Army National Guard and Florence proving grounds


☐ Favorable ☐ Unfavorable

Why? \_\_\_\_\_

**X** New route northwest of Florence downtown area- crosses Gila River just east of proposed Florence Copper Project

☐ Favorable ☐ Unfavorable


Why? \_\_\_\_\_



Map not to scale.

Federal Aid No.: STP-999-A(BBM)

**Aj** New route between Vail Rd and Fast Track Rd  
☐ **Favorable**    ☐ **Unfavorable**  
 Why? \_\_\_\_\_



**AN** New route between Martin Rd and Storey Rd following portions of Wheeler Rd, one-half mile west of Attaway Rd, located west of the "triple" irrigation canals—veers around Pinal County planned open space

☐ **Favorable**    ☐ **Unfavorable**

Why? \_\_\_\_\_

Additional Comments:

This image shows a blank sheet of white paper with horizontal blue or grey ruling lines. The lines are evenly spaced and run across the width of the page. There are no margins, text, or other markings on the paper.



2540 N. Tucson Blvd.  
Tucson, AZ 85716



NO POSTAGE  
NECESSARY  
IF MAILED  
IN THE  
UNITED STATES

**BUSINESS REPLY MAIL**

FIRST-CLASS MAIL PERMIT NO. 496 TUCSON, AZ

POSTAGE WILL BE PAID BY ADDRESSEE

ADOT OUTREACH TEAM  
2540 N TUCSON BLVD  
TUCSON AZ 85775-6547



Please fold here to mail in your comments



**What do you think are the most important factors in selecting a possible route alternative?**

Please place a check next to the three (3) factors you consider most important.

- |  |   |  |
|--|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Best relieves traffic on local streets                                | <input type="checkbox"/> Best connects to other major routes (I-10, US 60, SR 87, SR 287, etc.) | <input type="checkbox"/> Input received from the public        |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Best relieves traffic on other highways and freeways                  | <input type="checkbox"/> Lowest cost  | <input type="checkbox"/> Input received from local governments |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Best connects to employment centers                                   | <input type="checkbox"/> Least impact to existing development                                   | <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Best connects to other destinations (e.g. school/shopping/recreation) | <input type="checkbox"/> Least impact to planned future development                             | _____  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Best connects to cities and towns                                     | <input type="checkbox"/> Least impact to natural areas and open space                           | _____  |
|  | <input type="checkbox"/> Makes best use of existing roads and highways                          | _____  |



**At this time there is no funding identified for the North-South Corridor. If the road were constructed as a tolled facility would you support and/or use the new highway?**

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Yes, I would support the tolled highway   | <input type="checkbox"/> Comments: _____ |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Yes, I would use the tolled highway   | _____                                    |
| <input type="checkbox"/> No, I would not support the tolled highway and would continue to use existing highways to reach my destination(s) | _____                                    |
|  | _____                                    |

## Contact Information

Workshop Attended: ☐ Dec. 6 ☐ Dec. 7 ☐ Dec. 8 ☐ Dec. 12 ☐ Other

Name \_\_\_\_\_ Email \_\_\_\_\_

Address \_\_\_\_\_

The Arizona Department of Transportation appreciates your participation. Public comments are an important part of the study and are welcome at any time for review and consideration. Comments returned by Thursday, January 12, 2012 will be included in the summary of these public meetings. Please submit your comments to the ADOT Outreach Team:

**Mail:** 2540 N. Tucson Blvd., Tucson, AZ 85716

**Phone:** 520-327-6077, ext. 120

**Fax:** 520-327-4687

**Email:** [northsouthstudy@azdot.gov](mailto:northsouthstudy@azdot.gov)

[www.azdot.gov/northsouthcorridorstudy](http://www.azdot.gov/northsouthcorridorstudy)

## North–South Corridor Study Public Workshops

### Agenda

<b>Eloy</b> Santa Cruz Valley Union High School Tuesday, Dec. 6	<b>Apache Junction</b> Moose Lodge Meeting Room Wednesday, Dec. 7	<b>Coolidge</b> Elks Lodge Meeting Room Thursday, Dec. 8	<b>San Tan Valley</b> Walker Butte Elementary School Monday, Dec. 12
--	--	---	---

**6 p.m. Open House**  
*Please visit the information stations to view displays and maps. Study team members are available to answer questions.*

**6:15 p.m. Presentation**  
**Welcome and Introductions**  
Teresa Guillen, Arizona Department of Transportation Senior Community Relations Officer

**Study Overview and Possible Route Alternatives**  
Javier Gurrola, ADOT Predesign Project Manager  
Dave Perkins, Kimley-Horn & Associates

**6:45 p.m. Workshop Sessions**  
*Detailed maps and comment forms are available at each table. We invite you to discuss possible route alternatives in-depth with study team members and provide input regarding which possible route alternatives are or are not favorable to you.*

**7:45 p.m. Open House Continues**

**8 p.m. Adjourn**

**Comment Forms:** Please fill out a comment form. This is one of the best ways to share and document your opinions with the study team.

**Study Information:** Additional study information, copies of the displays and the PowerPoint presentation used at tonight's meeting may be found at [www.azdot.gov/northsouthcorridorstudy](http://www.azdot.gov/northsouthcorridorstudy).



# CONNECT North-South Corridor Study

## Potential New Transportation Route

from US 60



to Interstate 10

## North-South Corridor Study Potential New Transportation Route Fact Sheet

### Overview

Expected growth in Pinal County supports the need for a new transportation route. The Arizona Department of Transportation and Federal Highway Administration are studying the area between US 60 near Apache Junction and I-10 near Eloy and Picacho. The purpose of the study is to identify and evaluate a possible route to provide a connection between US 60 and I-10.

### Study Process

The study is anticipated to be completed in 2013 and will include:

- *Environmental Impact Statement (EIS)*, as required by the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), to provide an examination of environmental impacts for each of the proposed route alternatives, including hazardous materials, cultural and biological resources, socioeconomic and geological conditions, land ownership, air quality, noise impacts and water resources.
- *Alternatives Selection Report* to document development and review of possible route alternatives, including the impact of not making any improvements (a no-build option).
- *Location/Design Concept Report (L/DCR)* to document a preferred route alternative, define initial right of way needs and present an implementation plan, along with project costs and preliminary design plans.

### Possible Route Alternatives

The study is in the alternative selection phase, which means the team is looking at a range of *possible route alternatives*, including the impacts of not making any improvements (also known as a no-build option).

The study team started by evaluating a 900 square-mile study area to identify a Corridor Opportunity Area that was presented at the fall 2010 public and agency scoping meetings.

In summer 2011, a newsletter was sent to approximately 55,000 area residents, businesses and property owners with a map showing corridor segments.

After receiving input from the public and various agencies, and evaluating technical data, the team has identified possible route alternatives as presented at the winter 2011 public workshops.

The possible route alternatives include possible new roadways, improvements to existing roadways, locations on both sides of the CAP canal and alternatives that take rail and transit into consideration.

To determine the possible route alternatives, the study team looked at:

- Public, agency and jurisdictional input
- Technical assessment
- Purpose and need criteria
- Existing roadways and utilities
- Rail and transit

## North–South Corridor Study Potential New Transportation Route Fact Sheet – Continued

The study team now needs to determine which possible route alternatives will work best. The study team will screen the possible route alternatives using specific criteria:

- Regional service and accessibility: How the possible route alternative may link to other transportation features in the area, provide congestion relief, accommodate the Intercity Rail, and provide accessibility to communities, including employment and activity centers
- Impacts, including water resources, environmental, noise, development and open space factors
- Public and agency input
- Cost, including construction and right of way acquisition

### Next Steps

After screening the possible route alternatives, the study team will select at least two possible route alternatives, along with a no-build option, for detailed assessment in the EIS and DCR phase. The possible route alternatives selected will go through a more detailed analysis and will be presented to the public for additional review and feedback.

### Public Participation

Public participation is an important and ongoing part of the study. Since the study began in 2009, the team has given many presentations to stakeholder groups. In fall 2010, the study team held four public scoping meetings and one agency scoping meeting. During fall and winter 2010, the study team held multiple agency coordination meetings. For summary reports of these meetings, please visit [www.azdot.gov/northsouthcorridorstudy](http://www.azdot.gov/northsouthcorridorstudy).

### Other Projects in the Area

The study team is collaborating with other project teams along the North–South Corridor Study area to maximize the benefits for area residents and motorists who travel through Pinal County and the state of Arizona. The study and project teams the North–South Corridor Study team is collaborating with include:

- State Route 24 (formerly State Route 802) Study  
[www.azdot.gov/ValleyFreeways/SR24](http://www.azdot.gov/ValleyFreeways/SR24)
- Intercity Rail Study  
<http://www.azdot.gov/intercityrail>
- US 60 Alignment Study: Superstition Freeway to Florence Junction  
[www.azdot.gov/Highways/Valley\\_Freeways/US60/Pinal\\_County/index.asp](http://www.azdot.gov/Highways/Valley_Freeways/US60/Pinal_County/index.asp)
- I-10 Corridor Study: Jct. I-8 to Tangerine Road  
[www.i10tucsondistrict.com/i8totang2](http://www.i10tucsondistrict.com/i8totang2)
- I-10 Widening: SR 87 to Picacho  
[www.i10tucsondistrict.com/87toPP-traffic-interchange](http://www.i10tucsondistrict.com/87toPP-traffic-interchange)

### Contact Information

- Javier Gurrola, ADOT Predesign Project Manager, 602-712-7687, [jgurrola@azdot.gov](mailto:jgurrola@azdot.gov)
- Teresa Guillen, ADOT Communication and Community Partnerships, 602-828-8075, [tguillen@azdot.gov](mailto:tguillen@azdot.gov)
- ADOT Outreach Team, 520-327-6077, [northsouthstudy@azdot.gov](mailto:northsouthstudy@azdot.gov)
- Media inquiries, please call 800-949-8057



## **North–South Corridor Study Potential New Transportation Route Frequently Asked Questions**

### **Where is the study located?**

The study area extends from US 60 near Apache Junction to I-10 near Eloy and Picacho.

### **Why is the Arizona Department of Transportation working on this study?**

Planned growth in the study area shows the need for a new transportation corridor. The completion of the study would help determine right of way needs ahead of future development. It is also an important step in obtaining future funding for construction.

### **What is the study schedule?**

The study is currently in the alternative selection phase. This will be followed by an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) and Location/Design Concept Report (L/DCR) phase. The study is anticipated to be completed in 2013.

### **What is an alternative selection phase?**

The North-South Corridor Study team needs to identify all reasonable alternatives and then screen those possible route alternatives to determine which will work best. After screening the possible route alternatives, the study team will select at least two possible route alternatives, along with the impacts of not making any improvements (also known as a no-build option), for detailed assessment in the EIS and DCR phase.

### **What is an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS)?**

For studies that will have a significant impact, the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) requires an EIS document that will provide an examination of environmental impacts for each of the proposed route alternatives. The team will evaluate hazardous materials, cultural and biological resources, socioeconomic and geological conditions, land ownership, air quality, noise impacts and water resources.

### **What is a Location/Design Concept Report (L/DCR)?**

Once the study team has narrowed down possible route alternatives, they will study them more in depth during the preparation of the L/DCR. The L/DCR will include a preferred route alternative, define initial right of way needs and present an implementation plan. Project costs and preliminary design plans will also be included.

### **What is a possible route alternative?**

A possible route alternative is a possible alignment for the transportation corridor. To determine the possible route alternatives, the team considered public, agency and jurisdictional input; technical assessments; purpose and need criteria; existing roadways and utilities; and rail and transit. The general width of a route alternative during this phase of the project is 1,500 feet. The final width of a possible route is still to be determined.

### **How will ADOT fund the construction of this corridor?**

ADOT cannot seek funding for construction until the study is complete and has a better understanding of what may be needed. At that time, ADOT will pursue many funding options, including state, federal and public-private partnerships.

### **What is a Public-Private Partnership (P3)?**

A P3 refers to the contractual agreement between a public agency and a private sector entity that allows the private sector entity to have greater participation in the delivery of a transportation project when providing funding. Using traditional project delivery methods, ADOT bears all of the risks and responsibilities for a project. Under a P3, the private partner takes on some or all of the projects risks and responsibilities. There are many types of P3s. For roadway and bridge projects, P3s typically involve an up-front investment by a private partner who then designs, builds, finances, operates and maintains the facility in exchange for future revenues generated by the facility. These revenues typically come from tolls paid by the users of the facility. Please visit [www.azdot.gov/p3](http://www.azdot.gov/p3) for more information.

## North–South Corridor Study Potential New Transportation Route Frequently Asked Questions – Continued

### **Where is the corridor going to be located?**

It has not yet been determined where the corridor would be located. Currently, the study is in the alternative selection phase. The team is currently seeking public input on the possible route alternatives.

### **Will existing roads be used, such as State Route 79 and State Route 87?**

Possible route alternatives may or may not include existing roads.

### **Will existing and planned development be avoided?**

Route alternatives were developed to minimize impacts on existing and planned development to the extent possible. The amount of impact will be included as a factor in the route alternatives screening process. The study team will continue to coordinate with city, town and county planning staff within the study area.

### **Is the study team aware of the fissures in the area?**

The team is aware of and taking into consideration both ground subsidence (the gradual settling or sinking of a land area) and fissures (cracks or crevices in the ground that may form as a result of subsidence) for route alternatives.

### **Is the study team aware of Salt River Project's current and planned development?**

Yes, and the study team is working collaboratively with Salt River Project.

### **What about the change in air quality that a new transportation route may create?**

The study team will look at both the current and future air quality conditions of possible route alternatives and evaluate potential impacts.

### **Will you take wildlife habitats and crossings into consideration?**

The team will study area wildlife, vegetation, threatened and endangered species, current habitat and wildlife crossings. These will be considered as the team develops possible route alternatives. The study team is coordinating with the Arizona Game & Fish Department and U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service.

### **What about the Union Pacific Railroad yard near I-10 and Picacho?**

The study team is collaborating with all railroad companies within the study area. For more information regarding the Union Pacific Railroad, please visit [www.up.com](http://www.up.com).

### **What about commuter rail?**

The North-South Corridor Study team is working collaboratively with the ADOT Intercity Rail Study team. For more information about the ADOT Intercity Rail Study, please visit <http://www.azdot.gov/intercityrail>.

### **How will the North-South Corridor Study impact other ADOT projects?**

The North-South Corridor Study team is collaborating with the US 60 Study, State Route 24 (formerly State Route 802) Study, I-10 Corridor Study and I-10 Widening: State Route 87 to Picacho project teams to enhance the projects and maximize the benefits to the state of Arizona.

- US 60: [www.azdot.gov/Highways/valley\\_freeways/us60/pinal\\_county/index.asp](http://www.azdot.gov/Highways/valley_freeways/us60/pinal_county/index.asp)
- State Route 24: [www.azdot.gov/valleyfreeways/sr24](http://www.azdot.gov/valleyfreeways/sr24)
- I-10 Corridor Study: [www.i10tucsondistrict.com/i8totang2](http://www.i10tucsondistrict.com/i8totang2)
- I-10 Widening: SR87 to Picacho: [www.i10tucsondistrict.com/87topp-traffic-interchange](http://www.i10tucsondistrict.com/87topp-traffic-interchange)

### **How can I provide comments about the North-South Corridor Study?**

Mail: ADOT Outreach Team  
2540 N. Tucson Blvd.  
Tucson, AZ 85716

Email: [northsouthstudy@azdot.gov](mailto:northsouthstudy@azdot.gov)  
Phone: 520-327-6077  
Fax: 520-327-4687

**[www.azdot.gov/northsouthcorridorstudy](http://www.azdot.gov/northsouthcorridorstudy)**

**ADOT Intercity Rail Study:** A current study that is exploring possible routes to connect Phoenix and Tucson by rail.

**Alignment:** Potential or planned route.

**Corridor:** A wide area of land where a route alternative may potentially be located in the future.

**Corridor Opportunity Area:** The 300 square-mile area within the North–South Corridor Study project study area is being evaluated for a potential new transportation route. The Corridor Opportunity Area was presented to the public in fall 2010.

**Corridor Segment:** Smaller sections of the Corridor Opportunity Area to help easily identify opportunities and challenges that may determine whether the selected route alternative could be placed there.

**Cultural Resources:** Historic buildings or districts, archaeological sites and Native American historical and cultural sites.

**Environmental Impact Statement (EIS):** A document required by the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) that records the findings and impacts of the proposed project to the human and natural environment. It also explains what steps would be taken to lessen or mitigate major impacts that may be caused by the proposed project.

**Facility:** A highway or freeway built to accommodate multimodal transportation needs.

**Fissure:** Crack or crevice in the ground that may form as a result of the gradual settling or sinking of a land area.

**Geotechnical:** The use of technology to determine the earth's composition or soil structure that is conducted before engineering projects begin.

**Location/Design Concept Report (L/DCR):** A technical study and analysis of potential route alternatives. It identifies a preferred alternative, defines initial right of way requirements and recommends an implementation plan that includes project costs and preliminary design plans.

**Mitigation:** Efforts made to lessen the severity or extent of potential major impacts to the public or the environment from the proposed project.

**Multimodal:** A combination of multiple types of transportation modes that includes bicycles, public transit, vehicles, pedestrians and other forms of transportation.

**National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA):** A law that requires all federal agencies to evaluate what possible impacts a proposed project would have on humans and the natural environment. It was established to create procedural requirements in the form of environmental documents for local, state and federal projects that involve federal funds. NEPA includes three levels of environmental documentation, based on the level of anticipated environmental impact, which are: an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), Environmental Assessment (EA) and Categorical Exclusion (CE). It is used as a tool for decision-making, based on the positive and negative environmental effects identified for a proposed project. ADOT projects that use federal funds must follow the NEPA process for obtaining the necessary environmental clearance.

**No-Build Option:** Evaluation of not taking action or not making improvements within the corridor.

**Possible Route Alternative:** Possible options, opportunities or places to locate a roadway or transportation improvement.

**Public-Private Partnerships (P3):** A partnership between a public agency and private-sector organizations or individuals committed to building or improving public transportation facilities by helping with funding that could enhance or add improvements to public roadways, transit opportunities and other transportation facilities.

**Right of Way (ROW):** The public or private land needed for construction or roadway improvements.

**Screening:** The process to narrow down the possible route alternatives. To narrow down the alternatives, the study team will evaluate public input, agency input and technical analysis, including engineering and environmental considerations, rail and transit, and the potential cost of each possible route alternative.

**Stakeholder:** A person, company, group or agency that may be directly or indirectly affected by a project or study.

**Subsidence:** The gradual settling or sinking of a land area. May lead to cracks or crevices in the ground. Land subsidence is often attributed to excessive ground-water pumping.

**Sun Corridor:** The area in Arizona between the Arizona/Mexico border and the Prescott area. (A significant level of growth is anticipated in this corridor over the next 20 to 30 years.)



# North-South Corridor Study



December 2011  
Public Workshops

Federal Aid No. STP-999-A(BBM)  
ADOT Project No. 999 PN 000 H7454 01L

# ADOT Study Team Members

Welcome and Introductions:

Teresa Guillen

ADOT Senior Community Relations Officer

Presenters:

Javier Gurrola, ADOT Project Manager

Dave Perkins, Kimley-Horn & Associates

North-South Corridor Study

December 2011



## Tonight's Topics


- Study Overview
- Why We Are Doing This Study
- What We Have Accomplished to Date
- Where We Are Now
- What's Next
- How You Can Participate



North-South Corridor Study



December 2011



The study area:

- Extends from US 60 near Apache Junction south to I-10 near the town of Picacho.
- The northern 1/3 consists primarily of undeveloped desert, which is mostly state trust land. It also includes a potential interchange with the State Route 24 study.
- The middle 1/3, which is bisected by the Gila River, is comprised of mostly agricultural land; Coolidge and Florence are both south of the river.
- The southern 1/3 also consists primarily of agricultural land, and includes the Picacho Reservoir and the Picacho Mountains.
- The primary objective for this study is to evaluate a high-capacity connection between US 60 and I-10 in this portion of Pinal County, which is expected to experience high growth between now and 2050.



## Study Overview (con't)



- Currently in study phase
- Anticipated completion of preliminary engineering and environmental studies in 2013
- Potential design and construction not yet funded

North-South Corridor Study

December 2011

Planning studies conducted by ADOT in recent years in consultation with state, county, local and tribal stakeholders have determined the need for a high-capacity transportation corridor in Pinal County.


We are currently in the study phase. For a study of this magnitude, it includes preparation of a Location/Design Concept Report (L/DCR) and an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). The L/DCR is a preliminary engineering design document that details engineering components required for a new transportation facility and its associated costs. The EIS documents any anticipated impacts to the environment for the build alternative and is developed per the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA).

If a build alternative is selected, it is at that point design and construction could be planned. There is currently no funding identified for these two phases. However, due to current legislation, ADOT can enter into a Public Private Partnership (P3) with a private entity.

The North-South Corridor has been identified as a possible candidate for a tolled facility. On the comment form we have included a question regarding whether or not you would support a tolled facility.

For more information about (P3), please visit: [www.azdot.gov/p3](http://www.azdot.gov/p3)

## Study Partners and Stakeholders




North-South Corridor Study

December 2011


ADOT is committed to working closely with community members, businesses and public officials; involving the public in the decision-making process; and continuing to provide information as the project moves forward.

Each of our stakeholders are important and involved in the study. Each shown here has the responsibility of representing the public interest.

## Why We Are Doing This



2005 Growth Areas  
Population: 6 million



2050 Growth Areas  
Population: 14-15 million

### Summary:

- Historically, Arizona has experienced significant population growth.
- While this has slowed over the past few years, over the long-term, Arizona will continue to grow.
- Planners have projected that AZ could more than double in population by 2050.
- As you can see, growth will occur in the present urban cores of Phoenix and Tucson and grow into a megapolitan area of more than 14 million in the **Sun Corridor** that stretches from Flagstaff to Nogales.
- Whether this growth will occur by 2050 is debatable but history tells us that AZ will continue to grow when the economy improves.

## Purpose and Need

- Provide capacity for existing and future conditions
- Alleviate existing and future congestion
- Enhance the regional transportation system
- Improve access to future activity centers
- Consistent with local, regional and statewide plans

North-South Corridor Study

December 2011

- For the better part of 10 years, ADOT has been working with state, county, local, and tribal stakeholders to plan several important transportation corridors in Pinal County, including the North-South Corridor.
- This study, the North-South Corridor Study, is the next step in developing a major new transportation facility.
- In the North-South Corridor Study we will prepare an Environmental Impact Statement.
- One of the most important documents in an EIS is the Purpose and Need Statement (P&N).
- The P&N considers future growth and travel demand in a defined study area and answers the question – “Is the North-South Corridor needed?”
- The North-South Corridor is definitely needed to meet travel demand today and in the future, but it is not the total solution.

## Purpose and Need (con't)

Must be supplemented by other improvements:

- Transit
- New roads
- Improvements to existing facilities
- Safety enhancements
- Enhancements to manage traffic and offer choices

North-South Corridor Study


December 2011

- While our analysis has shown a new facility appears to be needed, it cannot by itself meet all of the future travel in the study area and must be supplemented by other transportation improvements, including new or improved local roads, use of technology to enhance traffic safety and operations, and transit.
- The North-South Corridor will accommodate the intercity rail if that study recommends the North-South alternative.

## What We Have Accomplished

- Corridor planning

North-South Corridor Study



- Keep the P&N in mind as we review the information that we have developed for your review and use in filling out the comment forms.
- Our first step was to map study area features which identify opportunities for a North-South Corridor and which must be avoided if possible.
- Considerations: Open space, development, flood structures, fissures, etc.



## What We Have Accomplished (con't)

- Public and agency scoping

North-South Corridor Study



- Public and agency scoping meetings were held one year ago and the public provided us with input on areas where the North-South Corridor was most feasible.

## What We Have Accomplished (con't)

- Corridor segments as seen in summer 2011 newsletter

North-South Corridor Study




We conducted a detailed analysis of drainage, utilities, ground water subsidence and fissures, and economic development opportunities to further define opportunities for the North-South Corridor.



## Possible Route Alternatives


- NEPA Guidelines
- Public and Agency Input
- Purpose and Need
- Technical Evaluations
  - Drainage, geology and utility assessments
  - Economic development opportunities
  - Other studies
  - Available environmental information
- No-build option

North-South Corridor Study



- We used this information to develop a number of route alternatives for the North-South Corridor.
- The development of route alternatives considered many inputs listed here.
- National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) must be considered to be eligible for federal funding.
- NEPA requires us to consider and objectively evaluate all reasonable and prudent alternatives.
- Some environmental agencies asked us to consider using existing roads for the North-South Corridor.
- The study team must narrow down these alternatives using detailed screening criteria and then recommend a smaller set of alternatives to carry forward into the EIS and L/DCR.
- The selected route alternatives will be evaluated with a no-build alternative.

## NORTHERN HALF OF Possible route alternatives



December 2011

- There are three start/end points: 1) Ironwood, 2) the end of the Superstition Freeway, and 3) the future Peralta interchange of the US 60 reroute.
- Construction will soon start on SR 24 from Loop 202 to Ironwood road. SR 24 will continue east in the future and the North-South Corridor will have an interchange in the highlighted area north of the Queen Creek Wash.
- We have identified three crossing alternatives across the Gila River (one north of Florence, one near the new SRP 500kV power lines, and one west of Attaway).

## SOUTHERN HALF OF Possible route alternatives



December 2011

- Two start/end points are located at 1) SR 87/I-10 interchange and 2) 2 miles east of SR 87.
- All route alternatives avoid the Picacho Reservoir.
- Route alternatives follow Fast Track, Vail Road, the rail road east of SR 87, or SR 87 itself.

## Screening Route Alternatives

- Narrow down possible route alternatives
  - Public input (why we're here today)
  - Agency input
  - Technical factors (by study team)
    - Regional service and accessibility
    - Impacts
    - Cost

North–South Corridor Study



- Regional service and accessibility include factors such as linkage to other transportation features, congestion relief, accessibility to communities, employment, activity centers, and accommodation of the intercity rail.
- Impact factors include water resources, environmental, noise, development, economic development, and open space.
- Cost factors include construction and right-of-way acquisition.
- Following the screening of route alternatives, agency and public meetings will be conducted to present results.

## Next Steps After Screening

- Select route alternatives for detailed assessment, along with the no-build option
  - Environmental Impact Statement (EIS)
  - Location/Design Concept Report (L/DCR)
- Ongoing public outreach
- Public hearings
- Select recommended alternative
- Completion of study – tentatively 2013

North–South Corridor Study

December 2011

- After screening of the route alternatives, one or more will be selected for detailed study in the EIS.
- During the EIS, public outreach will continue and a public hearing will be held to receive the public's input if a preferred route is identified.
- The study is scheduled for completion in 2013.

## How You Can Participate

- Please join us in breakout sessions for a workshop discussion to ask questions
- Detailed maps and comment forms are available at each table
- Discuss the possible route alternatives in-depth
- Provide your input as to what you find favorable or unfavorable



# Comment Form

## Includes:

- General overview
- Study information
- Maps
- Comment area

North-South Corridor Study

## North-South Corridor Study POTENTIAL NEW TRANSPORTATION ROUTE BETWEEN US 60 AND INTERSTATE 10 IN PINAL COUNTY



## WE WANT TO HEAR FROM YOU

Expected growth in Pinal County supports the need for a new transportation route. The Arizona Department of Transportation and the Federal Highway Administration are studying the area between US 60 near Apache Junction and I 10 near Ray and Phoenix.

The purpose of the study is to identify and evaluate a possible route to provide a connection between US 60 and I 10. The study team started evaluating a 900 square-mile study area to identify a Corridor Opportunity Area that was presented at the Fall 2010 public and agency scoping meetings.

After receiving input from the public and various agencies, and evaluating technical data, the team has identified possible route alternatives as presented here in this comment form.

The goal of the comment form is to gather specific opinions or concerns from individuals who live, work and travel through the study area. The public's comments will be a factor in determining which route alternatives will be selected for additional study.

Please turn to the next page to provide your comments on the segments that are being evaluated in this phase of the study. Your feedback is important to us!

PLEASE TURN TO THE  
NEXT PAGE TO FILL OUT  
THE COMMENT FORM.


ADOT

ADOT Project No. 949765-000-0000-01 / Project No. 10-1000-0000



1. Circle favorable segments
2. Cross out unfavorable segments
3. Mark lines on the map, if you want
4. Give us your comments on segments you marked

## North-South Corridor Study





- Additional space for comments
- Extra sheets of paper also available at tables

## Southern Route Alternatives

[illegible]

# Submitting Comments

Back of comment form:

- Answer two questions on the back of the form
- Fill out your contact information

Leave at the registration desk or mail in

Also available online at  
[www.azdot.gov/northsouthcorridorstudy](http://www.azdot.gov/northsouthcorridorstudy)

North-South Corridor Study



NO POSTAGE  
 NECESSARY  
 IF MAILED  
 IN THE  
 UNITED STATES



BUSINESS REPLY MAIL

FIRST-CLASS MAIL PERMIT NO. 406 TUCSON, AZ

POSTAGE WILL BE PAID BY ADDRESSEE

ADOT OUTREACH TEAM  
 2540 N. TUCSON BLVD  
 TUCSON, AZ 85716-6547



---

Please fold here to mail in your comments.

**Q What do you think are the most important factors in selecting a possible route alternative? Please place a check next to the three (3) factors you consider most important.**

<input type="checkbox"/> Best preserves traffic on local streets.	<input type="checkbox"/> Best connects to other major routes (I-10, US-66, SR-22, SR-287, etc.)	<input type="checkbox"/> Input received from the public
<input type="checkbox"/> Best follows traffic on other highways and freeways.	<input type="checkbox"/> Lowest cost.	<input type="checkbox"/> Input received from local governments.
<input type="checkbox"/> Best connects to employment centers.	<input type="checkbox"/> Least impact to existing development.	<input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____
<input type="checkbox"/> Best connects to other destinations (e.g., schools, shopping, recreation).	<input type="checkbox"/> Least impact to planned future development.	
<input type="checkbox"/> Best connects to urban and towns.	<input type="checkbox"/> Least impact to natural areas and open space.	
	<input type="checkbox"/> Makes best use of existing roads and highways.	

**Q At this time there is no funding identified for the North-South Corridor. If the road were constructed as a tolled facility would you support and/or use the new highway?**

<input type="checkbox"/> Yes, I would support the tolled highway.	Comments: _____ _____ _____
<input type="checkbox"/> No, I would not support the tolled highway.	
<input type="checkbox"/> No, I would not support the tolled highway and would continue to use existing highways to reach my destination(s).	

**Contact Information**

Working Address: ☐ Dec. 5 ☐ Dec. 7 ☐ Dec. 8 ☐ Dec. 11 ☐ Other \_\_\_\_\_

Name: \_\_\_\_\_ Email: \_\_\_\_\_

Address: \_\_\_\_\_

The Arizona Department of Transportation solicits public participation. Public comments are an important part of the study and are welcome at any time for review and consideration. Comments received by Tuesday, January 12, 2012, will be reviewed in the summary of these public meetings. Please submit your comments to the ADOT Outreach Team.

Mail: 2540 N. Tucson Blvd., Tucson, AZ 85716  
 Phone: 520-627-6077, ext. 110  
 Fax: 520-627-6667  
 Email: [northsouthstudy@azdot.gov](mailto:northsouthstudy@azdot.gov)  
[www.azdot.gov/northsouthcorridorstudy](http://www.azdot.gov/northsouthcorridorstudy)

Forms must be returned no later than Jan. 12, 2012, to be included in the summary of this meeting.



Thank you!


Workshop sessions are beginning  
Time to provide your comments

North-South Corridor Study

December 2011

## North-South Corridor Study

# STUDY PROCESS



★ WE ARE HERE

North-South Corridor Study

# ENVIRONMENTAL STUDIES



- **Neighborhood/residential considerations**
- **Socioeconomic considerations**
- **Environmental justice**
- **Land use**
- **Water resources**
- **Noise**
- **Habitat connectivity**
- **Air quality**
- **Cultural resources**
- **Biological resources**
- **Visual resources**
- **Hazardous materials**
- **Public parks/recreation**
- **Secondary and cumulative impacts**

# ENGINEERING ELEMENTS



## TRAFFIC ANALYSES

*Evaluate design-year traffic conditions to determine the function and capacity of the corridor.*

## ALTERNATIVE DEVELOPMENT

*Develop and evaluate reasonable alternatives including the no-build alternative. Select alternatives to be further evaluated as part of the Environmental Impact Statement.*

## ROADWAY DESIGN AND GEOMETRY

*Define alignment and profile consistent with applicable guidelines.*

## MODAL OPTIONS

*Identify and evaluate the feasibility of accommodating alternative modes of travel in the corridor, including bus, rail, bus rapid transit, park and ride, etc.*

## INTERCHANGES

*Determine location, configuration and capacity of possible new traffic interchanges with the existing and planned roadway system.*

## RIGHTS-OF-WAY

*Define right-of-way limits and access controls to guide land-use decisions and preserve right-of-way.*

## DRAINAGE FEATURES

*Design infrastructure to accommodate rivers, washes, CAP canal and other drainage features within the corridor right-of-way.*

## IMPLEMENTATION PLAN

*Recommend a phased construction plan consistent with available funding and need for the corridor.*

North-South Corridor Study

# STUDY NEED



- **Address needs identified in local, regional and statewide plans**
- **Address lack of regional transportation capacity**
- **Address challenges related to the existing networks and transportation system linkages**

North-South Corridor Study

# STUDY PURPOSE



## PROVIDE ACCESS TO RAPIDLY GROWING AREAS OF PINAL COUNTY

- Accommodate growth-induced traffic to relieve anticipated congestion
- Provide traffic relief to I-10
- Provide a direct connection to the eastern portion of the Phoenix metropolitan area



## **APPENDIX E**

### **Public Workshop Comments on Factors**

## Most Important Factors Summary

<b>Best relieves traffic on local streets</b>	<u>66</u>	<b>Lowest cost</b>	<u>31</u>
<b>Best relieves traffic on other highways/freeways</b>	<u>54</u>	<b>Least impact to existing development</b>	<u>108</u>
<b>Best connects to employment centers</b>	<u>41</u>	<b>Least impact to planned development</b>	<u>24</u>
<b>Best connects to other destinations</b>	<u>24</u>	<b>Least impact to natural areas/open space</b>	<u>23</u>
<b>Best connects to cities/towns</b>	<u>57</u>	<b>Makes best use of existing roads/hwys</b>	<u>35</u>
<b>Best connects to other major routes</b>	<u>97</u>	<b>Input received from public</b>	<u>34</u>
<b>Other (see comments below)</b>	<u>31</u>	<b>Input received from local gov't</b>	<u>11</u>

Provides a better freeway route to Tucson from Apache Junction. Current is 202 to 10 & This is much shorter.

must be part of a comprehensive multi-model system that supports economic developmt.

The path that reflects what local municipalities have expressed as the best routes for economic development and future planning.

good to connect to major routes and lease impact to Florence but make traffic better.

the route that the city's support & that would foster more comercial growth like a mall

Most efficient to make roads least disruptive to existing traffic & development

There needs to be room to grow 30-50 years from now.

Noted in following order from top to bottom: 2,3,1,4,5,6

Noted in the following order:

1 Best connects / 2 Lowest cost / 3 Makes best use of existing roads/hwys

Input from the builders of the road

Long term econ. develop-

Input from property owners in study corridor

many people don't know about this proposal. You guys need to put it out on the news, radio, or just buy some tv time to talk about it. All the friends and people I talked to were very interested and loved the idea

In reference to FACTOR "Best connects to other major routes" crossed out "SR 87, SR 287" and added "SR 24"

For Factor "Least impact to existing development", contact scratched out the word "least" and added "no", and scratched out "development" and wrote "residents" and added a #1 next to the Factor

Input from major property owners along freeway corridor.

go down 60 & 79

Using existing roads would be fine in some of the areas listed but using residential area roads is un acceptable. Most people using this hwy will be passing through twice a day if that and the residents have to live there everyday. Use land that is least effective on our Arizona Residents.

## Most Important Factors Summary

<b>Best relieves traffic on local streets</b>	<b>66</b>	<b>Lowest cost</b>	<b>31</b>
<b>Best relieves traffic on other highways/freeways</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>Least impact to existing development</b>	<b>108</b>
<b>Best connects to employment centers</b>	<b>41</b>	<b>Least impact to planned development</b>	<b>24</b>
<b>Best connects to other destinations</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>Least impact to natural areas/open space</b>	<b>23</b>
<b>Best connects to cities/towns</b>	<b>57</b>	<b>Makes best use of existing roads/hwys</b>	<b>35</b>
<b>Best connects to other major routes</b>	<b>97</b>	<b>Input received from public</b>	<b>34</b>
<b>Other (see comments below)</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>Input received from local gov't</b>	<b>11</b>

Provides a long-term solution to a problem that will continue to get worse -- instead of just providing short-term relief or band-aid solutions.

The San Tan area is growing like crazy and Ironwood is getting too much traffic during rush hour (plus the speed limits don't match the natural flow of traffic). A good highway that isn't too far east would fix this.

see other comments

No Route that would take away personal homes to make way for the freeway

Most Direct

Least impact on State Trust Land

We own or represent the property owners of approximately 1,200 acres at Arizona Farms and Attaway. The approved planned area development is called Arizona Farms. We have spent a long time working with the Town of Florence on the future planning of our farm. We have worked with several of the large property owners and the town on where we want this future corridor to go. This is why I have selected the favorable or non favorable routes. Thank you.  
Seth Keeler

What is best for the local citizens.

Listen to local government. They have already heard from all of us

support what the towns want, they ar the local voice of the people.

local city government is as "grassroots" of an opinion as you can get. Please support their adopted alignment.

need a commercial center, Florence has that with there community supported alignment

develop/build a rail system - use existing rail infrastructure

## **APPENDIX F**

### **Public Workshop Comments on Funding**

**Comments**

My Taxes pay for existing roads-would not pay for a Toll Road. I am not in a big hurry to go anywhere

would use the Ironwood/60 Bus out west to Power Rd for work & also use Ironwood/Hunt Hwy for my sec. job. The car I have is unreliable

I would not oppose a tolled highway but I would not use it

HAVING LIVED IN STATES WITH A TOLL WAY SYSTEM THEY SEEM TO BECOME A MAGNET FOR GRAFT AND GREED AND OUT SOURCED MANAGEMENT BEYOND US BORDERS.

No NAFTA superhighway or any part of it.

I hate toll roads & will always avoid them!

Depends on toll cost

I travel existing roads three or more times per week. I would rather see a tax to support construction and maintenance.

If a toll would get the project built faster I would support it. Toll would/should be no more than \$0.10 per mile.

As we move foreward, wehave to look at all forsible alternatives, that will make this critical corridor a reality. This areas is a very important part of the Sun Corridor and also to the economic future of Central AZ.

Tolled roads divert traffic. This route will greatly impact economic development, but a toll road will divert "customers" from the local economies.

Toll roads would deter local users from taking them and continue to overload existing roads.

The freeway is needed and a toll is a good option to get things started ASAP.

Once tolls get started for special projects like this, they never go away. I wouldn't save anytime or miles by using this route for my daily commute.

I was raised in an area w/Toll roads (midwest) and I despised them-I still do and would not use it. I would drive 30+ miles out of my way to avoid a toll. As a young adult I would get out of my car-cover my plates & run the tolls.

A toll facility is far more profitable to no facility.

For occasional use only. See additional comment. Toll roads in Denver have not produced the income anticipated. Care needs to be taken in not over estimating income if a toll highway is constructed.

Maximize taxes & fed money other than putting yet another fiancial burden on tax payers. avoid overspending and assign contract to lowest bidder. not friends, family or "special interest". Do not raises taxes & fund this. Enough with unethical politicians

People would just avoid it so no use building it

or ? How much would it cost? Never been tolled in my life so not familiar. If it would be to expensive to drive on people would not use it and it would be useless

But I wouldn't like it. Why do we have to pay alone? None of the other towns have to do that.

If all freeways in AZ were tollways. I would support this. However, I would pay taxes to maintain Freeways in NW valley that I do not use while also paying a toll for my local tollway that other parts of the valley do not pay for. This does not seem fair.

Open Road Tolling

Rent/Purchase Transponders for individual cars

Reasonable rate (contrast to will rogers in ok)

**Comments**

Absolutely, make a reasonable amt. of toll for all axle sizes-make transponders for vehicles w/ an open toll lane(s) (example ill. dept. of transportation)

---

Limited finances for senior's

---

As with everything the amount of toll per mile may be an issue.

---

Would re-evaluate quickest & least expensive way to Phoenix areas. I'd only use a toll route if I saved time and money spent on fuel.

---

Not in favor. Would limit use and lessen effectiveness.

---

it depends on cost of toll. Would definately pay a toll to get to 10 on southern route.

---

Having Tolles provide for paying for the Roadways. From Chicago have used these.

---

Toll road, how proved disastrous in other study-have been entities of themselves

---

Tolls never go away, traffic jams

---

This is an abject lesson in futility

---

Too many contractors want state-feds to pay for the road then turn it over to toll rd. no expense for them.

---

Toll highway can be built a.s.a.p. with chinese investors...they would snap it up in a N.Y. minute!

---

Have the snow pay for the toll roads

---

My association with Toll Roads is that there is a projected price of use that is raised by request to the legislature. More lies.

---

No toll road, if a toll road is installed I would not use it.

---

Highways should remain public property. I avoid toll roads or much as 2 can

---

I don't like tollways-some are confusing also. Once they're in place, they never disappear

---

No-once in place the funds will be used for other purposes and probably be put in a slush fund and everone will have their fingers in it. (Bad idea-I would not use it.)

---

I am against toll roads in AZ. Our roads should be available for all to use.

---

Toll road construction thru public lands is a benefit for the affluent. I gives them a way to live further from work, and not have to put up with the traffic congestion, that less affluent people must put up with.

---

Depends on cost and timelines. I am opposed to toll road at this time but would consider change of pace is reasonable.

---

Extensive study will be needed to support a toll road-

---

Tolls: Only if guarantee that after a specified time period they went away. Tolls should be at exits & entrances only

---

This seems to be a model that has worked well in other cities. (Including Austin, Dallas, Fort Worth)

---

Tolled roads have to many tolled booths and can get very expensive. I could change my mind if I knew how mutch it would cost to use and how many booths would exist.

---

I would use the tolled highway. However, with the projected development(s), wouldn't the increase in taxpayers make it possible to fund as needed??

---

**Comments**

I think a toll hwy keeps traffic down and it helps thw hwy maintain. But I am not sure if people would use the hwy or still use the back roads as they do now. If the toll was reasonable I think it might work but like California the tolls are 3 -8 dollars and I do not think the people would pay that kind of money.

---

Mass transit would be greatly preferred to roadways. I would be willing to pay to use the mass transit rather than the roadway.

---

If you can't budget what really is a needed major corridor that you are proposing other than considering to make it a toll road, our state is doing an extremely poor job of taking care of the growing state and need for new major roads that don't affect existing neighborhood and residential homes communities. I've been on many toll roads, but they go completely around the city and existing residential neighborhoods. They DO NOT go right smack dab down someones residential area. It is the states responsibility to budget for these types of needed developments. Most of the people who would be using this road would actually people who live and work in the surrounding cities. Paying a toll to get to work on top of other expenses to get to work and pay taxes to this state is out of the question in my book. I'd rather move to a state that cares about the communities its suppose to serve. I took a poll just in the community where I live along with my coworkers who live in all different areas and they all say the same thing. NO TO TOLL ROAD for this purpose.

---

I pay enough in taxes! Seeing that this probably won't happen for at least 20+ years, I'll probably be dead by then or close to it!!

---

If it can get me from San Tan Valley to Mesa easily I'll pay the toll, especially if the speed limit is something like 80+ (if Texas can do it so can we). If it goes to Florence I'll never use it because work is the other direction.

---

I am against tolls and would avoid them. Many other people I have talked to have said the same thing, therefore a toll road would only be a waste of money for a business and/or the state of Arizona to develop. Please keep in mind also that sometimes foreign companies will win the contracts on these toll roads, therefore, allowing revenue to go to them instead of keeping the money within the state.

---

We are too far east and south to be a tolled road. Save the tolls for the MOST volume areas. We already feel the toll of choosing the far southeast valley.

---

There's nothing wrong with the existing highways other than they need repairs one in awhile. I would not pay to make it to my destination 5 minutes quicker than the existing highways would. The economy is too down in the dumps still for this project. I feel in a way some of the proposed routes would b like trapping people where they have to pay to travel unlike the system we use now. I do not and would not support this project in any form!

---

I would prefer not to have a toll. The toll cost will be a big factor. If it is too high it will drive people away. Also there is the additional cost of the toll equipment and staff to maintain.

---

NO TOLL ROADS, PLEASE!!!

---

out of necessity because i am a resident

---

I used to live in a Toll Highway area. I avoided them and did not appreciate having to pay to commute on top of the expense of fuel and wear and tear on the car.

---

This was done in the Denver area with E-470 and the highway was sold to a Mexican company where the tolls no go. They are also very expensive. Tolls will be in the several dollars per trip. That portion of highway, E-470, remains under utilized and all predictions regarding pay-back of construction costs and car miles were grossly overestimated making it a "white elephant." Interstate 97 through New York was to be a "temporary" toll road and the temporary has lasted over sixty years.

---

A toll road may be the right financing mechanism here. It depends on how much it would cost to use. If it was too expensive, I would not use it.

---

You realize that this is one of the poorest surbaban areas right? Who would fund this with a toll.

---

**Comments**

As a former resident of the state of New Jersey home of the toll road. They only add to corruption and add unneeded cost i.e. toll booths and all the required maintance to operate them. If anything the New Jersey Turnpike and Parkway are perfect examples of why toll roads DO NOT work.

---

It would depend on what the toll would be, how much time it saved, and how convient it would be to use (both to access and to pay the tolls). Coins, tokens, electronicly?

---

I would be willing to pay a toll as long as it is reasonable

---

I would prefer a freeway, but if a tolled highway is the only way to get the project funded, I would use it.

---

Government collects enough of our money already

---

If I still had family living in Apache Junction, this corridor would be wonderful. I have, frequently, taken SR 79 to Phoenix to avoid traffic on I-10 prior to the I-10 road widening project; but, SR 79 is a little out of the way. I have taken SR 87 through Coolidge and connected to SR 79 before as well. I actually use this route if the toll were comparable to what I would save in gas and time by not using I-10 or SR 79. Though, now that I no longer have family in Apache Junction, the draw to travel "the back road" is greatly reduced... Also, how would the toll work with residents who live in that area? The road is for north-south travel, but I think a toll would significantly impact the residents of the area. I support a toll for travelers, but not necessarily for residents of the area...

---

Do NOT build a road- develop a rail system instead

---

Would depend upon reasonable expense to use it. Say 10 cents per 10 miles would be reasonable.

---

Shouldn't have to pay to use a road we already pay taxes on it.

---

Toll roads are expensive and I believe highways are part of public ownership

---



## **APPENDIX G**

### **Public Workshop Comments on Segments**

## Segment A Summary

Favorable 87

Unfavorable 76

No Response 44

Is okay but prefer I where it would be more convenient to build and avoid

Same as D, E, F, and G

### Favorable

Route 24 conection vary important

make a transfer to power Rd.

Reduce trafic  
Trafic noise  
Heavy Trucks

one of my routes to work (QC) from A.J.

starts closer in to Phoenix/Mesa

Only option that is still centrally located

Makes use of existing right of way. Currently carries very heavy traffic

Uses existing Roadway

Best way to go to 60 from Anthem

Continuation of "B" closer to 202 intersecting existing R/W

Direct, established route

I see no cause for objection to this

good connection to 60

direct route-use existing situation

most direct

use of exist Hwy.

use of existing hwy

Good starting point. Noted on map as FIRST CHOICE

On existing road, less environmental effect (nature)

Heavily used route already and connects US60 to many commercial center in S.T.V.

uses existing roads and is the most beneficial to existing developments

Direct connection to 60

helps unload Ironwood Dr. lower cost-less existing. bldgs more open land.

**Segment A Summary**Favorable 87Unfavorable 76No Response 44

existing population need

closest to Phoenix

Ok

There is already access

avoid farming areas & areas already congested

share a lot of existing development

Direct route to 10

most westerly route traffic flow will be to the NW from/to the S.E

Direct access to I10 to the 60. Most direct.

works well or move E to Idaho.

existing right of way

Route already exists along Ironwood

Not my 1st choice. would rather see a new road. It is already crowded at that stretch of road.

Existing road

Best access for existing residence

Like to end up East at least this far (not farther E)

Good rt for commuters

eases congestion coming off US60 focuses on Queen Creek San Tan Valley residents

This the route that most residents take to get from Queen Creek, Coolidge and Johnson Ranch to get to the 60 FWY

More open road without to much interruption of residences already there.

Already Built

a interstate out here would nice

Most direct route to the 60 from San Tan Valley.

It supports Segment E.

Help relieve some of the traffic build up on Ironwood and US 60. Many people live in the Johnson Ranch area and therefore the Ironwood Off / On Ramp gets backed up.

Lower impact to existing communities.

Close in enough, not too far out.

## Segment A Summary

Favorable 87

Unfavorable 76

No Response 44

easy access from US 60, possible loop with sr 24

no intrusion upon current residents.

Most of the traffic originates in the San Tan Valley area and heads toward Phoenix and Mesa. By connecting the San Tan Valley area with the Phoenix Metropolitan area will greatly reduce traffic congestion. As San Tan Valley grows we will need a more efficient way to travel toward the Greater Phoenix area.

The best access point to the US 60. Using I, R, N segments are a GIANT waste as NO existing developments exist, have no immediate economic impact, and could always be "added" later. We need ironwood to be a freeway NOW!

Easy access exit off of 60, central for most living east of this exit and south of it.

Most westerly. An unfavorable aspect would be disruption on existing Ironwood and prevention of access off of this section to currently developing areas.

Ironwood is a long stretch of road that is only 2 lanes going in and out of the Queen Creek/San Tan Valley area.

It is obvious that Ironwood is the most traveled thoroughfare in far east valley. This is road of choice and necessity for most residents of Johnson ranch and surrounding area. The housing around the Ironwood/Ganzel and Ocotillo and Combs area is growing. The hospital is located there also. Forward thinking would dictate that this is where road / highway should be and easier access to US 60 and US 202.

Lots of traffic using this stretch of Ironwood road to access US 60 to head west. Could remove existing golf course to the east of Ironwood to build new road and have local traffic use existing roadway.

most useful entry point & existing road

open land

Segment A is closer to a lot of commercial industry located at Signal Butte Road. Connecting at A would also help mitigate traffic for the AZ Renaissance Festival by reducing the traffic demands on US60 for persons who don't plan on attending the February festival. Also, keeping the US60 route separate from a new corridor would give more options for north-south travel in this area of the state in the case of accidents

give San Tan Valley a boost for growth

## Unfavorable

There are 3 schools on this Road. High congestion Already EXISTS.

Could be alternate if connected to E

Not approved by Town of Florence

Leave existing large roads for ER bypass road(s) alternatives

Ironwood already is a good surface road

Need to preserve ex. surface arterial.

Does not increase road

Heavy population

**Segment A Summary****Favorable** 87**Unfavorable** 76**No Response** 44

Too much development in place.

Disruption w/ existing traffic-appears more costly might piss off a bunch of citizens

Ironwood will be a good surface street as the freeway

Ironwood is a good arterial Road

Road OK as is

Eliminates good road

Ironwood Dr needs to be a reliever

to much traffic

Existing road

Ironwood Dr was recently upgraded as local collector-shouldn't be limited access or toll road way

preserve existing surface arterial

N end of A can't be widened enough at US60 bridge.

to far west, does not assist development of S.V.

goes through residential areas, trailer park, golf course

routes south affect existing RESIDENTIAL!

near residential area

This route is redundant to an existing highway (SR79) and would needlessly destroy the environment and negatively affect public health.

many reasons...

Stay away from residential areas. People do not want a 4 to 6 lane highway along residential corridors. Heavy traffic plus the heavy trucks will make way too much noise. By the time you get this thing built or within five years after its built, your suggested furthest east route will be very close to residential ares and possibly already surrounded. Just look at the growth that happened to the East valley between 1980 & 2000. Please think ahead!!! Save the taxpayers some money for a change. Plus consider the traffic noise that can and will be heard for miles away from this project. Most of us taxpayers in Pinal county have moved this far out to stay away from the congested and noisy traffic areas of Maricopa County. Build it in the least developed area PLEASE!!!!

Too close to residential neighborhoods

Too much noise in my neighborhood. Too close to existing homes.

Should not be built in any area that would take your personal home

Far too much impact to surrounding areas. Route I makes more sense for a northern point.

Ironwood Road already exists and we need another north south route to relieve traffic.

## Segment A Summary

Favorable 87

Unfavorable 76

No Response 44

---

That area is already developed and would require excessive spending to acquire

---

area already has Ironwood Dr and Gantzel Rd. Highway would be wasted here

---

area too busy already - AJUSTD just N of 60 on Ironwood. Too many kids/buses & cars! Safety issues

---

connects to unfavorable segments "B" and "E"

---

cost; congestion during construction; negative impact on existing development

---

Construction has and will cause extreme transit issues. The Road is fairly new anyway.

---

Too busy already

---

Too many developed areas

---

Major reconstruction on relatively new road

---

## Segment B Summary

Favorable 55

Unfavorable 110

No Response 42

Town would like this route but personally I favor E due to less impact on existing homes

### Favorable

Route 24 conection Highly important

Existing right of way

Best way to get to 60 from Anthem

Good access o Airport in Mesa existing R/W

D, F, N, below and access to gateway airport

Already is high noise area from the R.R.

serves people of San Tan Valley

direct route-use existing situation

most direct

use of exist Hwy.

use of existing hwy

straight shot high traffic, high need

same as "A"

same as A

Direct and favorable for convention center future

existing population need

very logical

Direct route to 10

1. Most direct route 2.Uses land already committed to a roadway

Direct access I-10 to the 60 most direct.

existing roadway

Existing Road

Best access for existing residence. And sooner connection to SR24

Good rt for commuters

continues from section "A" allows for higher volume of traffic lowers commute times

Gantzel already busy- traffic would flow better with new corridor

## Segment B Summary

Favorable 55

Unfavorable 110

No Response 42

Existing Road

We use Ironwood as a freeway now anyway.

it's already a main corridor and it makes sense. It's right in the middle of San Tan Valley and would benefit most residents

Most direct route to the 60 from San Tan Valley.

Help relieve some of the traffic build up on Ironwood going to and from Queen Creek. Many people live in this area and therefore Ironwood Rd. gets overly used

Less impact to established neighborhoods.

Same as D, E, F, and G

Most of the traffic originates in the San Tan Valley area and heads toward Phoenix and Mesa. By connecting the San Tan Valley area with the Phoenix Metropolitan area will greatly reduce traffic congestion. As San Tan Valley grows we will need a more efficient way to travel toward the Greater Phoenix area.

Yes! That road needs to be a Freeway ASAP!

same comments as on Segment A

For the same reasons as Segment A has. This will pass up and coming area near new Banner hospital, Johnson ranch and bring people to and from this growing area. To place further away will only stress the residents more in terms of travel. Convenience is key now instead of placing in out of way area. Place in center now prior to more growth. Easier access to US 60 and a quick East west to 202 from Ironwood area very much needed.

uses an existing road

give San Tan Valley a boost for growth

## Unfavorable

connects to F, see below

Same as A above. Add in expanded traffic as Queen Creek ext grows.

Bisects too much current development

Travels thru very populated areas would get crowded with commuters

Not approved by Town of Florence

To close to existing Residences

same

see A

This arterial too critical to lose. Impacts ex. devel.

same.



**Segment B Summary**Favorable 55Unfavorable 110No Response 42

same w/a

already too well travelled-heavy traffic

To disruptive to existing traffic

Cuts through large community.

Too much impact. expensive.

Traffic noise & too close to my home! Brand new development homes & stores

Displace too many existing businesses. expensive

Ironwood traffic flows very smoothly now. Gantzal is the only N/S route presently. If it becomes a freeway-and there's an accident-there's no other route!

Detrimental to existing development.

too many homes & businesses impacted

See A

Road OK as is

Same as A Impacts development

same as above

Surface roads are 4-lane now.

Existing road

developed areas

preserve critical arterial

already improved; dollars spent; huge disruption to whole area; won't increase traffic capacity by 3 more than 1/3

too populated-xxx subdivisions

Ironwood already developed-

Ironwood Dr. will be needed in addition to the freeway, adjacent to lots of existing residential

This street is already busy.

Does not avoid existing development

its a main rd. Already why would you want to make it into a freeway. Also traffic would be a nightmare since thats the only fast way to I-60

goes in front of Banner Medical Center

see A

**Segment B Summary****Favorable** 55**Unfavorable** 110**No Response** 42

See A

There is already a 4 lane road that leads to that area. With residents and homes.

To much upheaval to the residences already in proposed area, other areas should be proposed so as to not dismantle property lines or already residing neighborhoods...

This route is redundant to an existing highway (SR79) and would needlessly destroy the environment and negatively affect public health.

Stay away from residential areas. People do not want a 4 to 6 lane highway along residential corridors. Heavy traffic plus the heavy trucks will make way too much noise. By the time you get this thing built or within five years after its built, your suggested furthest east route will be very close to residential ares and possibly already surrounded. Just look at the growth that happened to the East valley between 1980 & 2000. Please think ahead!!! Save the taxpayers some money for a change. Plus consider the traffic noise that can and will be heard for miles away from this project. Most of us taxpayers in Pinal county have moved this far out to stay away from the congested and noisy traffic areas of Maricopa County. Build it in the least developed area PLEASE!!!!

Too close to residential neighborhoods

Too redundant with Ironwood.

Too much noise in my neighborhood. Too close to existing homes.

Should not be built in any area that would take your personal home

Too many all ready established residential areas. We do not want a major freeway running through our neighborhood. We moved to this area to enjoy peace and quiet. We willingly moved 15 miles from the freeway. Build a new freeway in an open area & then let people decide if they want to buy or build there.

too close to residential and commerce

Far too much impact to surrounding areas

leads into congested residential, already developed, area

Ironwood Road already exists and we need another north south route to relieve traffic.

Already a heavily congested area for local traffic that is next to impossible to drive on at rush hours. I favor relieving the traffic from this north/south artery, and creating another option.

Does not work without A&C

Not enough ROW south of Germann to Skyline Dr, adjacent high voltage power line along Gantzel south of Germann to near Skyline Dr, will need to remove many homes and businesses along Gantzel Rd south of Germann.

same as A

dense development already. Would need frontage roads in addition to freeway

cost; congestion during construction; neg. impact on existing development

## Segment B Summary

Favorable 55

Unfavorable 110

No Response 42

reverse engineering  
to may existing homes  
too disruptive

---

Using this segment of road would eliminate another north-south travel option for drivers. If the object behind the new corridor is to facilitate north-south movement, why remove what appears to be a major north-south thoroughfare? I suggest keeping Ironwood Dr/Gantzel Rd in this area so it may better function as an acceptable detour should an accident or maintenance be required on the corridor.

---

Construction has and will cause extreme transit issues. The Road is fairly new anyway.

---

Too busy already

---

Developments

---

Noise and same

---

## Segment C Summary

Favorable 24

Unfavorable 110

No Response 73

F to H seems better

Curve adds to length and increases cost

The in with O.Q

Probably should skirt Johnson Ranch & stay on F

unsure

### Favorable

This could work as well as H

Might save money over buying Gila Land

direct route

Most beneficial to existing developments

Relieves Hunt Highway congestion.

Direct route to 10

Direct access I1-0 to the 60. Most direct.

waste to tax \$\$ too curvy adds \$\$ but better choice

It's not as direct as Segments F/G/H but not bad.

This will help relieve Hunt Highway which is currently only a single lane road in both directions. Contractual agreements between Arizona and The Gila River Community is a concern though. In short, how much will they charge the Arizona taxpayers to run a highway through and will this charge be beneficial to the rest of Arizona in the long run?

Same as D, E, F, and G

Most of the traffic originates in the San Tan Valley area and heads toward Phoenix and Mesa. By connecting the San Tan Valley area with the Phoenix Metropolitan area will greatly reduce traffic congestion. As San Tan Valley grows we will need a more efficient way to travel toward the Greater Phoenix area.

I like this option better than alternatives, because it is most westerly.

San Tan Valley would have growth opportunities help to incorporate some day soon

### Unfavorable

requires F, see below

same for reason in A & B

Not approved by Town of Florence

same

## Segment C Summary

Favorable 24

Unfavorable 110

No Response 73

I've eliminated A & B

To close to Hunt

Florence bypass devastating. Loss of critical arterial. Impacts ex. devel.

same.

Not necessary

Too Indirect

To much congestion already in the area

Current work on Hunt. Current house is affected.

Seem like the noise level with the mountain there would be negative/enviro sensitive

Negative impact on Hunt Hwy neighborhood traffic.

too close to homes

Ironwood/Gantzel are good arterial Roads

Hunt Hwy is not a feasible option

No development available to the west of why. Not central.

No population base on the west side

dumb-developed areas exist. to many homes impacted

Bad to bypass Florence, need arterial

Where does all current traffic go for years of construction.

same

Hunt Hwy will be needed in addition to freeway, this segment is also adjacent to existing residential

This roadway is already too busy.

Does not avoid existing development

goes through residential & shopping area

just use existing Hunt Hwy

see A

See A

There has to many residential communities this will effect.

needs further explanation

**Segment C Summary**Favorable 24Unfavorable 110No Response 73

This route is redundant to an existing highway (SR79) and would needlessly destroy the environment and negatively affect public health.

Because we like the route of F and H better. It disturbs less homes.

Stay away from residential areas. People do not want a 4 to 6 lane highway along residential corridors. Heavy traffic plus the heavy trucks will make way too much noise. By the time you get this thing built or within five years after its built, your suggested furthest east route will be very close to residential areas and possibly already surrounded. Just look at the growth that happened to the East valley between 1980 & 2000. Please think ahead!!! Save the taxpayers some money for a change. Plus consider the traffic noise that can and will be heard for miles away from this project. Most of us taxpayers in Pinal county have moved this far out to stay away from the congested and noisy traffic areas of Maricopa County. Build it in the least developed area PLEASE!!!! Stay away from residential areas. People do not want a 4 to 6 lane highway along residential corridors. Heavy traffic plus heavy trucks makes way too much noise.

Seems to cut through my community of copper basin

follows segments A and B

Should not be built in any area that would take your personal home

There's no other way around that area, it would be a trap!

Too many already established residential areas. We do not want a major freeway running through our neighborhood. We moved to this area to enjoy peace and quiet. We willingly moved 15 miles from the freeway. Build a new freeway in an open area & then let people decide if they want to buy or build there.

too close to communities, closes San Tan Valley off, disrupts mountain park

Far too much impact to surrounding areas

This route is not a good route because you would have to follow along the Ironwood alignment to get to this area.

Why move for the Indian community. Too many existing housing developments! In addition the proposed connection will miss Florence, the economic center of Pinal County.

Too far west, and not a straight shot to segment "D"

That area is already developed and would require excessive spending to acquire

same issue, has Hunt highway

Hunt hwy is already here, why spend money on a road that already has transport.

There is infrastructure already in place - This would be a waste of money

cost; congestion during construction; neg. impact on existing development

see B

Because I don't favor Segment B, I cannot favor Segment C. Segment C also maneuvers around hilly to mountainous terrain, which might necessitate more drainage related improvements.

## Segment C Summary

Favorable 24

Unfavorable 110

No Response 73

Construction has and will cause extreme transit issues. Although the road needs repair, there are no alternatives at this time.

---

Too busy already

---

Developments

---

## Segment D Summary

Favorable 73

Unfavorable 79

No Response 55

unsure

Segment D keeps a lot of the existing north-south travel in tact, while offering improvements to a lesser-used (so it seems), but existing roadway. Although, this option crosses the Gila River at one of the wider points of the river, it does so with minimal impact on the surrounding community. (Right-of-Way may be easier to buy.)

### Favorable

Looks like sparcley populated area

see A B&C except if I 3 K are selected.

Best way to go to 60 from Anthem

existing R/W

Follows present traffic patterns and accesses most municipalities

Area already has lots of traffic

direct route

services large development area at Merrill ranch.

services large population area

Good route south. Few homes are affected.

follows existing road less new

same as A

Best route for current use.

Less existing displacement less expensive

Direct route to 10

Why the curve though-make it straight.

Most direct way South

Direct route I-10 to the 60 most direct

near residential development

easier access for populated areas

I would like to see a new road to Coolidge

existing road

Most direct route

same as sections E, G, & H



## Segment D Summary

Favorable 73

Unfavorable 79

No Response 55

Does not effect a lot of residents it is mostly farm land.

Business

Easy access for a lot of people.

again, it's already a main corridor and used by all in this area. Would cause the least amount of impact on residents.

Most direct route to the 60 from San Tan Valley.

Very Direct Route to I-10. Not redundant with 79/77 route.

This will help relieve Hunt Highway which is currently only a single lane road in both directions.

Close in enough, not too far out.

easy transition to SR87 to I-10

They are the ones who need streamlined access

finished the proposed route with little intrusion.

Most of the traffic originates in the San Tan Valley area and heads toward Phoenix and Mesa. By connecting the San Tan Valley area with the Phoenix Metropolitan area will greatly reduce traffic congestion. As San Tan Valley grows we will need a more efficient way to travel toward the Greater Phoenix area.

Straight shot, centrally located to reach 87, 287, 387, south corridor segments, etc.

Most westerly.

This area is mostly undeveloped and close enough to developed areas to be an asset.

cont south, straight shot to "Y"

More direct pathway to southern routes, and newly constructed road that could be improved.

include Coolidge and help its growth

follow this straight down should cost much less. I would think.

Leads to Union Pacific Railway Line -cheapest way to build thoroughfare

## Unfavorable

too close to Sun City Anthem

Too close to our development

Not approved by Town of Florence

Too close to Merrill Ranch

Too close to Hunt

See C above. This route would hurt Florence.

**Segment D Summary****Favorable** 73**Unfavorable** 79**No Response** 55

same.

Road already there.

To close to Sun city Anthem-our home

too close to homes

Same as above

Too much traffic now.

see C above.

same

stay away from Hunt Hwy.

same

Hunt Hwy will be needed in addition to freeway, also impacts both existing & planned residential dev.

Does not avoid existing development

goes through Coolidge central area

see A

See A

neighborhoods already exist what happens to them?

This route is redundant to an existing highway (SR79) and would needlessly destroy the environment and negatively affect public health.

Stay away from residential areas. People do not want a 4 to 6 lane highway along residential corridors. Heavy traffic plus the heavy trucks will make way too much noise. By the time you get this thing built or within five years after its built, your suggested furthest east route will be very close to residential ares and possibly already surrounded. Just look at the growth that happened to the East valley between 1980 & 2000. Please think ahead!!! Save the taxpayers some money for a change. Plus consider the traffic noise that can and will be heard for miles away from this project. Most of us taxpayers in Pinal county have moved this far out to stay away from the congested and noisy traffic areas of Maricopa County. Build it in the least developed area PLEASE!!!!

follows Segment A, B, and C

Too much noise in my neighborhood. Too close to existing homes.

See Above

Far too much impact to surrounding areas

This is not a good route because again we need to create more routes to relieve traffic and this route would be on top of Hunt Highway.

## Segment D Summary

Favorable 73

Unfavorable 79

No Response 55

Too far from Florence!

same as C

also a similar issue as C

same as C

conflicts with Anthem @ Merrill Ranch

cost; congestion during construction; neg. impact on existing development

see B

Too busy now. Also, too many developments

## Segment E Summary

Favorable 53

Unfavorable 87

No Response 68

this could be an alternate to B

This route is completely unacceptable. Not only is it redundant to an existing highway (SR79) and other roads, but it would be a new construction is what is now a mostly undeveloped desert landscape. This landscape is important for wildlife and people alike and should be kept intact.

### Favorable

Looks like sparsley populated area

More direct route to Q which is the only decent path

Leaves local traffic roads as they are.

serves people in San Tan Valley

If connected to SR 24 or 202.

Faster more direct route south

Possible connection to SR-24

Further away from home better but close enough to get to.

Less existing displacement less expensive

New route is the only logical option

Funnels traffic to 60 and 202 towards Phoenix or SR 24.

A to E,G,H,D,Y,Z,AA, Less impact on existing population

Direct route I-10 to the 60. Most direct.

if connected to SR24 or 202

This would be a great roadway to help me get into town for work.

construction or traffic wont be in the way of each other. I think by going that rout the job can get done faster

allows for more of a direct route towards Coolidge & I-10, bypasses Queen Creek/San Tan Valley traffic

Does not effect as many residents and give people a nother choice to use other than Ironnwood.

only it it does not disrupt existing neighborhoods

It is alright because there is seems to go through undeveloped land, but we do like going down Ironwood better.

This would be the \*best\* route in my opinion. It cuts the most drive time off, supports the growing San Tan Valley sub-divisions in the area for the east valley commute and isn't redundant with any other route.

This area is just starting to develop. Therefore, it would be prudent now to buy up and develop out in this area in order to save tax payers in the long run. As humans continue to populate, this area will be under demand for development.

## Segment E Summary

Favorable 53

Unfavorable 87

No Response 68

provides Queen Creek eastern access to the highway and also provides boundaries for community growth without disrupting current development. There are many road improvement opportunities and options for exits with this portion of the route. Personally I think this would be the most successful portion of the project.

Reduced flood control costs, no State Trust land used, CAP Canal is an existing sound barrier for residents on the East, better access to Gateway Airport/202/Phoenix, less miles of roadway to build, better access for Queen Creek/Riggs Rd/Hunt Hwy/Gantzel, and overall reduced cost.

skirts most residential areas where construction will not intrude on daily life. Construction should go much faster because of this.

Avoids existing congestion, while improving access as a viable alternative. Allows for growth, and the state already owns the land in the first place ;-)...

Removes traffic from currently heavily congested local roads yet runs close enough to them to maintain a steady flow of traffic combined with easy access for commuters.

open land

I favor Segment E over Segment B because it does not impact the existing Ironwood Road traffic. If the object behind the new corridor is to facilitate north-south movement, keeping the Ironwood Dr/Gantzel Rd in this area by creating another corridor would further expand the network of roads in southern Arizona. Segment E also minimizes the impact on the residential communities near N Ironwood Road at E Ocotillo Road.

## Favorable

cost effective; less negative impact on existing development. Note my suggested change on map (road from section E to O at Judd Rd crossing over segment K)

## Unfavorable

leads to G

same as in A

Could be alternate if connect to G & L to Q

Not approved by Town of Florence

I've eliminated A

same.

No desirable due to its destination to G

stupid route. wastes mileage. out of the way.

Route does not pass through commercial centers and does not connect to enough existing roads.

too close to homes

Second alternative to B and F

does no do good for econ.dev. behind the CAP-

**Segment E Summary****Favorable** 53**Unfavorable** 87**No Response** 68

Too many issues w/ CAP/Wild-cat lot owners

see A

See A

Abuts our development. Noise, property value depreciation, increase traffic in and around development

too close to our residential area

too remote and out of the way. Leave the farm land alone

Stay away from residential areas. People do not want a 4 to 6 lane highway along residential corridors. Heavy traffic plus the heavy trucks will make way too much noise. By the time you get this thing built or within five years after its built, your suggested furthest east route will be very close to residential areas and possibly already surrounded. Just look at the growth that happened to the East valley between 1980 & 2000. Please think ahead!!! Save the taxpayers some money for a change. Plus consider the traffic noise that can and will be heard for miles away from this project. Most of us taxpayers in Pinal county have moved this far out to stay away from the congested and noisy traffic areas of Maricopa County. Build it in the least developed area PLEASE!!!!

I live in Laredo Ranch and this particular route is close to our eastern border of our community. We already endure so many issues like cement factories, late night farming and flight paths, we don't need another factor of pollution and noise. Please consider an alternate route, there seems to be so many other options away from communities.

Too close to residential neighborhoods

Too much noise in my neighborhood. Too close to existing homes.

Too close to existing communities and neighborhoods. Pollution, noise, are issues

See Above

Too many already established residential areas. We do not want a major freeway running through our neighborhood. We moved to this area to enjoy peace and quiet. We willingly moved 15 miles from the freeway. Build a new freeway in an open area & then let people decide if they want to buy or build there.

Far too much impact to surrounding areas

Most of the traffic from Pinal county heads toward phoenix and downtown Mesa. This route is unnecessary due to Ironwood Drive already connecting Pinal County to Apache Junction.

This proposed route is too close to the communities of Laredo Ranch, Castlewood, and Pecan Creek. The added pollution, airborne and noise, are what we moved here to avoid. Ironwood is a perfect corridor to the 60 for these neighborhoods and any added corridor should be located farther east of these communities. the farther east away from current population centers may stimulate growth in the area it goes through.

Too close to my community

This does not work without A

too close to residential area

too close to Planned communities of Laredo Ranch and Castlegate

## Segment E Summary

Favorable 53

Unfavorable 87

No Response 68

---

Too close to Ironwood Dr.

---

Ironwood lead in too busy at present

---

Too busy now. Also, too many developments

---

## Segment F Summary

Favorable 47

Unfavorable 93

No Response 67

Town would like this route

unsure

### Favorable

shortest, straightest route

Best way to go to 60 from Anthem

See D, above and H below

Already High noise area

only if it connects to L

Better direct route south

Reduces traffic on Hunt Hwy

Ok, straight route from Phoenix to Tucson, existing roads

Follows existing RR tracks so noise should not be as large an issue to residents.

see comments on next page.

Population need

New route is an option only if RR supports

Most direct route more central than C

Direct route I-10 to the 60. Most direct.

only if it connects to L

more direct

this would be a good road to get around Hunt Hwy.

would bring business were SRP is already working

Railroad

Most direct route to the 60 from San Tan Valley.

This area is just starting to develop. Therefore, it would be prudent now to buy up and develop out in this area in order to save tax payers in the long run. As humans continue to populate, this area will be under demand for development.

Better access for residential population and access to more commute alternatives

Why not, everybody already avoids living next to the train for the same reason, they don't like the noise!

keeps road noise next to existing noise source, less disruptive



## Segment F Summary

Favorable 47

Unfavorable 93

No Response 67

alternate to C would be good

### Unfavorable

location of future SRP 230kv transmission line (2018)

same as A

Not approved by Town of Florence

To close to existing Housing

I've eliminated A & B

Too close to Railroad

same.

To busy now area

Homes are affected

Too close to Copper Basin.

too close to homes-esp our home

See A-B

Ultimately leads to segment "B" (see comments on segment "B" above)

don't feel its needed if sections B,G & H are developed

see A

See A

There has to many residential communities this will effect.

Neighborhood exists too much displacement

This route is completely unaccepable. Not only is it redundant to an existing highway (SR79) and other roads, but it would be a new construction is what is now a mostly undeveloped desert landscape. This landscape is important for wildlife and people alike and should be kept intact.

Stay away from residential areas. People do not want a 4 to 6 lane highway along residential corridors. Heavy traffic plus the heavy trucks will make way too much noise. By the time you get this thing built or within five years after its built, your suggested furthest east route will be very close to residential ares and possibly already surrounded. Just look at the growth that happened to the East valley between 1980 & 2000. Please think ahead!!! Save the taxpayers some money for a change. Plus consider the traffic noise that can and will be heard for miles away from this project. Most of us taxpayers in Pinal county have moved this far out to stay away from the congested and noisy traffic areas of Maricopa County. Build it in the least developed area PLEASE!!!!

follows unfavorable segment A and B

Too much noise in my neighborhood. Too close to existing homes.

## Segment F Summary

Favorable 47

Unfavorable 93

No Response 67

See Above

Too many all ready established residential areas. We do not want a major freeway running through our neighborhood. We moved to this area to enjoy peace and quiet. We willingly moved 15 miles from the freeway. Build a new freeway in an open area & then let people decide if they want to buy or build there.

Highway would be too close to Poston Butte High School

Far too much impact to surrounding areas

Most of the traffic from Pinal county heads toward phoenix and downtown Mesa. This route is unnecessary due to Ironwood Drive already connecting Pinal County to Apache Junction.

It is more desirable to relieve local traffic jams on Ganzel/Ironwood and Hunt Hwy, leaving a those to be 2nd access road for local traffic, and this road does not allow that for it uses those roads as main segments.

This does not work without A&B.

connects to unfavorable segment "B"

negative impact on existing developement

see B

I favor Segment E. Please view reasons listed under Segments B and Segment E for more information.

Ties into the Ironwood/Gantzel Rd route, and eliminates much needed farm and open lands.

Too busy already

Too busy now. Also, too many developments

## Segment G Summary

Favorable 69

Unfavorable 70

No Response 68

### Favorable

Sparsley populated area

Approved by Town of Florence

Already an area with noise, etc.

Great location. In between 79 & Hunt

Keeps route W of CAP and could connect to SR 24.

Better direct route south

faster route to Hwy 60/Apache Junc. & Gold Canyon

Direct route South.

Far enough away from my home.

Less existing displacement less expensive

N/A

straight run to coolidge

Direct route I-10 to the 60. Most direct.

Keeps route w of cap and could connect to SR24

This would be a good road to help get through the back roads.

Most direct route

same as E

direct route to Coolidge & I-10

As long as it runs into H and not into L and P and Q.

This is the only Segment that supports Segment E, the best northern segment.

I am not familiar with this area.

Far enough away that construction will not interfere with exisiting Ironwood traffic and not too close to homes.

Property is already impacted by railroad and SRP lines.

Close in enough, not too far out.

same as D and E

still skirts most currently developed residential areas.

Can't build homes there anyway!

## Segment G Summary

Favorable 69

Unfavorable 70

No Response 68

Roads already in place for this segment, they will just need upgrading. Removes traffic from currently heavily congested local roads yet runs close enough to them to maintain a steady flow of traffic combined with easy access for commuters.

This could be advantageous, if continued north and south. But it is easterly of current and probably near future development.

This area is mostly undeveloped and close enough to developed areas to be an asset.

less congestion during construction than B, C, & D; less neg. impact on existing development

open land

Segment G is the only segment which connects to my favored option, Segment E.

Route is approximately midway between Hunt hwy and SR 79, without interfering with current transit during construction.

## Unfavorable

could impact SRP 500kv line maintenance

same as above. except if I J K are selected.

Could be alternate if connected to L to Q

same.

Not effecient for const w/ existing developmt & vehicle travel.

Bad route, over residential area with no high volume roads

No existing homes/roads/business to connect. Poor use of state trust land.

SRP solar plant

too close to homes

Second alternative to B and F

Too much impact on housing-\$

It's close to, but not adjacent to SRP power line thus create huge "Void" area

see A

See A

only if it disrupts existing srp and magma ranch

This route is completely unaccepable. Not only is it redundant to an existing highway (SR79) and other roads, but it would be a new construction is what is now a mostly undeveloped desert landscape. This landscape is important for wildlife and people alike and should be kept intact.

no no no no no

## Segment G Summary

Favorable 69

Unfavorable 70

No Response 68

Stay away from residential areas. People do not want a 4 to 6 lane highway along residential corridors. Heavy traffic plus the heavy trucks will make way too much noise. By the time you get this thing built or within five years after its built, your suggested furthest east route will be very close to residential ares and possibly already surrounded. Just look at the growth that happened to the East valley between 1980 & 2000. Please think ahead!!! Save the taxpayers some money for a change. Plus consider the traffic noise that can and will be heard for miles away from this project. Most of us taxpayers in Pinal county have moved this far out to stay away from the congested and noisy traffic areas of Maricopa County. Build it in the least developed area PLEASE!!!!

See Above

the Srp 500kV transmission line, how often is work performed on said line? How often would there be a mass of vehicles crowding the area to work on the said line? What would happen if said line broke, how close would it come to the traffic?

Far too much impact to surrounding areas

Most of the traffic from Pinal county heads toward phoenix and downtown Mesa. This route is unnecessary due to Ironwood Drive already connecting Pinal County to Apache Junction.

straight shot south to "D"

conflicts with current or planned development

this could be an alternate to F

## Segment H Summary

Favorable 65

Unfavorable 81

No Response 61

### Favorable

Lightly populated

shortest, straightest

Best way to go to 60 from Anthem

See D above and ease of access from Hunt Highway

Pickup traffic from Magic Ranch easier.

Better direct route south

faster route to alternative route F/B & A instead of Hunt Hwy

Direct route South.

Good route down, less mileage from town

Less existing displacement less expensive

N/A

Great strait run to Coolidge-will cut down on farm equipment.

Most direct route South to I10

Direct route I-10 to the 60. Most direct.

more direct

This route would be preferred to help connect G & F to D.

missing most of existing homes

Most direct route

same as G section

Has very few residential homes is mostly farm land.

It goes through undeveloped land.

Most direct route to the 60 from San Tan Valley.

The other routes are too far east.

This area is just starting to develop. Therefore, it would be prudent now to buy up and develop out in this area in order to save tax payers in the long run. As humans continue to populate, this area will be under demand for development.

Far enough away that construction will not interfere with existing Ironwood traffic and not too close to homes.

Close in enough, not too far out.

## Segment H Summary

Favorable 65

Unfavorable 81

No Response 61

access to hospital, connects G to D

Same as D, E, F, and G

continues through undeveloped area

Removes traffic from currently heavily congested local roads yet runs close enough to them to maintain a steady flow of traffic combined with easy access for commuters. Straight shot for flow of traffic, yet easy to jump off/on when needed.

favorable, if the alignment includes Segment G.

This area is mostly undeveloped and close enough to developed areas to be an asset.

There aren't a lot of travel options for residents of Magic Ranch Residential. This segment would add a major thoroughfare these residents could access which would expedite their travel time and connect them with other communities in this area of southern Arizona.

Most direct route, with few terrain or detour issues.

connect F to D

Relieves traffic on Ironwood & Gantzel - leads to rail line

Too close to existing homes

## Unfavorable

same as in G

To close to Sun city anthem

Path to close to Coolidge proper

Not approved by Town of Florence

Brings freeway to close to Merrill Ranch existing housing

Cuts through existing housing

Dues not seem to be consistent w/ travel models.

would cause more of devaluation of property.

Too close to residential

same as above

not consistent w/travel models

Too close to magic ranch homes

Must connect to segment "D" (see comments on segment "D" above)

Too may RR crossings

**Segment H Summary**Favorable 65Unfavorable 81No Response 61

---

see A

---

---

See A

---

---

neighborhood already exists

---

---

This route is completely unacceptable. Not only is it redundant to an existing highway (SR79) and other roads, but it would be a new construction is what is now a mostly undeveloped desert landscape. This landscape is important for wildlife and people alike and should be kept intact.

---

---

no no no no no

---

---

Stay away from residential areas. People do not want a 4 to 6 lane highway along residential corridors. Heavy traffic plus the heavy trucks will make way too much noise. By the time you get this thing built or within five years after its built, your suggested furthest east route will be very close to residential ares and possibly already surrounded. Just look at the growth that happened to the East valley between 1980 & 2000. Please think ahead!!! Save the taxpayers some money for a change. Plus consider the traffic noise that can and will be heard for miles away from this project. Most of us taxpayers in Pinal county have moved this far out to stay away from the congested and noisy traffic areas of Maricopa County. Build it in the least developed area PLEASE!!!!

---

---

Residential impact.

---

---

See Above

---

---

Far too much impact to surrounding areas

---

---

Most of the traffic from Pinal county heads toward phoenix and downtown Mesa. This route is unnecessary due to Ironwood Drive already connecting Pinal County to Apache Junction.

---

---

Misses Florence!

---

---

not supported by local government AT ALL!

---

---

again, roads exist here, so do homes

---

---

feeds into same issue as C & D

---

---

conflicts with current or planned developments

---

---

negative impact on existing development

---

---

see B

---



## Segment I Summary

Favorable 104

Unfavorable 44

No Response 59

Access to Apache Junction

Unable to locate on map

### Favorable

most direct, utilizes 3

Less disruption to existing strvc tubes & people.

A good location for Junction. Equa distant to Apache Jct. a Gold Canyon

straighter shot to florence

Cost central access

I assume land would be cheaper than private or rez.

connects to 60, though better options connect to SR 24 or 202

new road

less dirsruptive

will need to widen 60.

Takes advantage of Hwy 60 already in place

Use of new 60 relocation

faster route to Apache Junction

Leads directly to US60

easily accessible from W60 & e60 to go South not too close to homes yet.

seems the most desirable & cleanest.

Good starting point. Allows for improvement. Noted on map asSECOND CHOICE

Ok, not so far out of the way for people coming from Phoenix, kind of out of the way for residents

Farther East more direct N-S to Exit S Take congestion off Ironwood

Better access without impacting population that now exists.

Quicker to Phx.

limit impact

To me looks more direct

Least impact on existing housing

uses #2 start/end point

## Segment I Summary

Favorable 104

Unfavorable 44

No Response 59

Lower cost

It will cut out a lot of traffic through Bold Canyon-destination for work is Coolidge

Will encourage new development & located on state land.

Desired residential and commercial growth/state land

aAids conjection

first really available route to south if one is on 60 going toward east; would gather some of AJ & western thereof traffic & then Gold Canyon cars

connects to 60 though better options connect to SR24 or 202

I think it would be better to have a new road

Less invasive to subdivisions

1. Better econ dev. for S.V. 2. possible alternate to by-pass-

State Trust Land

direct access to developments in the long term. bypasses gold canyon

not next to existing residential

Doesn't affect homes

join another section of US60

Has very few if any resident homes.

look at land scape if it doesn't disrupt existing neighborhood

The least developed area. This route would cause the least harm to current home owners. The noise level created by this route does the least damage. Construction on this route. This route would cause the least traffic congestion. This route would probably be one of the cheapest routes for construction cost. This route would cause the majority of people less traffic congestion, noise and overall loss in property values that have already taken a VERY DEEP PLUNGE.

### LEAST IMPACT TO PRESENT HOMES

As Gold Canyon continues to grow, the current US 60 will be overloaded. Between all the activites (such as Women's Pro Golf, Country Thunder and the Renaissance Festival, this road is approaching its maximum limitations for road traffic in its current state of development.

Far enough away that construction will not interfere with exisiting Ironwood traffic and not too close to homes.

No impact to exhisting communities and neighborhoods.

It will have the least impact on existing routes. It will also help populate surrounding areas. Additional "freeways" further west makes it seem congested.I was unable to attend so my maps don't seem as detailed to match these questions. I prefer veering east at ocotillo and crossing the Gila River via the middle of the 3 options and veers closest to the reservoir and enters I10 just east of SR87.

## Segment I Summary

Favorable 104

Unfavorable 44

No Response 59

Close in enough, not too far out.

Best northern connection point with minimal impact to surrounding areas

Probably the best route, I, J, O, Q as the least intrusive upon existing housing and developed population areas.

This creates a new route and has good separation from Ironwood and the 79 Highway.

This area is mostly undeveloped and close enough to developed areas to be an asset.

less residential area affected

most sensible local to support future growth

less impact on existing homes, etc.

connects to proposed US 60 realignment

this one makes the most sense

cost effective. And no impact on existing development.

open land

Most direct route, with few terrain or detour issues.

Will relieve traffic on Ironwood

Less population, less impact

## Unfavorable

Too far out of city might make sense in 20 years not now.

too far to the east

Too far west to facilitate NW/SE traffic flow

Doesn't seem reasonable to me.

Too far East

This route is completely unacceptable. Not only is it redundant to an existing highway (SR79) and other roads, but it would be a new construction in what is now a mostly undeveloped desert landscape. This landscape is important for wildlife and people alike and should be kept intact.

Too far east but would still be acceptable if the J/K/G/H/D segments were chosen.

See Above

Unnecessary expense with SR 24 an bad use of State Trust land/See K

Most of the traffic from Pinal county heads toward phoenix and downtown Mesa. This route is unnecessary due to Ironwood Drive already connecting Pinal County to Apache Junction.

No, what a waste! Can always be done as an addition to segment E later!

## Segment I Summary

Favorable 104

Unfavorable 44

No Response 59

Too far east for commuter traffic, segment "A" closer to Phoenix commuter traffic, shopping/entertainment/etc. destinations

---

too far easterly

---

I favor starting point 1, for reasons stated under Segment A.

---

## Segment J Summary

Favorable 85

Unfavorable 52

No Response 70

no comment

### Favorable

same as I

favorable alignment

straighter shot to florence

cost central access

Avoids potential Hazards-Flood etc.

Works with preferred Florence alignment.

same.

less disruptive

Better direct route south

faster route to Apache Junction

Perfect for everybody

Because it would be most efficient to build less disruptive to existing

Connection to SR-24. Few homes affected.

Most direct N-S.

Follow the natural route

Further from my home.

Direct and least impact on existing development.

Continue of I for Sam Reason

Will encourage new development & in state land.

Will bring new homes and retail store to state land

shorter no structures

nice split of future expected growth traffic for houses & industry

works with preferred Florence alignment

same as I

State Trust Land

Has very few if any resident homes.

## Segment J Summary

Favorable 85

Unfavorable 52

No Response 70

if it would reduce congestion

Away from communities and a good base for growth

Would prefer something further West but this isn't as bad as M.

Far enough away that construction will not interfere with existing Ironwood traffic and not too close to homes.

Supports planned infrastructure and development, as long as it does not impact current communities and neighborhoods.

Close in enough, not too far out.

through unpopulated area.

This area is mostly undeveloped and close enough to developed areas to be an asset.

same as I

same as I

No existing development

open land

Most direct route, with few terrain or detour issues

Relieves traffic on Ironwood

Less populous

## Unfavorable

see I

too far to the east

Traffic flow will be NW/SE from the Phoenix metropolitan area

Unsure about road.

too close to proposed section E & not close enough too long term development near section S

see A

See A

This route is completely unacceptable. Not only is it redundant to an existing highway (SR79) and other roads, but it would be a new construction in what is now a mostly undeveloped desert landscape. This landscape is important for wildlife and people alike and should be kept intact.

## Segment J Summary

Favorable 85

Unfavorable 52

No Response 70

Stay away from residential areas. This route ends up taking this project much too close to already developed homes further south. People do not want a 4 to 6 lane highway along residential corridors. Heavy traffic plus the heavy trucks will make way too much noise. By the time you get this thing built or within five years after its built, your suggested furthest east route will be very close to residential ares and possibly already surrounded. Just look at the growth that happened to the East valley between 1980 & 2000. Please think ahead!!! Save the taxpayers some money for a change. Plus consider the traffic noise that can and will be heard for miles away from this project. Most of us taxpayers in Pinal county have moved this far out to stay away from the congested and noisy traffic areas of Maricopa County. Build it in the least developed area PLEASE!!!!

Freeway 202 should be handling this area? I am not 100% familiar with this area though.

See Above

Unfavorable

Does not make sense if you can connect segments S to M to I

Most of the traffic from Pinal county heads toward phoenix and downtown Mesa. This route is unnecessary due to Ironwood Drive already connecting Pinal County to Apache Junction.

Who is this for, the coyotes?

Too far easterly

I favor starting point 1, for reasons stated under Segment A.

## Segment K Summary

Favorable 38

Unfavorable 86

No Response 83

no comment

### Favorable

same as I

Approved by Town of Florence

I see no reason to object.

Optional route to get to 60.

Better direct route south

faster route to Apache Junction/Hwy 60/Gold Canyon

No homes affected.

On the way to Coolidge. Otherwise I have to go to 79 up and around

optional route to get to 60.

This would be a good route from Sun Tan to Gold Canyon/Apache Jct.

Most direct route

Has very few if any resident homes.

as long as it leaves existing residences intact

Would prefer Route E but this isn't as bad as O or S.

Far enough away that construction will not interfere with existing Ironwood traffic and not too close to homes.

Close in enough, not too far out.

This area is mostly undeveloped and close enough to developed areas to be an asset.

open land

Most direct route, with few terrain or detour issues.

Relieves traffic on Ironwood - direct route to rail line

### Unfavorable

see I

too close to 79

Would be toward existing problems & development

too close to homes

Costly and unnecessary crossing of the canal



**Segment K Summary**Favorable 38Unfavorable 86No Response 83

why???

same as section J

see A

See A

This route is completely unacceptable. Not only is it redundant to an existing highway (SR79) and other roads, but it would be a new construction is what is now a mostly undeveloped desert landscape. This landscape is important for wildlife and people alike and should be kept intact.

Stay away from residential areas. This route ends up taking this project much too close to already developed homes further south. People do not want a 4 to 6 lane highway along residential corridors. Heavy traffic plus the heavy trucks will make way too much noise. By the time you get this thing built or within five years after its built, your suggested furthest east route will be very close to residential ares and possibly already surrounded. Just look at the growth that happened to the East valley between 1980 & 2000. Please think ahead!!! Save the taxpayers some money for a change. Plus consider the traffic noise that can and will be heard for miles away from this project. Most of us taxpayers in Pinal county have moved this far out to stay away from the congested and noisy traffic areas of Maricopa County. Build it in the least developed area PLEASE!!!!

I am unfamiliar with this area therefore I would not know how this would affect traffic.

Too close to existing development.

See Above

I may be confused but isn't the purpose to move traffic where they need to go at the cheapest cost. Flood control cost east of the CAP Canal would cost more than the west side of the CAP Canal. Connecting to the US 60 (with SR-24 and Ironwood) is unnecessary due to the commute of most people and by connecting to the 202 access to Phoenix Mesa Gateway Airport is improved along with access alternatives to the Phoenix metropolitan area. Use of State Trust Land lost, noise for local residents (I moved here 10 years ago for peace and quiet), pollution

Far too much impact to surrounding areas

Most of the traffic from Pinal county heads toward phoenix and downtown Mesa. This route is unnecessary due to Ironwood Drive already connecting Pinal County to Apache Junction.

Starting to go west and then it will go east again. Doesn't make sense.

Who is the for, the Quail Hunters?

Too far easterly

impedes future growth

connects to unfavorable segment "G"

I favor starting point 1, for reasons stated under Segment A.

## Segment L Summary

Favorable 45

Unfavorable 84

No Response 79

### Favorable

could be used w/ I thru G

Quickest path to Q

Approved by Town of Florence

Will probably bring more development.

Good crossing at AZ Farms Road

Works with most of Florence alignment and consistent with travel models.

Population need

moves traffic further east from mountains and indian land.

consistent with travel model & connects Florence

Would be a good addition to the back roads at STV.

same as E

would help tie in sections G, H, D with M,S,T

What developments, these guys are probably already bankrupt. Buy it now while it's cheap!

less congestion during construction than B, C, & D. And no existing development to impact

open land

### Unfavorable

Could be alternate if connected to G

this well become major commusale area & Florence supports it

proposed development com'l & residential

Avoid this area which is adjacent to excellent development & Aq.

Potentially connects to segments "F" & "B" (see comments on segment "E" above)

Traverses near existing homes & final plats in Mesquite Trails & Felix Farms

see A

See A

Leads to homes that have large properties that house many animals.

because it impacts dobson farms and arizona farms developments

wildhorse estates is a residential area.

Your Maps are wrong. There are current residential home communities along Felix Road between Arizona Farms and Hunt Highway. There are hundreds of homes. You are proposing to run a new transportation corridor (possibly 6-8 lanes) down the Northern portion of Felix where there are hundreds of residential homes right off of Felix with small children and animals. Running this type of corridor literally right on top of a development is NOT to the benefit of anyone. There is enough open land further east within segments I, M, S, W, X that would eliminate any need to propose a new corridor through segments L, P or Q (right on top of people which would displace them, devalue an already devalued home market, turn a rural area that people chose to buy/build a home at into an area with heavy fast moving traffic, noise and air pollution, and a huge environmental impact on this area. Wild Horse Estates is right next to Anthem and has another very large home development right on the north side of it. This IS an entire residential area.....not an area under construction or slated to be in construction starting in 2020. You need to revisit this corridor and move it and then update your maps so you are working with current information. I have NOT received any information or mail involving this proposal. I

To close to Crestfield Manor and Wildhorse Estates. We like our peace and quiet.

Stay away from residential areas. This route ends up taking this project much too close to already developed homes further south. People do not want a 4 to 6 lane highway along residential corridors. Heavy traffic plus the heavy trucks will make way too much noise. By the time you get this thing built or within five years after its built, your suggested furthest east route will be very close to residential areas and possibly already surrounded. Just look at the growth that happened to the East valley between 1980 & 2000. Please think ahead!!! Save the taxpayers some money for a change. Plus consider the traffic noise that can and will be heard for miles away from this project. Most of us taxpayers in Pinal county have moved this far out to stay away from the congested and noisy traffic areas of Maricopa County. Build it in the least developed area PLEASE!!!!

Too far east. Would not support San Tan Valley.

How will this affect some of the farmers that are living out in that area now? Arizona Farms Road has lots of agricultural business. Cattle Ranchers use this area and US 79 too.

same

See Above

Too far out to be of much use.

unnecessary/See K/too expensive

Far too much impact to surrounding areas

Most of the traffic from Pinal county heads toward phoenix and downtown Mesa. This route is unnecessary due to Ironwood Drive already connecting Pinal County to Apache Junction.

Too far easterly

This is not need if western route is not used.

this is not what the city adopted

I favor Segment H-- Segment L and beyond (L, P, U, V, Q, X, AB, AM, AO, etc.) require a lot of road to be built east and only re-direct traffic back towards the west. Option Q, the bridge, would be nearly as costly as option D since they both appear to cross at wide points. Option X could be evaluated to determine whether or not it is cost effective to take the road so far east and back-track to the west after crossing at a less-wide part of the river.

Less direct path south.

Adds distance & expense

Unfavorable

This route is completely unacceptable. Not only is it redundant to an existing highway (SR79) and other roads, but it would be a new construction is what is now a mostly undeveloped desert landscape. This landscape is important for wildlife and people alike and should be kept intact.

## Segment M Summary

Favorable 34

Unfavorable 74

No Response 99

no opinion

To close to Crestfield Manor and Wildhorse Estates. We like our peace and quiet.

unsure

### Favorable

obviously an area where this is Feasible.

want to move further east

Will encourage new development & in state land.

Ok to connect up N-O or S

same as I

not next to existing residential

See I

Has very few if any resident homes.

The least developed area. This route would cause the least harm to current home owners. The noise level created by this route does the least damage. Construction on this route. This route would cause the least traffic congestion. This route would probably be one of the cheapest routes for construction cost. This route would cause the majority of people less traffic congestion, noise and overall loss in property values that have already taken a VERY DEEP PLUNGE.

LEAST IMPACT TO PRESENT HOMES

Makes sense when connecting Segments S to I for a shorter route

This area is mostly undeveloped and close enough to developed areas to be an asset.

no existing development

Alternate to I-J-O-Q

### Unfavorable

see I

To far out

Too far to the east

Favors unrealistic eastern routes T and W

Favors unrealistic eastern routes T and W

Don't see the reason for it.

where is this?

## Segment M Summary

Favorable 34

Unfavorable 74

No Response 99

This route is completely unacceptable. Not only is it redundant to an existing highway (SR79) and other roads, but it would be a new construction is what is now a mostly undeveloped desert landscape. This landscape is important for wildlife and people alike and should be kept intact.

Too far east. Would not support San Tan Valley.

Not familiar with this area.

See Above

Too far out to be of much use.

unnecessary/See K

Most of the traffic from Pinal county heads toward phoenix and downtown Mesa. This route is unnecessary due to Ironwood Drive already connecting Pinal County to Apache Junction.

This is not good because it is building a route that is getting too close to the 79 Highway.

Who is this for, the Jack Rabbits?

Too far easterly

feeds into very poor alignment option for future growth

feeds into a alignment unsuported by Florence

this does not support alignment adopted by municipalities

creates an alignment that impeades growth

I favor starting point 1, for reasons stated under Segment A.

Less direct path south.

Adds distance, too costly

## Segment N Summary

Favorable 22

Unfavorable 79

No Response 106

no opinion

unsure

### Favorable

Seems fairly straight.

faster route to Gold Canyon.

Ok to connect to O

favor #2

Would be a good connection point from US60 to K & O

Has very few if any resident homes.

This area is mostly undeveloped and close enough to developed areas to be an asset.

if this helps line up the highway with the supported current alignment

no existing development

### Unfavorable

see I

To far out

Too far to the east

Better to connect to SR 24, 60 or 202

Better to connect to SR24, 60, or 202

same as section J & K

see A

See A

Where is this?

This route is completely unacceptable. Not only is it redundant to an existing highway (SR79) and other roads, but it would be a new construction is what is now a mostly undeveloped desert landscape. This landscape is important for wildlife and people alike and should be kept intact.

Because I live in an EXISTING RESIDENTIAL area called WILDHORSE ESTATES that is right along Felix Road & Segment Q will no longer make it safe for my children to play outside their own house. Too much noise & pollution will also be produced. I purchased a house in this development because it was peaceful & quite & if you put an 6-8 lane highway in, it will no longer be peaceful & quite.

**Segment N Summary****Favorable** 22**Unfavorable** 79**No Response** 106

Stay away from residential areas. This route ends up taking this project much too close to already developed homes further south. People do not want a 4 to 6 lane highway along residential corridors. Heavy traffic plus the heavy trucks will make way too much noise. By the time you get this thing built or within five years after its built, your suggested furthest east route will be very close to residential ares and possibly already surrounded. Just look at the growth that happened to the East valley between 1980 & 2000. Please think ahead!!! Save the taxpayers some money for a change. Plus consider the traffic noise that can and will be heard for miles away from this project. Most of us taxpayers in Pinal county have moved this far out to stay away from the congested and noisy traffic areas of Maricopa County. Build it in the least developed area PLEASE!!!!

The route is too inefficient.

Not familiar with this area.

See Above

Too far out to be of much use.

unnecessary/See K

Does not make sense if you can connect segments S to M to I

Most of the traffic from Pinal county heads toward phoenix and downtown Mesa. This route is unnecessary due to Ironwood Drive already connecting Pinal County to Apache Junction.

C'mon, are you seriously putting in this in for the Gophers?

Too far easterly

I favor starting point 1, for reasons stated under Segment A.

Less direct path south.

Too costly



## Segment O Summary

Favorable 73

Unfavorable 53

No Response 81

alternate-#2

unsure

### Favorable

used w/ I thru J

straighter shot to florence

cost central access

Connect to I

Approved by Town of Florence

Again, Fairly straight run-lower maintenance.

good location if it connects to 60

Works with Florence alignment.

new rod

Better direct route south

more direct faster route to

Doesn't bother anything much no houses

The city of Florence supports this area & will create employment & commrseat

Because it would be most effecient to build

Most direct N-S Route

Follow natural route

Direct and least impact on existing development

Continue of direct route

Will encourage new development & in state land.

Commercial corridors on state land.

less development in area

good collector point for improved Bella Vista to west with dense housing & expected growth to east

Works with Florence alignment

straighter saves \$

Good route from STV to Gold Canyon/Apache Jct.

## Segment O Summary

Favorable 73

Unfavorable 53

No Response 81

Away from communities and a good base for growth

through unpopulated area. faster (and hopefully cheaper) construction.

Good spacing and a straight shot.

We own property here and want this corridor to come through our farm.

This area is mostly undeveloped and close enough to developed areas to be an asset.

exactly what local government supports

the city of Florence has adopted this

open area

this alignment has already been adopted by Florence

least impact to developments

Town of Florence adopted their alignment!

cost effective. No impact on existing development.

Less impact on developed areas

## Unfavorable

see I

Impact agricultural areas

Ignores difficulty w/ crossing Magma RR/CAP and huge dam

same as section J, K, N

see A

See A

Way to many residential homes that will be effected

Neighborhood already exists for correction officers too much displacement and disruption of travel would cause upheaval and dismissals or an already short staffed state facility...

This route is completely unacceptable. Not only is it redundant to an existing highway (SR79) and other roads, but it would be a new construction is what is now a mostly undeveloped desert landscape. This landscape is important for wildlife and people alike and should be kept intact.

Please stay away from Felix road. There are a few homes there that do not to have freeways in there neighborhood, Keep it near Hunt Highway where the raods are already being used for traffic.

**Segment O Summary**Favorable 73Unfavorable 53No Response 81

Because I live in an EXISTING RESIDENTIAL area called WILDHORSE ESTATES that is right along Felix Road & Segment Q will no longer make it safe for my children to play outside their own house. Too much noise & pollution will also be produced. I purchased a house in this development because it was peaceful & quite & if you put an 6-8 lane highway in, it will no longer be peaceful & quite.

Stay away from residential areas. This route ends up taking this project much too close to already developed homes further south. People do not want a 4 to 6 lane highway along residential corridors. Heavy traffic plus the heavy trucks will make way too much noise. By the time you get this thing built or within five years after its built, your suggested furthest east route will be very close to residential ares and possibly already surrounded. Just look at the growth that happened to the East valley between 1980 & 2000. Please think ahead!!! Save the taxpayers some money for a change. Plus consider the traffic noise that can and will be heard for miles away from this project. Most of us taxpayers in Pinal county have moved this far out to stay away from the congested and noisy traffic areas of Maricopa County. Build it in the least developed area PLEASE!!!!

This route is too far east for commuters, but would be preferable to segments S/T/W.

Will this development affect the farm lands out in this area? Will this in return have a negative impact on Arizona's export business as well as feeding the people within the state?

See Above

Too far out to be of much use.

unnecessary/See K

Far too much impact to surrounding areas

Most of the traffic from Pinal county heads toward phoenix and downtown Mesa. This route is unnecessary due to Ironwood Drive already connecting Pinal County to Apache Junction.

No one would pay for this, why should you?

Utilizing segments E and G are closer in to San Tan Valley homes, and roads are already built in segment G.

I favor starting point 1, for reasons stated under Segment A.

Less direct path south.

Too costly - rail bed best alternative

## Segment P Summary

Favorable 40

Unfavorable 83

No Response 84

### Favorable

Approved by Town of Florence

Takes freeway away from housing development

Again-easy access usually brings more development.

good connection to AZ Farms Road

Works with Florence alignment.

Will meet good construction efficiency

Will encourage new development & in state land.

New corridor for transportation.

works with Florence alignment

We own property here and want this corridor to come through our farm.

What developments, these guys are probably already bankrupt. Buy it now while it's cheap!

This area is mostly undeveloped and close enough to developed areas to be an asset.

we went threw this with the city go with their support

no existing development

### Unfavorable

adds length

unnecessary-

Takes the road too close to florence

see o above

disrupts developments devalues homes.

existing homes

comes near florence

interferes with planned development

Total invasion of existing homes in Crestfield Manor

widen Felix Rd & Hunt Hwy

see A

See A

## Segment P Summary

Favorable 40

Unfavorable 83

No Response 84

Way to many residential homes that will be effected. And large property that house many animals.

Neighborhood already exists and ditto above comment

residential area

This route is completely unacceptable. Not only is it redundant to an existing highway (SR79) and other roads, but it would be a new construction is what is now a mostly undeveloped desert landscape. This landscape is important for wildlife and people alike and should be kept intact.

Your Maps are wrong. There are current residential home communities along Felix Road between Arizona Farms and Hunt Highway. There are hundreds of homes. You are proposing to run a new transportation corridor (possibly 6-8 lanes) down the Northern portion of Felix where there are hundreds of residential homes right off of Felix with small children and animals. Running this type of corridor literally right on top of a development is NOT to the benefit of anyone. There is enough open land further east within segments I, M, S, W, X that would eliminate any need to propose a new corridor through segments L, P or Q (right on top of people which would displace them, devalue an already devalued home market, turn a rural area that people chose to buy/build a home at into an area with heavy fast moving traffic, noise and air pollution, and a huge environmental impact on this area. Wild Horse Estates is right next to Anthem and has another very large home development right on the north side of it. This IS an entire residential area.....not an area under construction or slated to be in construction starting in 2020. You need to revisit this corridor and move it and then update your maps so you are working with current information. I have NOT received any information or mail involving this proposal. I

Traffic already travels down Hunt, it would be better to keep the majority of the traffic where it already flows.

Because I live in an EXISTING RESIDENTIAL area called WILDHORSE ESTATES that is right along Felix Road & Segment Q will no longer make it safe for my children to play outside their own house. Too much noise & pollution will also be produced. I purchased a house in this development because it was peaceful & quite & if you put an 6-8 lane highway in, it will no longer be peaceful & quite.

Stay away from residential areas. This route ends up taking this project much too close to already developed homes further south. People do not want a 4 to 6 lane highway along residential corridors. Heavy traffic plus the heavy trucks will make way too much noise. By the time you get this thing built or within five years after its built, your suggested furthest east route will be very close to residential areas and possibly already surrounded. Just look at the growth that happened to the East valley between 1980 & 2000. Please think ahead!!! Save the taxpayers some money for a change. Plus consider the traffic noise that can and will be heard for miles away from this project. Most of us taxpayers in Pinal county have moved this far out to stay away from the congested and noisy traffic areas of Maricopa County. Build it in the least developed area PLEASE!!!!

The route is too indirect.

Not familiar with this area.

Impact on planned communities/development.

See Above

Too far out to be of much use.

too expensive

Far too much impact to surrounding areas

## Segment P Summary

Favorable 40

Unfavorable 83

No Response 84

---

Most of the traffic from Pinal county heads toward phoenix and downtown Mesa. This route is unnecessary due to Ironwood Drive already connecting Pinal County to Apache Junction.

---

Getting too close to the 79 Highway.

---

Not necessary if using segments A, E, G, H, D -or- L, and Q. (Expense)

---

same as O

---

I favor Segment H-- Segment L and beyond (L, P, U, V, Q, X, AB, AM, AO, etc.) require a lot of road to be built east and only re-direct traffic back towards the west. Option Q, the bridge, would be nearly as costly as option D since they both appear to cross at wide points. Option X could be evaluated to determine whether or not it is cost effective to take the road so far east and back-track to the west after crossing at a less-wide part of the river.

---

Less direct path south.

---

Too costly

---

## Segment Q Summary

Favorable 70

Unfavorable 69

No Response 69

unsure

### Favorable

used w/ I J etc

straighter shot to Florence

cost central access

500kv line already crews up future development, so put road there.

excellent path. puts road central to both Coolidge and Florence

Again seems a compatible use for the area.

Better direct route south

close to me doesn't bother many other area's and 500KW Line is located next to it

Most Direct N-S

Natural route

More direct to Florence

Close off ramp to new Florence Hospital.

same as I, J, O

Brings hwy. away from mountains to allow service to both east & west sides.

Should follow Christenson Rd.!

takes advantage of-utility easements & expected growth link roads

I think it is better to have a new road, that you don't have to move anything

straighter line

Nice addition to Florence/Coolidge

this route would go between Florence & Coolidge and we won't have to hear both towns cry about the FWY being too far from their town

State Route 287 is heavily used by people living in Coolidge, Casa Grande and the Florence area. As population increases, I have noticed a little more traffic congestion in this area. If this is not possible, may I suggest making State Route 287 a four lane highway?

finished the route in the most direct path to 287.

What developments, these guys are probably already bankrupt. Buy it now while it's cheap!

Only as an alternative to my first choice of segments A, E, G, H, D for reasons stated in previous responses

## Segment Q Summary

Favorable 70

Unfavorable 69

No Response 69

This is a good route. It keeps the freeway in an established area that is already disrupted due to the SRP powerline. It does not impact the Coolidge airport in a negative manner and does not disrupt as many residents and single family homes. It will not have a negative impact on the property values as the power line has already done that. This route will be the least disruptive to the communities of Florence, Coolidge, and valley farms as a whole. Much of the right of way has already been established so the state will spend less money and move on this much quicker than most of the other routes. This was the route the City of Coolidge voted for many years ago and is still the best route.

This area is mostly undeveloped and close enough to developed areas to be an asset.

no existing development

open land

good route for a rail line in Florence area

Less impact

## Unfavorable

Not approved by Town of Florence

To close to Merrill Ranch community

Cuts through planned housing

Further divides AMR and Merrill Ranch.

devalues homes

Too close to Sun City, Anthem-our home

too close to Anthem

Would be disruptive to existing building & Ag.

Divides Anthem & Merrill Ranch

Expensive condemnation for Final Plat lots in Mesquite Trails

widen Felix Rd / Hunt Hwy

see A

See A

Way to many residential homes that will be effected. And large property that house many animals.

ditti above comment

unacceptable. Residential area.

This route is completely unacceptable. Not only is it redundant to an existing highway (SR79) and other roads, but it would be a new construction is what is now a mostly undeveloped desert landscape. This landscape is important for wildlife and people alike and should be kept intact.



Your Maps are wrong. There are current residential home communities along Felix Road between Arizona Farms and Hunt Highway. There are hundreds of homes. You are proposing to run a new transportation corridor (possibly 6-8 lanes) down the Northern portion of Felix where there are hundreds of residential homes right off of Felix with small children and animals. Running this type of corridor literally right on top of a development is NOT to the benefit of anyone. There is enough open land further east within segments I, M, S, W, X that would eliminate any need to propose a new corridor through segments L, P or Q (right on top of people which would displace them, devalue an already devalued home market, turn a rural area that people chose to buy/build a home at into an area with heavy fast moving traffic, noise and air pollution, and a huge environmental impact on this area. Wild Horse Estates is right next to Anthem and has another very large home development right on the north side of it. This IS an entire residential area.....not an area under construction or slated to be in construction starting in 2020. You need to revisit this corridor and move it and then update your maps so you are working with current information. I have NOT received any information or mail involving this proposal. I

See above comment.

Because I live in an EXISTING RESIDENTIAL area called WILDHORSE ESTATES that is right along Felix Road & Segment Q will no longer make it safe for my children to play outside their own house. Too much noise & pollution will also be produced. I purchased a house in this development because it was peaceful & quite & if you put an 6-8 lane highway in, it will no longer be peaceful & quite.

Stay away from residential areas. This route ends up taking this project much too close to already developed homes further south. People do not want a 4 to 6 lane highway along residential corridors. Heavy traffic plus the heavy trucks will make way too much noise. By the time you get this thing built or within five years after its built, your suggested furthest east route will be very close to residential areas and possibly already surrounded. Just look at the growth that happened to the East valley between 1980 & 2000. Please think ahead!!! Save the taxpayers some money for a change. Plus consider the traffic noise that can and will be heard for miles away from this project. Most of us taxpayers in Pinal county have moved this far out to stay away from the congested and noisy traffic areas of Maricopa County. Build it in the least developed area PLEASE!!!!!!

Too far east for commuters but better than segment X.

See Above

Too far out to be of much use.

too expensive

Far too much impact to surrounding areas

Most of the traffic from Pinal county heads toward phoenix and downtown Mesa. This route is unnecessary due to Ironwood Drive already connecting Pinal County to Apache Junction.

Need lot of ROW since it parallels existing 500 KV transmission line and a railroad.

this is not the alignment locals support

not supported by area residence

I favor Segment H-- Segment L and beyond (L, P, U, V, Q, X, AB, AM, AO, etc.) require a lot of road to be built east and only re-direct traffic back towards the west. Option Q, the bridge, would be nearly as costly as option D since they both appear to cross at wide points. Option X could be evaluated to determine whether or not it is cost effective to take the road so far east and back-track to the west after crossing at a less-wide part of the river.

Less direct path south.

Too costly
In proposed Anthem area!

## Segment R Summary

Favorable 24

Unfavorable 84

No Response 99

Furthest eastern route and more central to N/S corridor

unsure

### Favorable

not a bad route!

Strait run-state trust should save \$.

use vacant land

Cost effect using State Trust

same as sections I, M, S, & T

not next to existing residential

See I

Does not have many residential homes.

Far enough away from my EXISTING RESIDENTIAL; Wildhorse Estates along Felix Rd. Will still get noise, but at least it will be safe for my children.

The least developed area. This route would cause the least harm to current home owners. The noise level created by this route does the least damage. Construction on this route. This route would cause the least traffic congestion. This route would probably be one of the cheapest routes for construction cost. This route would cause the majority of people less traffic congestion, noise and overall loss in property values that have already taken a VERY DEEP PLUNGE.

This area is mostly undeveloped and close enough to developed areas to be an asset.

no existing development

### Unfavorable

adds a TI to 3

see I

To far East

impacts natural areas.

too far to the east

Poor start lend location.

to far out east

Not desirable

Too far out.

## Segment R Summary

Favorable 24

Unfavorable 84

No Response 99

goes wrong way.

Poor start/end location

waste of \$\$

where is this

This route is completely unacceptable. Not only is it redundant to an existing highway (SR79) and other roads, but it would be a new construction is what is now a mostly undeveloped desert landscape. This landscape is important for wildlife and people alike and should be kept intact.

SR-24 can handle this area.

Too far east for commuters and too indirect compared to A or I.

Not familiar with this area.

See Above

Too far out to be of much use.

unnecessary/See K

Does not make sense if you can connect segments S to M to I

Most of the traffic from Pinal county heads toward phoenix and downtown Mesa. This route is unnecessary due to Ironwood Drive already connecting Pinal County to Apache Junction.

We don't want freeways just for the birds and bunnies.

Not necessary if using segments A, E, G, H, D -or- L, and Q. Too far east for San Tan Valley commuter traffic feeds into an option that would destroy planned growth

does not line up with supported alignment

opposite of what is supported by locals & towns!

I favor starting point 1, for reasons stated under Segment A.

Less direct path south.

Too long - costly

## Segment S Summary

Favorable 35

Unfavorable 79

No Response 93

unsure

### Favorable

Again State Trust Land.

uses vacant land

Undeveloped land

favor #1 preferred

Avoids existing development

same as section I & M

not next to existing residential

See I

Does not have many residential homes.

Far enough away from my EXISTING RESIDENTIAL; Wildhorse Estates along Felix Rd. Will still get noise, but at least it will be safe for my children.

The least developed area. This route would cause the least harm to current home owners. The noise level created by this route does the least damage. Construction on this route. This route would cause the least traffic congestion. This route would probably be one of the cheapest routes for construction cost. This route would cause the majority of people less traffic congestion, noise and overall loss in property values that have already taken a VERY DEEP PLUNGE.

LEAST IMPACT TO PRESENT HOMES

See Segment I

minimal impact to surrounding area

This area is mostly undeveloped and close enough to developed areas to be an asset.

cost effective. No impact on existing development.

Less impact on developments

### Unfavorable

same as w/ R

see I

Not approved by Town of Florence

To far East

impacts natural areas.

**Segment S Summary**Favorable 35Unfavorable 79No Response 93

too close to 79

Too far east and away from near & mid-term growth areas.

Not desirable due to far from any known development

too far east to meet growth demands

where is this

This route is completely unacceptable. Not only is it redundant to an existing highway (SR79) and other roads, but it would be a new construction is what is now a mostly undeveloped desert landscape. This landscape is important for wildlife and people alike and should be kept intact.

Would not support San Tan Valley at all.

Not familiar with this area.

See Above

Too far out to be of much use.

unnecessary/See K

Most of the traffic from Pinal county heads toward phoenix and downtown Mesa. This route is unnecessary due to Ironwood Drive already connecting Pinal County to Apache Junction.

More for the Jack Rabbits? You know I bet the cacti thinks cool too? Who heck does this help?

Not necessary if using segments A, E, G, H, D -or- L, and Q. Too far east for San Tan Valley commuter traffic

same as R

going threw state trust land makes no sence at all, why build it then?

same as S

I favor starting point 1, for reasons stated under Segment A.

Less direct path south.

Too costly

## Segment T Summary

Favorable 25

Unfavorable 90

No Response 92

Too CLOSE to residential areas. There are so many other options that won't impact the property value and noise quality of those who live out here.

### Favorable

ok

Again Access to Hwy's brings more development.

stays on west side of magma diversion dam

Preferred 1

Can avoid Magma Ranch (by combining w/ "W")

same as I, M & S. Tie in T with L

See I

Does not have many residential homes.

The least developed area. This route would cause the least harm to current home owners. The noise level created by this route does the least damage. Construction on this route. This route would cause the least traffic congestion. This route would probably be one of the cheapest routes for construction cost. This route would cause the majority of people less traffic congestion, noise and overall loss in property values that have already taken a VERY DEEP PLUNGE.

This area is mostly undeveloped and close enough to developed areas to be an asset.

no existing development

Less impact on developments

### Unfavorable

see I

Not approved by Town of Florence

existing a agriculture area impacts natural area

see o above

too close to 79, military reservation and Magma Dam

Costly. Dam impacts. FMR impacts. Not serving growth areas. Loss of econ. devel.

too costly

to far out east

Stay off existing Rt 87-need additional

costly. dam impact. FMR impacts-Loss of econ.dev.

## Segment T Summary

Favorable 25

Unfavorable 90

No Response 92

Too far from existing residence

see A

where is this

This route is completely unacceptable. Not only is it redundant to an existing highway (SR79) and other roads, but it would be a new construction is what is now a mostly undeveloped desert landscape. This landscape is important for wildlife and people alike and should be kept intact.

Would not support San Tan Valley at all.

Not familiar with this area.

same

See Above

Too far out to be of much use.

unnecessary/See K

Too close to existing communities

Most of the traffic from Pinal county heads toward phoenix and downtown Mesa. This route is unnecessary due to Ironwood Drive already connecting Pinal County to Apache Junction.

Why go this route? Magma Ranch II has already moved it's dirt, unlike Merrill Farms.

Not necessary if using segments A, E, G, H, D -or- L, and Q. Too far east for San Tan Valley commuter traffic

same issue as S & R

would impact development in area in a negative way!

impedes future development of area

wouldn't support growth

I favor starting point 1, for reasons stated under Segment A.

Less direct path south.

Too costly - longer routes



## Segment U Summary

Favorable 28

Unfavorable 84

No Response 95

### Favorable

Approved by Town of Florence

Saves homeowner complaints if any

good link to set to AZ Farms Road

An alternate route to V

will pick up future development

Will encourage new development

Will bring new growth to Florence.

an alternative route to V

Preferred #1

This area is mostly undeveloped and close enough to developed areas to be an asset.

no existing development

### Unfavorable

adds length/cost

same as R

see P

Could be an option

too costly for bridges & to. far east for aiding traffic in San Tan Valley

they won't like it

Expensive condemnation w/ entitled land

widen Felix Rd / Hunt Hwy

see A

See A

To many latge properties that house animals.

where is this

This route is completely unacceptable. Not only is it redundant to an existing highway (SR79) and other roads, but it would be a new construction is what is now a mostly undeveloped desert landscape. This landscape is important for wildlife and people alike and should be kept intact.

Would require freeway to come to close to Felix to get to this section.

**Segment U Summary**Favorable 28Unfavorable 84No Response 95

MUCH TOO CLOSE to residential areas. There are so many other options that won't impact the property value and noise quality of those who live out here.

---

Stay away from residential areas. This route causes this project to go much too close to already developed homes. People do not want a 4 to 6 lane highway along residential corridors. Heavy traffic plus the heavy trucks will make way too much noise. By the time you get this thing built or within five years after its built, your suggested furthest east route will be very close to residential areas and possibly already surrounded. Just look at the growth that happened to the East valley between 1980 & 2000. Please think ahead!!! Save the taxpayers some money for a change. Plus consider the traffic noise that can and will be heard for miles away from this project. Most of us taxpayers in Pinal county have moved this far out to stay away from the congested and noisy traffic areas of Maricopa County. Build it in the least developed area PLEASE!!!!

---

Too indirect. Would not help San Tan Valley commuters.

---

Not familiar with this area.

---

Cost of two canal crossings.

---

See Above

---

cost of building 2 bridges and not as direct. Just don't put zig zag waves in it like Maricopa did on the Red Mountain and 101 in Scottsdale. Easier way to have more accidents.

---

Too far out to be of much use.

---

unnecessary/See K/too expensive

---

Does not make sense when connecting Segments X and W or T

---

Most of the traffic from Pinal county heads toward phoenix and downtown Mesa. This route is unnecessary due to Ironwood Drive already connecting Pinal County to Apache Junction.

---

Don't pay for two bridges when you can buy the land through merrill ranch for cheap!

---

Not necessary if using segments A, E, G, H, D -or- L, and Q. Too far east for San Tan Valley commuter traffic

---

I favor Segment H-- Segment L and beyond (L, P, U, V, Q, X, AB, AM, AO, etc.) require a lot of road to be built east and only re-direct traffic back towards the west. Option Q, the bridge, would be nearly as costly as option D since they both appear to cross at wide points. Option X could be evaluated to determine whether or not it is cost effective to take the road so far east and back-track to the west after crossing at a less-wide part of the river.

---

Less direct path south. Multiple bridges over the CAp canal (Extra cost).

---

Too long - costly

---

**Favorable**

Approved by Town of Florence

More direct and keeps the freeway away from housing

Access brings Development.

good link to AZ Farms Road

An alternate route to U

Makes most commercial sense

an alternative route to U

#3 preferred

Future development, the land is worthless now!

This area is mostly undeveloped and close enough to developed areas to be an asset.

no existing development

**Unfavorable**

see u

same as P

see P

existing agriculture area. impacts natural area

devalues homes

they won't like that at Merrill Ranch

Expensive condemnation w/ entitled land

widen Felix Rd / Hunt Hwy

see A

See A

To many latge properties that house animals.

neighborhood already exists

This route is completely unaccepable. Not only is it redundant to an existing highway (SR79) and other roads, but it would be a new construction is what is now a mostly undeveloped desert landscape. This landscape is important for wildlife and people alike and should be kept intact.

Would require freeway to come to close to Felix to get to this segment.

## Segment V Summary

Favorable 33

Unfavorable 79

No Response 95

MUCH TOO CLOSE to residential areas. There are so many other options that won't impact the property value and noise quality of those who live out here.

Too indirect. Would not help San Tan Valley commuters.

Not familiar with this area.

same

See Above

Too far out to be of much use.

unnecessary/See K/too expensive

Does not make sense when connecting Segments X and W or T

Most of the traffic from Pinal county heads toward phoenix and downtown Mesa. This route is unnecessary due to Ironwood Drive already connecting Pinal County to Apache Junction.

Not necessary if using segments A, E, G, H, D -or- L, and Q. Too far east for San Tan Valley commuter traffic

I favor Segment H-- Segment L and beyond (L, P, U, V, Q, X, AB, AM, AO, etc.) require a lot of road to be built east and only re-direct traffic back towards the west. Option Q, the bridge, would be nearly as costly as option D since they both appear to cross at wide points. Option X could be evaluated to determine whether or not it is cost effective to take the road so far east and back-track to the west after crossing at a less-wide part of the river.

Less direct path south.

Costly - too long

## Segment W Summary

Favorable 30

Unfavorable 85

No Response 92

less favorable

See I

unsure

### Favorable

ok

Cannot Do much else w/this area.

Crazy! wrong side of Magma Dam!

Preferred #3

Combine w/ "T"

not next to existing residential

Leads closer to Florence CITY and has no homes that would be effected.

as long as it does not disrupt current dwellings

Impacts the least amout of residential areas and makes sense.

Far enough away from my EXISTING RESIDENTIAL; Wildhorse Estates along Felix Rd. Will still get noise, but at least it will be safe for my children.

The least developed area. This route would cause the least harm to current home owners. The noise level created by this route does the least damage. Construction on this route. This route would cause the least traffic congestion. This route would probably be one of the cheapest routes for construction cost. This route would cause the majority of people less traffic congestion, noise and overall loss in property values that have already taken a VERY DEEP PLUNGE.

LEAST IMPACT TO PRESENT HOMES

minimal impact to surrounding area

This area is mostly undeveloped and close enough to developed areas to be an asset.

### Unfavorable

see P

Not approved by Town of Florence

existing agriculture area. impacts natural area

See o above

See T

Appears to be in flood plain of diversion dam

**Segment W Summary**Favorable 30Unfavorable 85No Response 92

to close to E side of Magma Dam.

see T

it would cost more \$ from the impact on nat'l guard

Too far from existing residence

widen Felix Rd / Hunt Hwy

This route is completely unacceptable. Not only is it redundant to an existing highway (SR79) and other roads, but it would be a new construction is what is now a mostly undeveloped desert landscape. This landscape is important for wildlife and people alike and should be kept intact. The Army National Guard lands provide important and sensitive habitat for a variety of species.

Too close to AZ-79.

This is the worst possible route because it's too far East to help San Tan commuters and on top of that is indirect.

No additional highway is needed here. All the state needs to do is develop Highway 79 to a four lane highway. This will save taxpayers a considerable amount of money.

See Above

Too far out to be of much use.

unnecessary/See K/too expensive

Most of the traffic from Pinal county heads toward phoenix and downtown Mesa. This route is unnecessary due to Ironwood Drive already connecting Pinal County to Apache Junction.

Now we can blow up the freeway while we commute to work! Yippee! No.

Not necessary if using segments A, E, G, H, D -or- L, and Q. Too far east for San Tan Valley commuter traffic

same as stated above in R

this would make the highway of no benefit at all to the community

this alignment would be of no benefit to the local properties

same as T

disruptive to Nat'l Guard, etc.

I favor starting point 1, for reasons stated under Segment A.

Less direct path south.

Too costly - indirect route

See I

unsure

## Favorable

ok

Best access to areas of residential and Business-Industry

Would encourage much-needed traffic into the downtown area.

Gives Florence an excellent access.

Bring more \$ from Tourists for Florence

goes around planned housing good option.

Most critical segment for long term sustainability of Florence.

Helps entry to Florence approach

Less disruptive and plans for the future growth. See Florence!

By all means this freeway need to be close to county seat

need to serve Florence the county seat

Will help Florence grow.

most critical segment for long term sustainability of Florence

not next to existing residential

Leads closer to Florence CITY and has no homes that would be effected.

as long as it does not disrupt current dwellings

Impacts the least amout of residential areas and makes sense.

The least developed area. This route would cause the least harm to current home owners. The noise level created by this route does the least damage. Construction on this route. This route would cause the least traffic congestion. This route would probably be one of the cheapest routes for construction cost. This route would cause the majority of people less traffic congestion, noise and overall loss in property values that have already taken a VERY DEEP PLUNGE.

### LEAST IMPACT TO PRESENT HOMES

This will be needed to connect the proposed highway from Ironwood to I-10. Again though, I would be concerned with the farmers that live in this area and how it would affect Arizona exports and food for the locals. In depth studies would need ot be done in how this would affect the Arizona economy in the long run.

minimal impact to surrounding area

## Segment X Summary

Favorable 65

Unfavorable 60

No Response 82

Keeps Florence, an important town for the ENTIRE valley's security connected. Just ask the Dept. of Homeland Security, the Army National Guard, FBI, ATF, etc... They are ALL based out there!

This area is mostly undeveloped and close enough to developed areas to be an asset.

no existing development

Less impact

## Unfavorable

see P

to close in proximity for comfort. Road noise and poss. congestion also disruption to agriculture cond.

Negative impact on Florence Gardens & visibz idermesz

no easy access

Too close to development Florence gardens

No

too close to Hwy 79 with no benefit to town center local roads need to link Florence center with Hunt Hwy.

To far to the East. No gain.

just use existing 287 or 79. widen Felix Rd / Hunt Hwy

This route is completely unacceptable. Not only is it redundant to an existing highway (SR79) and other roads, but it would be a new construction is what is now a mostly undeveloped desert landscape. This landscape is important for wildlife and people alike and should be kept intact.

It appears that this segment will be directly on our property and would negatively impact a well preserved Hohokam, ballcourt village known as Poston Butte Ruins. Depending on the exact location it could also interfere with our farming and sand & gravel operations and possibly even uproot us from our homes. Please don't consider this segment!!

Too close to AZ-79.

Too far East to help San Tan commuters and on top of that is too indirect.

See Above

Too far out to be of much use.

unnecessary/See K/too expensive

Most of the traffic from Pinal county heads toward phoenix and downtown Mesa. This route is unnecessary due to Ironwood Drive already connecting Pinal County to Apache Junction.

Not necessary if using segments A, E, G, H, D -or- L, and Q. Too far east for San Tan Valley commuter traffic



## Segment X Summary

Favorable 65

Unfavorable 60

No Response 82

I favor Segment H-- Segment L and beyond (L, P, U, V, Q, X, AB, AM, AO, etc.) require a lot of road to be built east and only re-direct traffic back towards the west. Option Q, the bridge, would be nearly as costly as option D since they both appear to cross at wide points. Option X could be evaluated to determine whether or not it is cost effective to take the road so far east and back-track to the west after crossing at a less-wide part of the river.

---

Less direct path south.

---

help keep I-79 free for low traffic. Florence can grow more at Anthem

---

Too costly - indirect route

---

## Segment Y Summary

Favorable 57

Unfavorable 62

No Response 88

unsure

### Favorable

uses existing 87

w/ D Z AA

Uses existing right of way Straightest route least impact on environment

Best way to go to I10 to from Anthem

existing R/W

Same as AA, A below and most direct route

Strait Line Run. Much roadway already there.

Best route, straight shot, existing roads

Most direct Rt from US 60

Uses existing roads and less costly

Most direct route. Hwy 87 would be redundant if passed.

Direct route I-10 to the 60. Easy access to Coolidge

existing roadway

more reasonable

Would like to se road expanded

Existing Road

Most direct route

May help town of Coolidge growth. Close to future mall on Bartlett

uses already existing rds

Very little homes will be effected. Good routne to the Coolidge and the I-10.

Most direct route.

Current road for State Route 87 and 287 are used heavily. Something needs to be done to relieve the flow of traffic in this area. An Interstate Highway going by Coolidge on its way to the I-10 could help boost this cities fragile economy. Currently, Coolidge is barely surviving.

Most direct route to Tucson and would connect Coolidge,Eloy, and Picacho to San Tan Valley.

Roads already in, centrally located corridor

## Segment Y Summary

Favorable 57

Unfavorable 62

No Response 88

This area is mostly undeveloped and close enough to developed areas to be an asset. This is a future development that may never happen.

cont south to run with an existing noise source to "Z"

It would provide another thoroughfare for residents of Coolidge and the farming community, without going directly through town, as SR87 currently does. Connecting to SR 87 would utilize the existing corridor, which connects to I-10, and would facilitate future commerce in Coolidge if the main corridor passes through town.

Most direct path south.

help Coolidge growth and expansion

Direct route less costly

## Unfavorable

Too close to Coolidge

would require additional Row. Eliminates businesses in Coolidge

Not approved by City of Coolidge

If connection to 87 were further south it would avoid business at south edge of town

Bring freeway to close on North portion

Need to have a Freeway by-pass road for

Bypasses Florence

existing residences also 87 is a good alternate to Gilbert/Chandler

To disruptive

Stay off RT 87 Build new

Build alternative to existing road

Leaves SR87 as a feeder surface route.

bypass Florence

disrupts to many people in Coolidge on East side-wipes out eastside of town.

same as B & E

SR87 will be needed in addition to freeway (see also additional comment #1)

See A

If a build alternative is determined to be necessary, improvements should be made to existing highways (SR287 and SR87) rather than expanding smaller roads or building new ones. Ideally, alternate modes of transportation would be used to eliminate the need to build or expand any roads.

## Segment Y Summary

Favorable 57

Unfavorable 62

No Response 88

Stay away from residential areas. This route causes this project to go much too close to already developed homes. People do not want a 4 to 6 lane highway along residential corridors. Heavy traffic plus the heavy trucks will make way too much noise. By the time you get this thing built or within five years after its built, your suggested furthest east route will be very close to residential areas and possibly already surrounded. Just look at the growth that happened to the East valley between 1980 & 2000. Please think ahead!!! Save the taxpayers some money for a change. Plus consider the traffic noise that can and will be heard for miles away from this project. Most of us taxpayers in Pinal county have moved this far out to stay away from the congested and noisy traffic areas of Maricopa County. Build it in the least developed area PLEASE!!!!!!

---

Too far out to be of much use.

---

unnecessary/too expensive

---

Far too much impact to surrounding areas

---

Too far from Florence.

---

There are gas lines that run along Christensen road as well as a new bridge that was just redone to help local traffic. Christensen Road would be very disruptive to the City of Coolidge and would negatively impact a number of the citizens. This would hurt the already depressed local economy and force economically challenged people to leave their homes. The railroad is also within a mile of Christensen Road which would create a railroad, freeway, and major power line within 5 miles of each other. This would destroy property values in an already depressed area.

---

## Segment Z Summary

Favorable 65

Unfavorable 54

No Response 88

unsure

### Favorable

see Y

see Y

existing road way cheaper-rail line noise already their

uses existing right of way. straightest route

Best way to go to I10 from Anthem

existing R/W

Same as AA Below

Strait Run-High Traffic area

Best route, existing roads

Most direct Route from US60

same as Y

Same as Y. Best use of Hwy 87 corridor

Direct route I-10 to the 60. Most direct.

existing roadway

Would like to see road expanded

Existing Road

Most direct route

see section Y

Not to many houses. Great access for the I-10.

Most direct route.

Current road for State Route 87 and Selma are used by many. Something needs to be done to relieve the flow of traffic in this area. An Interstate Highway going by Coolidge on its way to the I-10 could help boost this cities fragile economy. Currently, Coolidge is barely surviving.

Most direct route to Tucson and would connect Coolidge,Eloy, and Picacho to San Tan Valley.

Too far from Florence.

Roads already in, centrally located corridor

This area is mostly undeveloped and close enough to developed areas to be an asset.

cont to "AA"

I prefer connecting into the major, existing north-south corridor here because I believe that was the intended purpose of SR87. Using the existing roadway here would reduce project costs and keep the number of interchanges on I-10 the same, reducing the number of access points to I-10.

Most direct path south.

more direct connection to I-10

Follow existing rd

## Unfavorable

Takes over existing highway

removes existing access roads

Not approved by City of Coolidge

same as above

Lose 87 w/ this option.

same as Y

Leaves SR87 as a feeder surface route.

see AA please

jLose 87 w this option

Bad news for current 2ESL Curts to much relocation to many problems with law suits

good existing road, leave for business frontage off freeway

See comment on segment "Y" above

See A

If a build alternative is determined to be necessary, improvements should be made to existing highways (SR287 and SR87) rather than expanding smaller roads or building new ones. Ideally, alternate modes of transportation would be used to eliminate the need to build or expand any roads.

Stay away from residential areas. This route causes this project to go much too close to already developed homes. People do not want a 4 to 6 lane highway along residential corridors. Heavy traffic plus the heavy trucks will make way too much noise. By the time you get this thing built or within five years after its built, your suggested furthest east route will be very close to residential areas and possibly already surrounded. Just look at the growth that happened to the East valley between 1980 & 2000. Please think ahead!!! Save the taxpayers some money for a change. Plus consider the traffic noise that can and will be heard for miles away from this project. Most of us taxpayers in Pinal county have moved this far out to stay away from the congested and noisy traffic areas of Maricopa County. Build it in the least developed area PLEASE!!!!!!

Too far out to be of much use.

## Segment Z Summary

Favorable 65

Unfavorable 54

No Response 88

---

unnecessary/too expensive

---

Far too much impact to surrounding areas

---

Direct route - shortest distance - less costly

---

unsure

## Favorable

see Y

see Y

uses existing right of way

Best way to go to I10 from Anthem

Uses existing Hwy & R/W

Currently the traffic pattern-least change

Strait Run high Traffic area.

Best route, straight shot, existing roads

Most direct route from US60

same as Y

Same as Y and Z

Most direct route from the I-10-To the 60. Most direct

existing roadway

follow railroad

Would like to see road expanded

Existing Road

Intersect with I-10 as far west as possible for better access to I8

Most direct route

Existing route

see section Y

Not to many houses. Great access for the I-10.

Most direct route.

Current road for State Route 87 and Arica are used by many. Something needs to be done to relieve the flow of traffic in this area, especially when I-10 is closed down and rerouted for accidents or bad weather. An Interstate Highway going by Eloy on its way to the I-10 could help boost this cities fragile economy. Currently, Eloy is barely surviving. Much farmland out here though, so a in depth study would need to be done to see how this would affect the farmers living out their.

Most direct route to Tucson and would connect Coolidge,Eloy, and Picacho to San Tan Valley.



## Segment AA Summary

Favorable 62

Unfavorable 51

No Response 94

Save da money!

Roads already in, centrally located corridor

This area is mostly undeveloped and close enough to developed areas to be an asset.

cont to "4"

I prefer connecting into the major, existing north-south corridor here because I believe that was the intended purpose of SR87. Using the existing roadway here would reduce project costs and keep the number of interchanges on I-10 the same, reducing the number of access points to I-10.

Most direct path south.

Follow existing rd

## Unfavorable

To close to our subdivision-To much traffic on 87-Road noise

Existing interchange area is a mess new @ AL better

see Z

removes existing access roads

Not approved by City of Coolidge

same as above

Lose 87 w/ this option.

Leaves SR87 as a feeder surface route.

do not use current 87-it's a good artery with local access. not good for limiting access/tolls

see Z

same as B & E but instea of I-60 to I-10

good existing road, leave as alternate route

See comment on segment "Y" above

See A

If a build alternative is determined to be necessary, improvements should be made to existing highways (SR287 and SR87) rather than expanding smaller roads or building new ones. Ideally, alternate modes of transportation would be used to eliminate the need to build or expand any roads.

## Segment AA Summary

Favorable 62

Unfavorable 51

No Response 94

Stay away from residential areas. This route causes this project to go much too close to already developed homes. People do not want a 4 to 6 lane highway along residential corridors. Heavy traffic plus the heavy trucks will make way too much noise. By the time you get this thing built or within five years after its built, your suggested furthest east route will be very close to residential areas and possibly already surrounded. Just look at the growth that happened to the East valley between 1980 & 2000. Please think ahead!!! Save the taxpayers some money for a change. Plus consider the traffic noise that can and will be heard for miles away from this project. Most of us taxpayers in Pinal county have moved this far out to stay away from the congested and noisy traffic areas of Maricopa County. Build it in the least developed area PLEASE!!!!!!

---

Far too much impact to surrounding areas

---

Direct route less costly

---

## Segment AB Summary

Favorable 51

Unfavorable 43

No Response 114

no opinion

unsure

### Favorable

Ok, but not as good as D to Y to Z to AA

Does not follow 500 KVA lines

meets Coolidge sitting resolution

Approved by City of Coolidge

Would make easy access for the Developments.

works with Florence alignment

similar to AM-AD AM-no preferable to disruption on Felix Rd w/AB

less mileage down

Keep west of potential fissure area

creates commercial corridors, optimizes 3 avenues of transportation

bypasses coolidge

works with Florence alignment

Supported by major area property owners and Coolidge City Council (Also see additional comment #2)

If it came through from X, but please avoid Q. But We prefer using Highway 87 routes Y,Z,and AA

The least developed area. This route would cause the least harm to current home owners. The noise level created by this route does the least damage. Construction on this route. This route would cause the least traffic congestion. This route would probably be one of the cheapest routes for construction cost. This route would cause the majority of people less traffic congestion, noise and overall loss in property values that have already taken a VERY DEEP PLUNGE.

Good alt route with minimal impact to established communities

Connects Florence.

This area is mostly undeveloped and close enough to developed areas to be an asset.

### Unfavorable

Prefer existing routes to carving new routes

Do not like city vote-in route was much better

widen/re-structure existing rds to accomodate new decelopments

## Segment AB Summary

Favorable 51

Unfavorable 43

No Response 114

See A

This effects to many homes and property that house animals.

neighborhood already exists

If a build alternative is determined to be necessary, improvements should be made to existing highways (SR287 and SR87) rather than expanding smaller roads or building new ones. Ideally, alternate modes of transportation would be used to eliminate the need to build or expand any roads.

Not shown on map.

I am unfamiliar with this area, but if it's like the rest of the area, a highway could have a negative impact on the agricultural business.

unnecessary/too expensive

Sorry, I do not see this on the provided map

I favor Segment H-- Segment L and beyond (L, P, U, V, Q, X, AB, AM, AO, etc.) require a lot of road to be built east and only re-direct traffic back towards the west. Option Q, the bridge, would be nearly as costly as option D since they both appear to cross at wide points. Option X could be evaluated to determine whether or not it is cost effective to take the road so far east and back-track to the west after crossing at a less-wide part of the river.

Less direct path south, no advantage seen to having the route farther east.

Indirect route too costly

## Segment AC Summary

Favorable 39

Unfavorable 51

No Response 117

no opinion

unsure

### Favorable

Future path for Westport Mall

meets Coolidge sitting resolution

Area is unused (virtually) now.

works with Florence alignment

similar w/AN east of existing power plant

Direct route

same as above

Does not contribute to NW/SE flow pattern

works with Florence alignment

See commenry on AB

Good alt route with minimal impact to established communities

Connects Florence.

This would be the lesser of some evils but not the perfect route. It would be better to be on Valley Farms Road running accross Coolidge and turning somewhere accross the City of Mesa owned land to get to Eloy. Do not let the developers selcect this route through their lobbyists. The investors have already taken their toll on Central AZ.

This area is mostly undeveloped and close enough to developed areas to be an asset.

### Unfavorable

Goes through Development Agreement

Not approved by City of Coolidge

why curve over \$\$\$

see AB

Puts freeway on West side of future mall site which is undesirable to mall developer of City

See A

This effects to many homes and property that house animals.

---

neighborhood already exists

---

If a build alternative is determined to be necessary, improvements should be made to existing highways (SR287 and SR87) rather than expanding smaller roads or building new ones. Ideally, alternate modes of transportation would be used to eliminate the need to build or expand any roads.

---

Stay away from residential areas. This route causes this project to go much too close to already developed homes. People do not want a 4 to 6 lane highway along residential corridors. Heavy traffic plus the heavy trucks will make way too much noise. By the time you get this thing built or within five years after its built, your suggested furthest east route will be very close to residential areas and possibly already surrounded. Just look at the growth that happened to the East valley between 1980 & 2000. Please think ahead!!! Save the taxpayers some money for a change. Plus consider the traffic noise that can and will be heard for miles away from this project. Most of us taxpayers in Pinal county have moved this far out to stay away from the congested and noisy traffic areas of Maricopa County. Build it in the least developed area PLEASE!!!!

---

Too indirect.

---

I am unfamiliar with this area, but if it's like the rest of the area, a highway could have a negative impact on the agricultural / cattle business.

---

use middle route crossing the river.

---

Only if utilizing segment Q which I prefer more centrally located segment D

---

I favor Segment H-- Segment L and beyond (L, P, U, V, Q, X, AB, AM, AO, etc.) require a lot of road to be built east and only re-direct traffic back towards the west. Option Q, the bridge, would be nearly as costly as option D since they both appear to cross at wide points. Option X could be evaluated to determine whether or not it is cost effective to take the road so far east and back-track to the west after crossing at a less-wide part of the river.

---

Less direct path south, no advantage seen to having the route farther east.

---

Too costly

---

## Segment AD Summary

Favorable 80

Unfavorable 24

No Response 103

no opinion

unsure

### Favorable

connect to 87

cost central access

Connect to AC

Good & open

meets Coolidge sitting resolution

Approved by City of Coolidge

Probably avoids potential hazards

Would work with Florence alignment

All farm but that is not going to be used for houses

logical connection w/AC-AN

Ok, straight down, roads there

Direct.

same

would work with Florence alignment

Avoids Picacho reservoir which has environmental impact and endangered species.

same as E

Supported by major area property owners and Coolidge City. Good transition between "AH" & "AN"

See comment on AB

The least developed area. This route would cause the least harm to current home owners. The noise level created by this route does the least damage. Construction on this route. This route would cause the least traffic congestion. This route would probably be one of the cheapest routes for construction cost. This route would cause the majority of people less traffic congestion, noise and overall loss in property values that have already taken a VERY DEEP PLUNGE.

Good alt route with minimal impact to established communities

Connects Florence.

This area is mostly undeveloped and close enough to developed areas to be an asset.

after AD either route south is acceptable

---

## Unfavorable

see AB

---

See A

---

This effects to many homes and property that house animals.

---

If a build alternative is determined to be necessary, improvements should be made to existing highways (SR287 and SR87) rather than expanding smaller roads or building new ones. Ideally, alternate modes of transportation would be used to eliminate the need to build or expand any roads.

---

Too indirect.

---

I am unfamiliar with this area, but if it's like the rest of the area, a highway could have a negative impact on the agricultural / cattle business.

---

Only as a second route if not using only if not using D, Y, Z, AA. D, Y, Z, AA is my first choice.

---

I favor Segment H-- Segment L and beyond (L, P, U, V, Q, X, AB, AM, AO, etc.) require a lot of road to be built east and only re-direct traffic back towards the west. Option Q, the bridge, would be nearly as costly as option D since they both appear to cross at wide points. Option X could be evaluated to determine whether or not it is cost effective to take the road so far east and back-track to the west after crossing at a less-wide part of the river.

---

Less direct path south, no advantage seen to having the route farther east.

---

Indirect route

---



unsure

## Favorable

connect to 87

Probably avoids potential hazards & pollution of Reservoir

Ok, if coming from Q, direct route down

Easement already in-close to railroad

take the strighter way

Connects Florence.

This area is mostly undeveloped and close enough to developed areas to be an asset.

## Unfavorable

To close to 87 and RR

Not approved by City of Coolidge

better alternatives (not much left of reservoir)

Unecessary duplication. Hwy 87 becomes redundant.

other alternatives are better

see AB

Too close to SR87/UPRR corridor (see additional comment #1)

See A

This effects to many homes and property that house animals.

If a build alternative is determined to be necessary, improvements should be made to existing highways (SR287 and SR87) rather than expanding smaller roads or building new ones. Ideally, alternate modes of transportation would be used to eliminate the need to build or expand any roads.

Stay away from residential areas. This route causes this project to go much too close to already developed homes. People do not want a 4 to 6 lane highway along residential corridors. Heavy traffic plus the heavy trucks will make way too much noise. By the time you get this thing built or within five years after its built, your suggested furthest east route will be very close to residential ares and possibly already surrounded. Just look at the growth that happened to the East valley between 1980 & 2000. Please think ahead!!! Save the taxpayers some money for a change. Plus consider the traffic noise that can and will be heard for miles away from this project. Most of us taxpayers in Pinal county have moved this far out to stay away from the congested and noisy traffic areas of Maricopa County. Build it in the least developed area PLEASE!!!!

No advantage over Y/Z.

## Segment AE Summary

Favorable 30

Unfavorable 63

No Response 114

---

I am unfamiliar with this area, but if it's like the rest of the area, a highway could have a negative impact on the agricultural / cattle business.

---

AH is better route

---

Not necessary.

---

I favor Segment H-- Segment L and beyond (L, P, U, V, Q, X, AB, AM, AO, etc.) require a lot of road to be built east and only re-direct traffic back towards the west. Option Q, the bridge, would be nearly as costly as option D since they both appear to cross at wide points. Option X could be evaluated to determine whether or not it is cost effective to take the road so far east and back-track to the west after crossing at a less-wide part of the river.

---

Less direct path south, no advantage seen to having the route farther east.

---

Indirect route

---

unsure

## Favorable

Parallels existing road-people could have a choice.

Ok, Z is better

easements already in close to Railroad

This area is mostly undeveloped and close enough to developed areas to be an asset.

## Unfavorable

Too close to 87 and RR

Not approved by City of Coolidge

better alternatives

Move farther East

same as AE

see AE

see AB

See comment on Segment "AE" above

See A

This effects to many homes and property that house animals. And does not make sense not to use the 87.

If a build alternative is determined to be necessary, improvements should be made to existing highways (SR287 and SR87) rather than expanding smaller roads or building new ones. Ideally, alternate modes of transportation would be used to eliminate the need to build or expand any roads.

Stay away from residential areas. This route causes this project to go much too close to already developed homes. People do not want a 4 to 6 lane highway along residential corridors. Heavy traffic plus the heavy trucks will make way too much noise. By the time you get this thing built or within five years after its built, your suggested furthest east route will be very close to residential ares and possibly already surrounded. Just look at the growth that happened to the East valley between 1980 & 2000. Please think ahead!!! Save the taxpayers some money for a change. Plus consider the traffic noise that can and will be heard for miles away from this project. Most of us taxpayers in Pinal county have moved this far out to stay away from the congested and noisy traffic areas of Maricopa County. Build it in the least developed area PLEASE!!!!!!

No advantage over Y/Z.

I am unfamiliar with this area, but if it's like the rest of the area, a highway could have a negative impact on the agricultural / cattle business.

AH is better route

## Segment AF Summary

Favorable 21

Unfavorable 64

No Response 122

---

Use existing highway

---

Not necessary.

---

I favor Segment H-- Segment L and beyond (L, P, U, V, Q, X, AB, AM, AO, etc.) require a lot of road to be built east and only re-direct traffic back towards the west. Option Q, the bridge, would be nearly as costly as option D since they both appear to cross at wide points. Option X could be evaluated to determine whether or not it is cost effective to take the road so far east and back-track to the west after crossing at a less-wide part of the river.

---

Less direct path south, no advantage seen to having the route farther east.

---

Rail line more direct

---

unsure

## Favorable

Again already a high noise area.

Ok cuts over for Tucson

This area is mostly undeveloped and close enough to developed areas to be an asset.

## Unfavorable

Not approved by City of Coolidge

better alternatives

does not follow 87

see AF

see AB

See comment on Segment "AE" above

See A

This effects to many homes and property that house animals. And does not make sense not to use the 87.

If a build alternative is determined to be necessary, improvements should be made to existing highways (SR287 and SR87) rather than expanding smaller roads or building new ones. Ideally, alternate modes of transportation would be used to eliminate the need to build or expand any roads.

Stay away from residential areas. This route causes this project to go much too close to already developed homes. People do not want a 4 to 6 lane highway along residential corridors. Heavy traffic plus the heavy trucks will make way too much noise. By the time you get this thing built or within five years after its built, your suggested furthest east route will be very close to residential ares and possibly already surrounded. Just look at the growth that happened to the East valley between 1980 & 2000. Please think ahead!!! Save the taxpayers some money for a change. Plus consider the traffic noise that can and will be heard for miles away from this project. Most of us taxpayers in Pinal county have moved this far out to stay away from the congested and noisy traffic areas of Maricopa County. Build it in the least developed area PLEASE!!!!

Indirect compared to AA.

I am unfamiliar with this area, but if it's like the rest of the area, a highway could have a negative impact on the agricultural / cattle business.

AI or AK is better route

Use existing highway

Not necessary.

## Segment AG Summary

Favorable 18

Unfavorable 67

No Response 122

I prefer connecting into the major, existing north-south corridor here because I believe that was the intended purpose of SR87. Using the existing roadway here would reduce project costs and keep the number of interchanges on I-10 the same, reducing the number of access points to I-10.

---

Less direct path south, no advantage seen to having the route farther east.

---

Rail line more direct

---

unsure

## Favorable

no opinion

cost central access to cities town

Connects AD & AK

meets Coolidge sitting resolution

Approved by City of Coolidge

Again strait Run.

Better than options to west

new rod.

No housing developments that will be affected

Furthest from existing SR87

Direct

better than other option to west

staighter

same as E

The least developed area. This route would cause the least harm to current home owners. The noise level created by this route does the least damage. Construction on this route. This route would cause the least traffic congestion. This route would probably be one of the cheapest routes for construction cost. This route would cause the majority of people less traffic congestion, noise and overall loss in property values that have already taken a VERY DEEP PLUNGE.

Good alt route with minimal impact to established communities

This area is mostly undeveloped and close enough to developed areas to be an asset.

## Unfavorable

Too close to reservoir

see AB

See A

This effects to many homes and proprty that house animals. And does not make sense not to use the 87.

## Segment AH Summary

Favorable 64

Unfavorable 35

No Response 109

If a build alternative is determined to be necessary, improvements should be made to existing highways (SR287 and SR87) rather than expanding smaller roads or building new ones. Ideally, alternate modes of transportation would be used to eliminate the need to build or expand any roads.

---

No advantage over Y/Z.

---

I am unfamiliar with this area, but if it's like the rest of the area, a highway could have a negative impact on the agricultural / cattle business.

---

Use existing highway

---

Only as a 2nd choice if for some reason you cannot do D, Y, Z, AA.

---

I favor Segment H-- Segment L and beyond (L, P, U, V, Q, X, AB, AM, AO, etc.) require a lot of road to be built east and only re-direct traffic back towards the west. Option Q, the bridge, would be nearly as costly as option D since they both appear to cross at wide points. Option X could be evaluated to determine whether or not it is cost effective to take the road so far east and back-track to the west after crossing at a less-wide part of the river.

---

Less direct path south, no advantage seen to having the route farther east.

---

Rail line more direct

---

## Unfavorable

Keeps separation from SR87/UPRR corridor and is supported by property owners & City of Eloy

---



unsure

## Favorable

Again strait Run.

option to AK

option to AK

same as E

Good alt route with minimal impact to established communities

This area is mostly undeveloped and close enough to developed areas to be an asset.

## Unfavorable

Not approved by City of Coolidge

Disruption to local traffic & existing farm operations & Vail Rd.

Reservoir

see AB

Inadequate separation from SR87/UPRR corridor due to location in Eloy's planned employment corridor

See A

This effects to many homes and property that house animals. And does not make sense not to use the 87.

If a build alternative is determined to be necessary, improvements should be made to existing highways (SR287 and SR87) rather than expanding smaller roads or building new ones. Ideally, alternate modes of transportation would be used to eliminate the need to build or expand any roads.

Stay away from residential areas. This route causes this project to go much too close to already developed homes. People do not want a 4 to 6 lane highway along residential corridors. Heavy traffic plus the heavy trucks will make way too much noise. By the time you get this thing built or within five years after its built, your suggested furthest east route will be very close to residential areas and possibly already surrounded. Just look at the growth that happened to the East valley between 1980 & 2000. Please think ahead!!! Save the taxpayers some money for a change. Plus consider the traffic noise that can and will be heard for miles away from this project. Most of us taxpayers in Pinal county have moved this far out to stay away from the congested and noisy traffic areas of Maricopa County. Build it in the least developed area PLEASE!!!!!!

No advantage over Y/Z/AA.

I am unfamiliar with this area, but if it's like the rest of the area, a highway could have a negative impact on the agricultural / cattle business.

Use existing highway

## Segment AI Summary

Favorable 32

Unfavorable 56

No Response 119

if local traffic is a challenge then utilize segments Q, AC, AD, AH, AI, AJ, AL for 2nd centrally located, straightest shot (only if not using D, Y, Z, AA)

---

I favor Segment H-- Segment L and beyond (L, P, U, V, Q, X, AB, AM, AO, etc.) require a lot of road to be built east and only re-direct traffic back towards the west. Option Q, the bridge, would be nearly as costly as option D since they both appear to cross at wide points. Option X could be evaluated to determine whether or not it is cost effective to take the road so far east and back-track to the west after crossing at a less-wide part of the river.

---

Less direct path south, no advantage seen to having the route farther east.

---

Rail line more direct

---

unsure

## Favorable

Moves, noise away from developed areas-might bring more devel.

option to AK

new rod.

Ok for going to Tucson, not as good as AA

option to AK

why curves xxx?

same as E

Good alt route with minimal impact to established communities

This area is mostly undeveloped and close enough to developed areas to be an asset.

## Unfavorable

Not approved by City of Coolidge

Close to residential on Wheeler Rd. & too close to future Prison

see AB

See comment on Segment "AI" above

See A

This effects to many homes and property that house animals. And does not make sense not to use the 87.

If a build alternative is determined to be necessary, improvements should be made to existing highways (SR287 and SR87) rather than expanding smaller roads or building new ones. Ideally, alternate modes of transportation would be used to eliminate the need to build or expand any roads.

Stay away from residential areas. This route causes this project to go much too close to already developed homes. People do not want a 4 to 6 lane highway along residential corridors. Heavy traffic plus the heavy trucks will make way too much noise. By the time you get this thing built or within five years after its built, your suggested furthest east route will be very close to residential ares and possibly already surrounded. Just look at the growth that happened to the East valley between 1980 & 2000. Please think ahead!!! Save the taxpayers some money for a change. Plus consider the traffic noise that can and will be heard for miles away from this project. Most of us taxpayers in Pinal county have moved this far out to stay away from the congested and noisy traffic areas of Maricopa County. Build it in the least developed area PLEASE!!!!!!

No advantage over AA.

I am unfamiliar with this area, but if it's like the rest of the area, a highway could have a negative impact on the agricultural / cattle business.

## Segment AJ Summary

Favorable 32

Unfavorable 54

No Response 121

---

Use existing highway

---

if local traffic is a challenge then utilize segments Q, AC, AD, AH, AI, AJ, AL for 2nd centrally located, straightest shot (only if not using D, Y, Z, AA)

---

I prefer connecting into the major, existing north-south corridor here because I believe that was the intended purpose of SR87. Using the existing roadway here would reduce project costs and keep the number of interchanges on I-10 the same, reducing the number of access points to I-10.

---

Less direct path south, no advantage seen to having the route farther east.

---

Rail line more direct

---

unsure

---

## Favorable

cost central access to cities towns

---

Fast track is uncluttered

---

Preffered by Eloy.

---

Approved by City of Coolidge

---

Again fairly strait. Leaves more desert for view East & West

---

works with AL

---

Close to developments that it can be used to travel.

---

Least disruptive & straighter path to pt 5 junction

---

Direct

---

does not follow 87

---

work with AL

---

Compatible with Eloy's planned employment corridor, supported by City and property owners (see segment Modification on Map & Additional Comment #3)

---

The least developed area. This route would cause the least harm to current home owners. The noise level created by this route does the least damage. Construction on this route. This route would cause the least traffic congestion. This route would probably be one of the cheapest routes for construction cost. This route would cause the majority of people less traffic congestion, noise and overall loss in property values that have already taken a VERY DEEP PLUNGE.

---

Good alt route with minimal impact to established communities

---

This area is mostly undeveloped and close enough to developed areas to be an asset.

---

## Unfavorable

off AH, out of the way

---

Closer to Fissures

---

see AB

---

See A

---

This effects to many homes and property that house animals. And does not make sense not to use the 87.

---

## Segment AK Summary

Favorable 53

Unfavorable 38

No Response 116

If a build alternative is determined to be necessary, improvements should be made to existing highways (SR287 and SR87) rather than expanding smaller roads or building new ones. Ideally, alternate modes of transportation would be used to eliminate the need to build or expand any roads.

---

No advantage over Y/Z/AA.

---

I am unfamiliar with this area, but if it's like the rest of the area, a highway could have a negative impact on the agricultural / cattle business.

---

Use existing highway

---

Not necessary

---

I favor Segment H-- Segment L and beyond (L, P, U, V, Q, X, AB, AM, AO, etc.) require a lot of road to be built east and only re-direct traffic back towards the west. Option Q, the bridge, would be nearly as costly as option D since they both appear to cross at wide points. Option X could be evaluated to determine whether or not it is cost effective to take the road so far east and back-track to the west after crossing at a less-wide part of the river.

---

Less direct path south, no advantage seen to having the route farther east.

---

Rail line more direct

---

using existing routes has minimal impact on wildlife. I no longer hear the coyotes at night. I miss them.

unsure

## Favorable

fewer home affected

stay away from AA

cost central access to cities towns

If right of way exists-use it

same as above

Approved by City of Coolidge

Again in strait Run.

good term invs

No developments nearby that could be affected

Furthest away from SR87 & local traffic

Direct route down useful.

Direct

Provides for new interchange development. Away from SR87 at I-10.

uses #5 start/ent point

least congested

good terminus

closer to pima county/proposed railroad yard/new development

No fissures

same as E

Keeps adequate spacing with SR87/UPRR corridor & is supported by property owners and City of Eloy

The least developed area. This route would cause the least harm to current home owners. The noise level created by this route does the least damage. Construction on this route. This route would cause the least traffic congestion. This route would probably be one of the cheapest routes for construction cost. This route would cause the majority of people less traffic congestion, noise and overall loss in property values that have already taken a VERY DEEP PLUNGE.

Good alt route with minimal impact to established communities

This area is mostly undeveloped and close enough to developed areas to be an asset.

---

## Unfavorable

cost of re-doing I-10 just completed

---

see AB

---

See A

---

This effects to many homes and property that house animals. And does not make sense not to use the 87.

---

If a build alternative is determined to be necessary, improvements should be made to existing highways (SR287 and SR87) rather than expanding smaller roads or building new ones. Ideally, alternate modes of transportation would be used to eliminate the need to build or expand any roads.

---

No advantage over Y/Z/AA.

---

I am unfamiliar with this area, but if it's like the rest of the area, a highway could have a negative impact on the agricultural / cattle business.

---

Use existing highway

---

Not necessary. If local traffic is a challenge on current 87, then utilize segments Q, AC, AD, AH, AI, AJ, AL for 2nd centrally located, straightest shot (only if not using D, Y, Z, AA)

---

I prefer connecting into the major, existing north-south corridor here because I believe that was the intended purpose of SR87. Using the existing roadway here would reduce project costs and keep the number of interchanges on I-10 the same, reducing the number of access points to I-10.

---

Less direct path south, no advantage seen to having the route farther east.

---

Rail line more direct

---



no opinion

unsure

## Favorable

closer access to florence

cost central access to cities towns

Already R.O.W for SRP-Why not no one else can use This area.

could work with X

Best location for straight line-should be cheapest of 3 alt. legs could disrupt local traffic on Valley Farms

Direct route down, less mileage

Most direct does this conflict w/ "cultural areas?" If so, move to AD

Direct

could work with X

This area is already compromised with power lines. Why compromise 2 area? Put everything here is all residents know what is there. This was original.

Keep East of Valley Farms Rd. - Align w/ power lines

same as E

The least developed area. This route would cause the least harm to current home owners. The noise level created by this route does the least damage. Construction on this route. This route would cause the least traffic congestion. This route would probably be one of the cheapest routes for construction cost. This route would cause the majority of people less traffic congestion, noise and overall loss in property values that have already taken a VERY DEEP PLUNGE.

Good alt route with minimal impact to established communities

Connects Florence

This route has the least impact and is already damaged financially due to the power line. There is already an established right of way the public is use to and this route would disrupt the least amount of established people.

This area is mostly undeveloped and close enough to developed areas to be an asset.

## Unfavorable

Not approved by City of Coolidge

Could be an option

see AB

**Segment AM Summary****Favorable** 46**Unfavorable** 45**No Response** 116

Cuts diagonally through major land holdings west of Valley Farms Rd and is not supported by City of Coolidge

---

See A

---

This effects to many homes and property that house animals.

---

If a build alternative is determined to be necessary, improvements should be made to existing highways (SR287 and SR87) rather than expanding smaller roads or building new ones. Ideally, alternate modes of transportation would be used to eliminate the need to build or expand any roads.

---

Not shown on map.

---

I am unfamiliar with this area, but if it's like the rest of the area, a highway could have a negative impact on the agricultural / cattle business.

---

I don't see this marked on map, but if it's where I think it is, it's not necessary if using segment Y

---

I favor Segment H-- Segment L and beyond (L, P, U, V, Q, X, AB, AM, AO, etc.) require a lot of road to be built east and only re-direct traffic back towards the west. Option Q, the bridge, would be nearly as costly as option D since they both appear to cross at wide points. Option X could be evaluated to determine whether or not it is cost effective to take the road so far east and back-track to the west after crossing at a less-wide part of the river.

---

4 generations lives here

---

Rail line more direct

---

no opinion

unsure

## Favorable

straighter shot to I-10

cost central access to cities towns

preserves development agreements

Approved by City of Coolidge

Avoids complications of P.C. planned area

works with Florence alignment and AL

Close to the Coolidge Airport supposed to be new airport so it would be logical to put it next to it.

Similar W/AC Furthest from Power Plant in Randolph

Direct

works with Florence alignment of AL

Less disruptive to future mall, airport, and existing citizens.

same as E

Keeps freeway on east side of future mall site per developer and City of Coolidge Resolution. (Also see additional Comment #4)

The least developed area. This route would cause the least harm to current home owners. The noise level created by this route does the least damage. Construction on this route. This route would cause the least traffic congestion. This route would probably be one of the cheapest routes for construction cost. This route would cause the majority of people less traffic congestion, noise and overall loss in property values that have already taken a VERY DEEP PLUNGE.

I am not familiar with Wheeler Road, but Attaway road needs to be developed. This area is developing on its' own anyways, so it would be better if the state bought up land now before there is too much commercial / housing development in the Attaway Rd area.

Good alt route with minimal impact to established communities

Connects Florence

This area is mostly undeveloped and close enough to developed areas to be an asset.

## Unfavorable

Could be an option

## Segment AN Summary

Favorable 62

Unfavorable 37

No Response 108

---

Ok. Already developed, but not a ton of houses

---

Too close to homeowners

---

see AB

---

See A

---

This effects to many homes and property that house animals.

---

If a build alternative is determined to be necessary, improvements should be made to existing highways (SR287 and SR87) rather than expanding smaller roads or building new ones. Ideally, alternate modes of transportation would be used to eliminate the need to build or expand any roads.

---

No advantage over Y.

---

Not necessary if using Y, Z, AA

---

I favor Segment H-- Segment L and beyond (L, P, U, V, Q, X, AB, AM, AO, etc.) require a lot of road to be built east and only re-direct traffic back towards the west. Option Q, the bridge, would be nearly as costly as option D since they both appear to cross at wide points. Option X could be evaluated to determine whether or not it is cost effective to take the road so far east and back-track to the west after crossing at a less-wide part of the river.

---

Rail line more direct

---

no opinion

I am not familiar with Martin Rd, but State Route 287 has many areas that are developing now. A new highway will be cheaper to build now in anticipation for a bigger population growth in this area later on.

unsure

## Favorable

Avoids potential problems w/cultural areas, Lawsuits, work stoppage, etc.

Best location to minimize impact on locals preferable to AM-AB

It avoids existing traffic & business

Possible if it will not disturb "cultural lands"

The least developed area. This route would cause the least harm to current home owners. The noise level created by this route does the least damage. Construction on this route. This route would cause the least traffic congestion. This route would probably be one of the cheapest routes for construction cost. This route would cause the majority of people less traffic congestion, noise and overall loss in property values that have already taken a VERY DEEP PLUNGE.

Good alt route with minimal impact to established communities

Connects Florence

This area is mostly undeveloped and close enough to developed areas to be an asset.

either AO/AM/AB

## Unfavorable

Not approved by City of Coolidge

Could be an option

might work if still connects to X and avoid landfill

Out of the way. Not intuitive

To far west, leads the wrong way

see AB

See comment on Segment "AM"

See A

This effects to many homes and property that house animals.

## Segment AO Summary

Favorable 30

Unfavorable 54

No Response 123

If a build alternative is determined to be necessary, improvements should be made to existing highways (SR287 and SR87) rather than expanding smaller roads or building new ones. Ideally, alternate modes of transportation would be used to eliminate the need to build or expand any roads.

---

Not shown on map.

---

Sorry I do not see this on map provided

---

I favor Segment H-- Segment L and beyond (L, P, U, V, Q, X, AB, AM, AO, etc.) require a lot of road to be built east and only re-direct traffic back towards the west. Option Q, the bridge, would be nearly as costly as option D since they both appear to cross at wide points. Option X could be evaluated to determine whether or not it is cost effective to take the road so far east and back-track to the west after crossing at a less-wide part of the river.

---

Less direct path south, no advantage seen to having the route farther east.

---

Rail line more direct

---

## ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

### Comments

we need turn lanes on 87 to access our subdivision between Houser Rd & Shedd Rd

---

Why not use the existing roadway from Apache Junction to Oracle Junction-widen to 4 lane roadway! Ok?

---

Preferred Route was chosen for northern route alternatives to provide the Town of Florence a economic development advantage from the corridor.

---

Major importance is Route 24 to get out west from Ironwood & 60 is highly needed for more job opportunities & colleges. If I could get to PHX that would be much appreciated.

---

Bus route from US-60 and Ironwood would be great. Even better if it can travel East to west. There is jobs and routes that we are not able to get through. It's really hard to find a job without public transportation.

---

Easiest Route for trucking and commerce

---

This appears to be a proposed part of the "projected" NAFTA super highway that is being forced upon the American Public.

---

I request a copy of the map on aerial (on the various tables) be sent to me @ town of Queen Creek ATTN: Tom Narva 22350 S. Ellsworth Rd QC,AZ 85142  
When public workshops complete.

---

From F&G to H&L to south I show favorable w/o comment; from that point north is of more concern to me & the town of Q.C.

---

In my opinion the most economical route would be: I, J, K, G, H, D, H, Z, AG, AS, AL

---

My personal choice for route is:  
A, E, G, H, D, Y, Z, AG, AJ, AL

---

Town of Queen Creek would like:  
A, B, F, H, D, Y, Z, AG, AJ, AL

---

I will bring comment forms to others @ the town.

---

I currently use AJ-Ironwood-Gantzel-Hunt-Attaway-287-87-10 frequently

---

as a former state prison employee. the need for a smoother, faster route to the Florence prison complexes would be helpful. Also to use as much existing road bed to help control cost.

---

Not that concerned with south alignment

---

I would be in favor of using Hunt Highway if the Roadway could be moved West as I have drawn on the map and marked CI

---

A&B Ironwood is a good road that provides an alternative route for locals. I'm very impressed with the valleys surface routes such as Baseline, Southern, Ellsworth, Power, Etal. Please consider a new route

---

## ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

### Comments

I personally would like to see the road made as much strait line as practicable. I think the fewer the curves-the more even the flow of traffic & I also think the straighter roads will save lives during Haboobs & Low intensity dust storms.

---

The best route would avoid Hunt Highway and Highway 79. We need these existing highways in addition to a new ADOT freeway.

Also, need to intersect AZ Farms Road in an area that will attract future retail and commercial development.

---

1. Add segment for E to connect to SR24 or 202.
  2. Please consider multi-modal options.
  3. Please recognize adopted preferences of local communities, such as Florence.
  4. Need to figure out how the N-S will tie into the 24.
  5. Analyze if NS and 24 built, is the US60 re-route still necessary?
  6. Avoid impacting Magna Dam and Florence Military Reservation.
- 

How many access roads to service roads?

Would like a copy of table map if possible.

---

put Hwy on an angel so it intersects I-10 at Oro Valley, Picture Rocks, Tucson. Rds. already exist according to this map. It would not save time. the current plan will disrupt existing developments. Putting the Hwy on an angel would cut a cross open unused land with less devaluation of property.

Partnership with private entity-"Private entity" must post bond in case they claim "bankruptcy" after they get the funds & stick taxpayers with the cost.

---

You can run it down the 87 then get on 287 and from there take route Q:

---

In general use most direct routes  
-avoid areas of development or cultural items.  
-make use of open lands.

---

Use of exist Hwys or roads would only work if exist. Communities did not have to be bought out for road R/W as the cost would be excessive.

---

support what the citys support, support commurseal development

---

tried to stay away from existing roads and citizenery  
straightest route

---

-Road abouts preferred to signals.

---

Southern Route is left blank because I should not choose who is affected below the 287.

---

We're waiting for the rail!!  
We'll use it every day! We'll pay for it!  
Please use existing roads! They are in the best locations for a path into town!

Don't pull a North 202 and swing it way out of the way! We never use it, it takes too long even though it's empty

---

Not enough homes/people live in the far east valley to require a freeway that connects to US 60 East of Ironwood. The most useful route would be via the existing Ironwood/Gantzel Route which is very heavily used already. A



## ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

### Comments

freeway east of Ironwood would not relieve this traffic from Ironwood.

This area suffers from a severe lack of public transportation that, if existed, may negate the need for a freeway.

---

The corridor from N-A to S-AA seems to be the most direct route from I-60 to the I10

Looking at the area that has the greater population (now or potential) this seems to be consistent in design principle.

Also to lessen the traffic on city streets

---

Using the existing roads and what is the most beneficial to the existing development should be most important points. Of all the routes only one fits the needs of the most people and uses the most existing roads.

Also from "C" on Hunt Hwy. Hunt Hwy should be 4 lanes to Maricopa County where it meets Ellsworth Road.

---

My recommendation

N-S Route

2 Most Direct route N-S

1 Alleviates Traffic/Congestion

J on existing roads

O

Q

AM

AN

AD

AH

AI

AJ

AL

S

Thank you for including the public in your considerations

Not just towns & taxing bodies

---

This route may keep disruption of residential areas to a minimum during construction. Once completed it will provide a great road w/exit-entrances to the west.

Keep high residential areas just that...

Residential!

This should keep high traffic noise & speed away from residential areas.

---

an alternative from "C" may be to jog over to "F" and run parallel to R.R.

This effort is essential to alleviate current congestion. Hunt Highway is a daily nightmare.

---

Please! don't put in B

Thank you!!!

---

We need an additional N/S route-besides Gantzel Rd.

Future development will be to the east of Gantzel. Build the freeway with future development in mind.

Gantzel area is already developed. Freeway would be after the fact.

## ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

### Comments

The desert is disappearing and will continue to do so in the future! Such is the nature of development

---

Not familiar or concerned with Southern section.  
But, think it should be an alternative to existing Route 87.

---

Northern Route  
Stay East of CAP canal to minimize impact on existing residential areas

Stay off existing major roads-Ironwood, Hunt Hwy-needed for local traffic. Removing then would not improve traffic

Southern Route  
Stay East and off existing major roads.

Minimize impact on existing residential areas & preserve existing roads for use

---

Note on Northern Route Alternatives Map:  
Ironwood is already a mess w/no shoulders to get off of. May as well use it for the freeway & do it right. Still to many rollovers on Ironwood-due to no shoulders!

---

Indicated routes would appear to be very central to Pinal while funneling traffic towards Phoenix which is the established pattern.

Road needs to service both east and west slots.

Indicated route allows for less disruption of existing development.

Existing surface routes are maintained and can be enhanced.

Thank you for the opportunity to offer input!!

---

Serves a lot of existing development direct logical

---

Route #2-#5  
I,J,O,Q,AO AC AD AH AK AL  
Less impact on population

---

using existing right of ways saves money and can speed construction of job. Connect to I10 at point H  
Some people want the road to go through thier areas-Not thinking of traffic and the cost as long at it makes their cities.

Best route point 2 to point 4 using Christenson-Clemence Rd. straight shot.

---

input from builder of the road as to best route  
Any of the segments could work so I do not find any to be unfavorable

---

These choices are very confusing

Why have so many?

You can't please all the people

Run road where there is less cost.

Run road where less people are up set about the road in their back yard.

---

## ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

### Comments

2. Important to locate corridor close to ex. development & where development forecasted over next 10,20,30, 40 years. Locating too far east in Superstition vistas does not seem to address current transportation route needs.
3. Try to avoid existing using surface arterials as we'll need those to work with the new corridor.
4. Follow preferences of local jurisdictions.
5. Try to avoid taking existing homes and commercial developments, e.g. along Hunt or Ironwood.

---

The other map doesn't really affect me to get to Coolidge

---

Above I have marked the desired route by "x" over the markers.

It appears to me that the least upheaval would be to build E to G but Ironwood A,B,F is currently in place.

At points F & G there is a merging to the point L to Point Q then Point AB then Point AC then AD to AC at which time there is a merge with the 87 at Z then AA

Special consideration The Felix family was living in the area prior to the Mexican War of 1845 after he surrender the family lost all their properties, which were thousands acres. The U.S. government gave them the choice of moving to present Mexico or purchasing a square mile of property and becoming citizens.

They are still here.

I think the Felix name should be considered in the naming of the road. GL.

---

Try to keep it next to Power lines & canals & train tracks. These are usually unfavorable areas for homes & families. Keep to the east for future use by people buying future homes & having business' out there.

---

come near all communities but not through them

---

A route east of Picacho mountains to 79 could be a shorter less costly route to 60. Route marked with A will serve the current population best.

---

I would still use Rt 87 to Rt 10

---

I live in the San Tan Valley area. Nearly all of my travel is to the North West, to the area enclosed by the 202 loop.

This new route should tie into the 202 loop, not proceed north to 60 at Apache Junction

This would avoid duplicating two major North/South highways from 60 to Warner Rd within 5 miles of each other.

---

The route as marked appears to be the most economical as well.

---

Keep freeway from existing communities

---

Please recognize the long term sustainability & economic development opportunities for town like Florence & Coolidge.

---

Route #2 I circled is what I like.

I really don't have any strong feelings about the southern route alternatives

---

I think it would be better to have a new road, that nothing has to be moved.

---

I feel it is better to use existing right of ways whenever possible. Land has already been purchased, environmental issues dealt with, and it is serving an existing population. These factors may result in expedited construction.

My concern with using existing right of ways is the upheaval to traffic already using this crowded roadway during

## ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

### Comments

construction.

I very much favor including consideration & planning for alternative transportation at the same time.

---

Why can't you existing route? The proceeding questions are irrelevant to me. I am a member of the working poor. The only thing I own besides a vehicle is my mobile home. I realize that those empowered to make this decision will not regard my wishes. I have a greedy landlord who raises our space rent to the maximum % at each legal opportunity.

My rent was \$140=monthly in 2003. Now 8 years later it is \$312+.

I just wish someone would make me, an offer, which would allow me to move where I can live the rest of my life with dignity.

I am 78 years of age-and still work my 40 hrs. per week.

NOW THIS!

Welcome to my American Dream.

B. Thoma  
654 E Ranch Sp 171  
San Tan Valley  
85140

---

On Northern Route Alternatives map:  
Road drawn from Peralta Rd to I; Could be county road link to N-S freeway

Widening existing roads like Ironwood, Gantsville & Hunt Hwy should not be done. For all the years of disruption you get minimal additional capacity. They are cost in-effective. Where do all the people go to get around the construction? They over tax other roads.

RE: US60 bypass around Gold Canyon. If SR24 was completed first, I believe the traffic on 60 would be diminished enough to eliminate that by-pass.

---

am cont: route that city of coolidge supported. councilmember curry wanted new route to the west but he resigned from city council so his opinion is out. This route makes the most sense. There is already an easement as well as an "established don't's" I support this contz.

---

XXX-  
the 24 xxx-indicated- & the N-South become the proposed by pass-

---

Existing facilities such as Ironwood Dr. & Hunt Highway will be needed in addition to the new freeway. Any segments that replace these roadways should be elimintaed.

---

I would propose that we take advantage of there not being an off ramp on the meridian Rd. and use it to create a new road.

I do not think that following an existing road would be beneficial to traffic issue than one already preventent.

---

By using existing road impact on communities will be less.

---

## ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

### Comments

near term residence should receive priority over long term development. In addition, access to Coolidge Airport and Banner Ironwood Hospital should be considered.

---

Overall would prefer to end up a bit East on 60 but not to far E.

Concerned about housing development (Wheeler Tract) on Wheeler Rd.

---

XX

Disturbs few currently developed/settled areas

Straight line much cheaper to build

Leaves 87 a viable alternate route

Opens new lands to future development

Lower acquisition costs

Much State & Busi Land on this route

---

Dont let the liberals or their non sense stop or pro-long the construction. Get this starte ASAP if the state or liberals trys to get in the way put it out in public and we will put pressure on those who are trying to stop it. Many people dont know about this FWY. You neen to put it out more so you can get more support.

The reason why I chose the rout I chose is because I believe the county could realy use some growth to the east of the rout I chose. It is good for the county because it would bring more business, people, and money to the county.

---

If both SR 24 and Section I joined E at an interchange it would give anybody going North A choise of Hwy 202 or by the superstition mountains.

---

I have traveled this corridor in which all of these proposals exist many, many times.

I like the idea of using existing rds/highways as much as possible. Specifically with the southern half of the corridor.

I feel that short term plans should be focused on the Northern half of the corridor, with emphasis on alleviating the congestion at the US 60 & Ironwood area.

Thank You.

---

My preferred option is the "No Build" option - My rationale is that once the road is built the entire valley from Hwy 60 South will be filled with houses and strip malls. The evidence is clear that this will happen, all one has to do is look at the E-470 road around the East side of Denver, Co. When E-470 was built there was nothing near it but farms and ranches, now it is completely surrounded by homes and strip malls as far as the eye can see. That is our future if this project is allowed to proceed. If the EPA is really concerned with the health of people in this area it would stop this project before Pinal County becomes another Maricopa County with the violations of EPA air quality standards. The study that projects the massive growth and the need for this project has been rendered obsolete by the economic conditions that have occurred since this study was started.

Fro the most part I-10 is only four lanes and should be widened to eight lanes from Phoenix to Tucson before any more money is spent on this project.

## ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

### Comments

EPA environmental impact studies are a waste of time and money given that this project will result in what I have stated in the first paragraph. The result will be air and noise pollution and loss of natural habitat for the many desert plants and animals. Impacts to humans should be the focus of the EPA studies which I'm sure will still be done, but the EPA will not worry about impacts to us humans until we are on the "endangered" list which is where we are headed if we continue the urban sprawl.

The ADOT Alternate Routes maps are flawed in that they do not accurately show the residential areas that are adjacent to the possible routes. If housing areas still have vacant lots and/or construction underway AND existing occupied homes, then that area must be shown as residential for purposes of this study. ADOT needs to physically drive the proposed routes to see where there are completed residences and then update the study maps. With this correct information it will be seen that the routes that do not impact existing residences in the North corridor are segments I,M,R,S,W,X. To me these are the only acceptable route segments with the Hwy 79 existing corridor being the best route but one that is not presently an option.

I live in Wildhorse Estates which is on the West side of Felix Rd and just North of the CBRR tracks. Our area is completely built out and has been since 2006 but is shown as yellow (Planned Development). The development to our North (Crestfield Manor) has many occupied residences but is also shown as yellow. Farther North at Empire Rd and Gantzel Rd (West side), Bella Vista Rd, and West side of Gantzel Rd it is all residential and is also shown as yellow. These are just a few of the errors on the study maps. These errors need to be corrected and the routes re-evaluated based on accurate maps. At the meetings we were told that the routes were chosen to minimize impacts to residential areas, but that is not truly the case.

The timing of these meetings was very poor since they and the comment period are all over shadowed by the Holidays. I question the meeting notification process since I received a mail to my residence address to "Resident". I am curious as to why the mailings were not sent out using the Pinal County tax assessor mailing address of record. The owner, who is going to be impacted by this project in many cases is not the physical resident at the impacted address or may get their mail at a different address (PO Box, etc). I have discussed this project with some of my neighbors and they are not aware of the project and never received the mailing for the meeting notice for December.

I'm looking forward to seeing the results of the comments that have resulted from the December 2011 meetings.

---

This letter, and the attached comment form from the December 2011 open house meetings, are sent on behalf of the corridor study area property owners and stakeholders listed below. This group owns and/or manages approximately 13,700 total acres within the corridor study area. The attached comment form represents the collective alignment preferences of this group for the southern area route alternatives.

- Property Reserve, Inc. - 3,860 acres
- Walton Development & Management (USA), Inc. - 1,546 acres
- Langley Properties - 2,250 acres
- WDP Partners - 320 acres
- Cardon-Hiatt Companies - 5,724 acres

While our stakeholder group has met extensively with ADOT and the corridor study team, we felt it was important to formally convey our group's alignment preferences through the comment forms provided at the December open house meetings. You will note that the alignment preferences indicated are consistent with those supported by the City of Eloy, the City of Coolidge and the Town of Florence. Please feel free to contact me directly at (480)240-5648 if you have any questions.

1) Any freeway alignment in the SR87/UPRR corridor will create serious access issues to adjacent property via the east-west arterial streets, and will effectively kill Eloy's planned employment/industrial corridor and hurt job creation in the area (applies to segments Y, Z, AA, AE, AF, AG, AI and AJ).

## ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

### Comments

2) For segment "AB", the curve north toward 287 should begin north of Vah Ki Inn Road.

3) See modification to "AK" on map to avoid planned residential development.

4) For segment "AN", start the curve to the west 1/2 mile between Kleck & Randolph in order to avoid planned residential development.

---

You NEED to stay away from all existing homes & neighborhoods your maps are incorrect. I have found that almost all your areas marked in yellow have homes or existing neighborhoods. I feel this is how you will justify your route. There is a lot of unused land out there find a route away from homes & neighborhoods!

Redo your maps and redo your study!

---

It doesn't make sense to use areas that will effect the residents that moved out here to get away from the city life. I understand that there is a need for people to travel through but a lot of these routes that you have presented will effect many of us. I do not understand why you would not take the 60 to the 79 and cross through the East side of Florence and Coolidge and go down through Eloy. There is a lot of farm land needed to produce crops, residential homes, and large properties that this will effect when just east of the 79 running all the way down east of Coolidge there is open land not being used for any crop, very little residents and very little property being used for animals. I live off of Felix between Arizona Farms and Hunt Hwy. On your maps you do not have my acre lot subdivision or the 2 residential home subdivisions next to me listed. This is not open land we have families with small children, horses, and other animals that we enjoy and the loud 6 to 8 lane hwy will effect us. Please feel free to contact me if you have any questions about our subdivision and where we are located. 480-244-1841. Thank you, Wild Horse Estate Resident.

---

Please always include affected neighborhoods in planning before decisions are made

---

I support a build alternative that includes only mass transit options and does not construct any new or expand any existing roads. We need to be looking toward the future and long-term planning. Roads only provide short-term solutions and are soon very congested. Alternatively, mass transit can provide long-term solutions, carry more people than roads, and are more beneficial to both people and the environment. Roads, on the other hand, are extremely detrimental to the environment and to public health. The North-South Corridor is an environmentally-sensitive area that is very important to people and wildlife alike, as well as for its own intrinsic values. We should minimize disruption of this area as much as possible.

---

You should really look at using Highway 79 as the proposed corridor for the eastern side. Its already there, has no homes directly along until you hit city of Florence. Its already set up as a highway. Please rethink putting a new major corridor down Felix Road where there are real people with children who live directly off of this road. Also, need to reclassify this area as "Existing Residential" because it is and your maps are wrong. Seems the majority of the new corridors don't have nearly the close proximity to residential areas as the one you are proposing putting directly down Felix Road. Again homes are within yards of that road, not miles. You need to eliminate this corridor proposal from your study. Thank you.

---

Our big concern is we don't want to start adding traffic to areas with homes where there is no traffic to begin with, like our neighborhoods on Felix Road. We suggest putting the traffic in areas where there is already a flow and pattern of traffic or out far where there is no home development at all.

---

The furthest East you can keep this project would be the cheapest in construction. The best route for the majority of people in Pinal County, because it would; cause the least damage to property values, cause the least traffic noise to homeowners that moved to Pinal County to get away from traffic noise and congestion. The farthest east route within twenty years would show wise future planning and probably save money for the taxpayers now and in the future. Also, if your going to build it, build it large enough for the future. It's not going to be nearly as expensive now as a



## ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

### Comments

widening project 10 to 15 years from now like you've had to do with US 60.

---

I WOULD LIKE WILDHORSE ESTATES LOCATED NEAR FELIX & ARIZONA FARMS RD. TO SHOW AS RESIDENTIAL AREA. I DO NOT WANT ANY ROUTE THAT HAS SEGMENTS L, P, Q, NEAR MY PROPERTY. SEGMENTS I, M, S, W, X, WILL HAVE THE LEAST IMPACT TO PRESENT HOMES.

---

The North-South corridor is a great idea. Please keep in mind commuters from San Tan Valley to the Phx area when selecting routes.

---

Balance transportaion demand with quality of life. Connect us to the Valley (given the extreme increase in population of this area, without impacting current and proposed development and infrastructure, to support this population. Minimize environmental impact, where possible to promote growth (population, economic, and quality of life). Not easy, but can be accomplished.

---

This proposed idea is a good for the community but the economy is still down. People will do EVERYTHING they can to go around these toll areas. Will there be pay raises? People can't afford this, and if it goes in to affect people will go around these areas either making them late for work or upsetting them cause they have to get up earlier to leave earlier and go around not to mention getting home later. Nobody wants that. This all seems like a HUGE headache. If this would've been proposed when the economy wasn't so bad I could see it working out but with the economy being as bad as it is its just going to take more of the peoples time. I strongly disagree with this idea in its full extent!

---

A straight line is the shortest distance and the least expensive. Also the population clusters are better served by using the shortest distance methodology. I personnally do not want to give developers the State Trust Lands if a highway is put through or there won't be any for use anymore.

---

There is an incredible amount of unused land in the surrounding populated areas. Everywhere you look there is brown dirt, desolation and land that has nothing on it, or is not planned for any use at all. Running a major corridor right thru populated areas like Coolidge and the San Tan Valley communities does not make sense at all. Property values will be hit even harder and the quality of life will drop dramatically. While a corridor connecting I-10 to Rt 60 would be a benefit that I would take advantage of and support. It must be put in areas that make sense.

---

Main concern is any noise abatement on the proposed route. Road noise and that type of noise polution can certainly ruin one of the reasons why many have migrated to the southern sub-divisions.

---

In general, build it sooner than later

---

This project should have been started years ago. There is only one route for the 100,000's of residence of the south east valley to reach any highway or inter-state. This route is through residential areas which is not efficient or safe. This corridor would save fuel for those that live in the areas and make the residential roads safer for pedestrians. This project should be fast tracked and finished as quickly as possible. With the current state of the economy the cost will be less now then what they would be when the economy rebounds. With the low price of housing in southern parts of the valley the traffic condition have continued to become more and more unbearable. Completion of this project would also relieve congestion on US60, northern I10 and the loop 202. To not build this corridor would be an extreme error in judgement that people of Arizona will pay for, for year to come.

---

I look forward to the connection between US 60 & I-10. I am not familiar with the area in Southern Route Alternatives, but I would hope that residential areas will be avoided in both Northern & Southern routes.

---

The valley's growth corridor will be shaken by this highway. Please support the alignment that the cities & towns have adopted.

THANK YOU!



## ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

### Comments

---

alignment currently, this must hold sway in your decision. Thanks for your attention!

---

If/when there will be the 60 bypass around Gold Canyon area that would be the ideal time to do ALL construction.

My thoughts are to use as much open space undeveloped area as possible. Less impact on citizens- less costs?? faster construction.

Enjoyed your presentation. Thank you for allowing our input.

---

It is critically important that ADOT keep in the forefront of their minds when considering the alignment that many of the towns have already gone through the public process and adopted alignments.

Notably - Florence with unanimous council consent.

---

Please support what the town do. They are our voice!

Your consideration is appreciated!

---

It would be more costly and cause tremendous traffic congestion to change an existing road into a freeway than to start from scratch on open land.

A freeway placed next to existing housing developments is very unfair to the people who bought homes/property in that area. It would have a major negative impact on the quality of life, noise, traffic, added businesses, crime, and reduced property values.

---

A highway of this size should not be round thru already existing housing developments\* It will destroy the quality of life for residents.

\*Means homes have already been constructed

---

Recommended route A-E-G-H-D-Y-Z-AA.

---

Develop a passenger rail system [augmented by BRT (Bus Rapid Transit) if necessary]. Focus on rail. Do NOT build more freeways. Use existing rail lines to develop a workable transit system.

---

Great idea as will give better access to gateway airport being further away for downtown Phoenix. Encourage more carrier to use gateway as flyers can get to area with SR 24.

Take some pressure off of I-10 to Tucson.

---

They SRP told us power line wasn't going on our property & it did. You think when you live on family homestead & out in country you would be saved from being forced off your land.

---

Least impact to Arizona Water Company's existing and planned water facilities including water mains, potable water production wells, booster stations, storage tanks and other utility facilities.

---

Ironwood routes are too busy already and Hunt Hwy is also too congested. Too many developments are impacted by the noise and pollution.

---

## ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

### Comments

(On Northern Route map) Why - 2050 population could double! No funding for project could enter with private public partnership - 1.Toll Road?

(Crossed out 1 and 2, drew line going west and connecting with Route 24.)

Additional comments: It is apparent to me Route 24 off 202 that heads SE to E solves the exit of 60 south. Take 202 to 24.

1. Direct to Florence Junction

2. Route to 10 with several options!

Most of major traffic trucks go to Florence Junction then east to Globe or Florence south!

---

## **APPENDIX H**

### **Public Workshop Comment Form Summary**

# North-South Corridor Study Public Workshops December 2011 Public Involvement Summary - Comment Forms

1

Name/ Date	Mtg/Comment Type	Comment		
Jon Orton	Public Workshop	<b>Segments:</b>	U	<b>Factors:</b>
12/06/11	Comment Form	A	V	Best relieves traffic/local streets
		B	W	Best relieves traffic/hwys & frwys
		C	X	Best connects to other destinations
		D	Y	
		E	Z	
		F	AA Unfavorable	
		G	AB	
		H	AC	<b>Funding:</b>
		I	AD	No: not support/won't use
		J	AE	
		K	AF	
		L	AG	
		M	AH	
		N	AI	
		O	AJ	
		P	AK	<b>Response:</b>
		Q	AL	N/A
		R	AM	
		S	AN	
		T	AO	

Additional comments:

## North-South Corridor Study Public Workshops December 2011 Public Involvement Summary - Comment Forms

2

Name/ Date	Mtg/Comment Type	Comment	
Hubert McKeever	Public Workshop	<b>Segments:</b>	<b>U</b>
12/06/11	Comment Form	<b>A</b>	<b>V</b>
		<b>B</b>	<b>W</b>
		<b>C</b>	<b>X</b>
		<b>D</b>	<b>Y</b>
		<b>E</b>	<b>Z</b> Unfavorable
		<b>F</b>	<b>AA</b> Unfavorable To close to our subdivision-To much traffic on 87-Road noise
		<b>G</b>	<b>AB</b>
		<b>H</b>	<b>AC</b>
		<b>I</b>	<b>AD</b>
		<b>J</b>	<b>AE</b>
		<b>K</b>	<b>AF</b>
		<b>L</b>	<b>AG</b>
		<b>M</b>	<b>AH</b> Favorable
		<b>N</b>	<b>AI</b> Favorable
		<b>O</b>	<b>AJ</b>
		<b>P</b>	<b>AK</b> Favorable
		<b>Q</b>	<b>AL</b> Favorable fewer home affected
		<b>R</b>	<b>AM</b>
		<b>S</b>	<b>AN</b>
		<b>T</b>	<b>AO</b>
<b>Additional comments:</b> we need turn lanes on 87 to access our subdivision between Houser Rd & Shedd Rd			
			<b>Factors:</b> Best relieves traffic/hwys & frwys Best connects to other destinations Best connects to cities/towns
			<b>Funding:</b> No: not support/won't use  My Taxes pay for existing roads-would not pay for a Toll Road. I am not in a big hurry to go anywhere
			<b>Response:</b> N/A

# North-South Corridor Study Public Workshops December 2011 Public Involvement Summary - Comment Forms

3

Name/ Date	Mtg/Comment Type	Comment	
Dr. John Maher, PhD	Public Workshop	<b>Segments:</b>	<b>U</b>
		<b>A</b>	<b>V</b>
12/7/11	Comment Form	<b>B</b>	<b>W</b>
		<b>C</b>	<b>X</b>
		<b>D</b>	<b>Y</b>
		<b>E</b>	<b>Z</b>
		<b>F</b>	<b>AA</b>
		<b>G</b>	<b>AB</b>
		<b>H</b>	<b>AC</b>
		<b>I</b>	<b>AD</b>
		<b>J</b>	<b>AE</b>
		<b>K</b>	<b>AF</b>
		<b>L</b>	<b>AG</b>
		<b>M</b>	<b>AH</b>
		<b>N</b>	<b>AI</b>
		<b>O</b>	<b>AJ</b>
		<b>P</b>	<b>AK</b>
		<b>Q</b>	<b>AL</b>
		<b>R</b>	<b>AM</b>
		<b>S</b>	<b>AN</b>
		<b>T</b>	<b>AO</b>

**Factors:**

**Funding:**

**Response:**  
N/A

**Additional comments:**  
Why not use the existing roadway  
from Apache Junction to Oracle  
Junction-widen to 4 lane roadway!  
Ok?

# North-South Corridor Study Public Workshops December 2011 Public Involvement Summary - Comment Forms

4

Name/ Date	Mtg/Comment Type	Comment		
Eddie Lamperez	Public Workshop	<b>Segments:</b>	<b>U</b> Favorable	<b>Factors:</b>
12/07/11	Comment Form	<b>A</b> Unfavorable	<b>V</b> Favorable	Best connects to cities/towns
		<b>B</b> Unfavorable	<b>W</b> Unfavorable	Least impact to planned developmt
		<b>C</b> Unfavorable	<b>X</b> Favorable	Input rec'd from local gov't
		<b>D</b> Unfavorable	<b>Y</b>	
		<b>E</b> Unfavorable	<b>Z</b>	
		<b>F</b> Unfavorable	<b>AA</b>	
		<b>G</b> Unfavorable	<b>AB</b>	
		<b>H</b> Unfavorable	<b>AC</b>	<b>Funding:</b>
		<b>I</b> Favorable	<b>AD</b>	Yes: support tolled hwy
		<b>J</b> Favorable	<b>AE</b>	Yes: use tolled hwy
		<b>K</b> Unfavorable	<b>AF</b>	
		<b>L</b> Unfavorable	<b>AG</b>	
		<b>M</b> Favorable	<b>AH</b>	
		<b>N</b> Favorable	<b>AI</b>	
		<b>O</b> Favorable	<b>AJ</b>	
		<b>P</b> Favorable	<b>AK</b>	<b>Response:</b>
		<b>Q</b> Unfavorable	<b>AL</b>	N/A
		<b>R</b> Unfavorable	<b>AM</b>	
		<b>S</b> Unfavorable	<b>AN</b>	
		<b>T</b> Unfavorable	<b>AO</b>	

**Additional comments:**  
Preferred Route was chosen for  
northern route alternatives to provide  
the Town of Florence a economic  
development advantage from the  
corridor.

# North-South Corridor Study Public Workshops December 2011 Public Involvement Summary - Comment Forms

Name/ Date	Mtg/Comment Type	Comment		
Melissa Kess	Public Workshop			
12/07/11	Comment Form			
<b>Additional comments:</b> Major importance is Route 24 to get out west from Ironwood & 60 is highly needed for more job opportunities & colleges. If I could get to PHX that would be much appreciated.		<b>Segments:</b>	<b>U</b> Unfavorable	<b>Factors:</b>
		<b>A</b> Favorable Route 24 connection vary important	<b>V</b> Unfavorable	Best connects to employment ctrs
		<b>B</b> Favorable Route 24 connection Highly important	<b>W</b> Favorable	Best connects to other destinations
		<b>C</b> Favorable	<b>X</b> Favorable	Best connects to other major routes
		<b>D</b> Favorable	<b>Y</b> Favorable	
		<b>E</b> Unfavorable	<b>Z</b> Favorable	
		<b>F</b> Unfavorable	<b>AA</b> Favorable	
		<b>G</b> Unfavorable	<b>AB</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>H</b> Unfavorable	<b>AC</b> Unfavorable	<b>Funding:</b>
		<b>I</b> Favorable	<b>AD</b> Unfavorable	Yes: use tolled hwy
		<b>J</b> Favorable	<b>AE</b> Unfavorable	would use the Ironwood/60 Bus out west to Power Rd for work &
		<b>K</b> Unfavorable	<b>AF</b> Unfavorable	also use Ironwood/Hunt Hwy for my sec. job. The car I have is unreliable
		<b>L</b> Unfavorable	<b>AG</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>M</b> Unfavorable	<b>AH</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>N</b> Unfavorable	<b>AI</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>O</b> Favorable	<b>AJ</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>P</b> Unfavorable	<b>AK</b> Unfavorable	<b>Response:</b>
		<b>Q</b> Favorable	<b>AL</b> Unfavorable	N/A
		<b>R</b> Favorable	<b>AM</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>S</b> Favorable	<b>AN</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>T</b> Unfavorable	<b>AO</b> Unfavorable	



# North-South Corridor Study Public Workshops December 2011 Public Involvement Summary - Comment Forms

6

Name/ Date	Mtg/Comment Type	Comment				
David A. Duarte	Public Workshop	<b>Segments:</b>		<b>U</b>	<b>Factors:</b>	
12/07/11	Comment Form	<b>A</b>	Favorable	make a transfer to power Rd.	<b>V</b>	Best relieves traffic/hwys & frwys
		<b>B</b>			<b>W</b>	Best connects to employment ctrs
					<b>X</b>	Best connects to other destinations
					<b>Y</b>	Best connects to cities/towns
					<b>Z</b>	Best connects to other major routes
					<b>AA</b>	
					<b>AB</b>	
					<b>AC</b>	<b>Funding:</b>
					<b>AD</b>	No: not support/won't use
					<b>AE</b>	
					<b>AF</b>	
					<b>AG</b>	
					<b>AH</b>	
					<b>AI</b>	
					<b>AJ</b>	<b>Response:</b>
					<b>AK</b>	N/A
					<b>AL</b>	
					<b>AM</b>	
					<b>AN</b>	
					<b>AO</b>	

# North-South Corridor Study Public Workshops December 2011 Public Involvement Summary - Comment Forms

7

Name/ Date	Mtg/Comment Type	Comment		
Karen Ames	Public Workshop	<b>Segments:</b>	<b>U</b> Unfavorable	<b>Factors:</b>
12/7/11	Comment Form	<b>A</b> Favorable	<b>V</b> Unfavorable	Best relieves traffic/local streets
<b>Additional comments:</b> Easiest Route for trucking and commerce		<b>B</b> Unfavorable	<b>W</b> Unfavorable	Best connects to other major routes
		<b>C</b> Unfavorable	<b>X</b> Unfavorable	Least impact to existing developmt
		<b>D</b> Favorable	<b>Y</b> Favorable	
		<b>E</b> Favorable	<b>Z</b> Favorable	
		<b>F</b> Unfavorable	<b>AA</b> Favorable	
		<b>G</b> Favorable	<b>AB</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>H</b> Favorable	<b>AC</b> Unfavorable	<b>Funding:</b>
		<b>I</b> Unfavorable	<b>AD</b> Unfavorable	Yes: use tolled hwy
		<b>J</b> Unfavorable	<b>AE</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>K</b> Unfavorable	<b>AF</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>L</b> Unfavorable	<b>AG</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>M</b> Unfavorable	<b>AH</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>N</b> Unfavorable	<b>AI</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>O</b> Unfavorable	<b>AJ</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>P</b> Unfavorable	<b>AK</b> Unfavorable	<b>Response:</b>
		<b>Q</b> Unfavorable	<b>AL</b> Unfavorable	N/A
		<b>R</b> Unfavorable	<b>AM</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>S</b> Unfavorable	<b>AN</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>T</b> Unfavorable	<b>AO</b> Unfavorable	

# North-South Corridor Study Public Workshops December 2011 Public Involvement Summary - Comment Forms

8

Name/ Date	Mtg/Comment Type	Comment			
Tom Novy	Public Workshop	<b>Segments:</b>			<b>U</b> Unfavorable adds length/cost
12/7/11	Comment Form	<b>A</b> Favorable			<b>V</b> Unfavorable see u
<b>Additional comments:</b>		<b>B</b> Unfavorable connects to F, see below			<b>W</b> Favorable
		<b>C</b> Unfavorable requires F, see below			<b>X</b> Favorable
		<b>D</b> Favorable			<b>Y</b> Favorable uses existing 87
		<b>E</b> Unfavorable leads to G			<b>Z</b> Favorable see Y
		<b>F</b> Unfavorable location of future SRP 230kv transmission line (2018)			<b>AA</b> Favorable see Y
		<b>G</b> Unfavorable could impact SRP 500kv line maintenance			<b>AB</b> Favorable Ok, but not as good as D to Y to Z to AA
		<b>H</b> Favorable			<b>AC</b> Unfavorable
		<b>I</b> Favorable most direct, utilizes 3			<b>AD</b> Unfavorable
		<b>J</b> Favorable			<b>AE</b> Unfavorable
		<b>K</b> Favorable			<b>AF</b> Unfavorable
		<b>L</b> Favorable			<b>AG</b> Unfavorable
		<b>M</b> Favorable			<b>AH</b> Unfavorable
		<b>N</b> Favorable			<b>AI</b> Unfavorable
		<b>O</b> Favorable			<b>AJ</b> Unfavorable
		<b>P</b> Unfavorable adds length			<b>AK</b> Unfavorable
		<b>Q</b> Favorable			<b>AL</b> Unfavorable
		<b>R</b> Unfavorable adds a T1 to 3			<b>AM</b> Unfavorable
		<b>S</b> Favorable			<b>AN</b> Unfavorable
		<b>T</b> Favorable			<b>AO</b> Unfavorable
					<b>Factors:</b> Best relieves traffic/hwys & frwys Best connects to other major routes Lowest cost
					<b>Funding:</b> No: not support/won't use  I would not oppose a tolled highway but I would not use it
					<b>Response:</b> N/A

# North-South Corridor Study Public Workshops December 2011 Public Involvement Summary - Comment Forms

9

Name/ Date	Mtg/Comment Type	Comment	
Bud Lambert	Public Workshop	<b>Segments:</b>	
12/7/11	Comment Form	<b>A</b> Favorable Reduce traffic Traffic noise	<b>U</b> Unfavorable
<b>Additional comments:</b>		<b>B</b> Unfavorable	<b>V</b> Unfavorable
		<b>C</b> Unfavorable	<b>W</b> Unfavorable
		<b>D</b> Favorable Looks like sparsley populated area	<b>X</b> Unfavorable
		<b>E</b> Favorable Looks like sparsley populated area	<b>Y</b>
		<b>F</b>	<b>Z</b>
		<b>G</b> Favorable Sparsley populated area	<b>AA</b>
		<b>H</b> Favorable Lightly populated	<b>AB</b>
		<b>I</b> Unfavorable	<b>AC</b>
		<b>J</b> Unfavorable	<b>AD</b>
		<b>K</b> Unfavorable	<b>AE</b>
		<b>L</b> Unfavorable	<b>AF</b>
		<b>M</b> Unfavorable	<b>AG</b>
		<b>N</b> Unfavorable	<b>AH</b>
		<b>O</b> Unfavorable	<b>AI</b>
		<b>P</b> Unfavorable	<b>AJ</b>
		<b>Q</b> Unfavorable	<b>AK</b>
		<b>R</b> Unfavorable	<b>AL</b>
		<b>S</b> Unfavorable	<b>AM</b>
		<b>T</b> Unfavorable	<b>AN</b>
			<b>AO</b>
		<b>Factors:</b>	
		Best relieves traffic/local streets	
		Best relieves traffic/hwys & frwys	
		Best connects to other major routes	
		<b>Funding:</b>	
		No: not support/won't use	
		HAVING LIVED IN STATES WITH A TOLL WAY SYSTEM THEY SEEM TO BECOME A MAGNET FOR GRAFT AND GREED AND OUT SOURCED MANAGEMENT BEYOND US BORDERS.	
		<b>Response:</b>	
		N/A	

# North-South Corridor Study Public Workshops December 2011 Public Involvement Summary - Comment Forms

10

Name/ Date	Mtg/Comment Type	Comment			
John Dittmar	Public Workshop				
12/7/11	Comment Form				
<b>Additional comments:</b> This appears to be a proposed part of the "projected" NAFTA super highway that is being forced upon the American Public.					
		<b>Segments:</b>	<b>U</b>	Unfavorable	same as R
		<b>A</b> Unfavorable	<b>V</b>	Unfavorable	same as P
		There are 3 schools on this Road. High conjection Already EXISTS.			
		<b>B</b> Unfavorable	<b>W</b>	Favorable	ok
		Same as A above. Add in expanded traffic as Queen Creek ext grows.			
		same for reason in A & B	<b>X</b>	Favorable	ok
		<b>C</b> Unfavorable	<b>Y</b>	Favorable	w/ D Z AA
		see A B&C except if I 3 K are selected.			
		<b>D</b> Favorable	<b>Z</b>	Favorable	see Y
		same as in A			
		<b>E</b> Unfavorable	<b>AA</b>	Favorable	see Y
		same as A			
		<b>F</b> Unfavorable	<b>AB</b>		no opinion
		same as above. except if I J K are selected.			
		<b>G</b> Unfavorable	<b>AC</b>		no opinion
		same as in G			
		<b>H</b> Unfavorable	<b>AD</b>		no opinion
		Less disruption to existing strvc tubes & people.			
		<b>I</b> Favorable	<b>AE</b>	Unfavorable	
		same as I			
		<b>J</b> Favorable	<b>AF</b>	Unfavorable	
		same as I			
		<b>K</b> Favorable	<b>AG</b>	Unfavorable	
		could be used w/ I thru G			
		<b>L</b> Favorable	<b>AH</b>	Favorable	no opinion
		no opinion			
		<b>M</b>	<b>AI</b>	Unfavorable	
		no opinion			
		<b>N</b>	<b>AJ</b>	Unfavorable	
		used w/ I thru J			
		<b>O</b> Favorable	<b>AK</b>	Unfavorable	
		unnecessary-			
		<b>P</b> Unfavorable	<b>AL</b>	Unfavorable	
		used w/ I J etc			
		<b>Q</b> Favorable	<b>AM</b>		no opinion
		not a bad route!			
		<b>R</b> Favorable	<b>AN</b>		no opinion
		same as w/ R			
		<b>S</b> Unfavorable	<b>AO</b>		no opinion
		ok			
		<b>T</b> Favorable			

**Factors:**  
Best connects to cities/towns  
Lowest cost  
Least impact to existing developmt

**Funding:**  
No: not support/won't use  
No NAFTA superhighway or any part of it.

**Response:**  
N/A

# North-South Corridor Study Public Workshops December 2011 Public Involvement Summary - Comment Forms

11

Name/ Date	Mtg/Comment Type	Comment		
Anonymous	Public Workshop	<b>Segments:</b>	<b>U</b>	<b>Factors:</b>
12/07/11	Comment Form	<b>A</b>	<b>V</b> Favorable	
		<b>B</b>	<b>W</b>	
<b>Additional comments:</b>		<b>C</b>	<b>X</b> Favorable	
		<b>D</b>	<b>Y</b>	
		<b>E</b>	<b>Z</b>	
		<b>F</b>	<b>AA</b>	
		<b>G</b> Favorable	<b>AB</b> Favorable	<b>Funding:</b>
		<b>H</b>	<b>AC</b>	
		<b>I</b> Favorable    A good location for Junction. Equa distant to Apache Jct. a Gold Canyon	<b>AD</b> Favorable	
		<b>J</b> Favorable    favorable alignment	<b>AE</b>	
		<b>K</b> Favorable	<b>AF</b>	
		<b>L</b> Favorable	<b>AG</b>	
		<b>M</b>	<b>AH</b> Favorable	
		<b>N</b>	<b>AI</b> Favorable	
		<b>O</b>	<b>AJ</b>	<b>Response:</b> N/A
		<b>P</b> Favorable	<b>AK</b>	
		<b>Q</b>	<b>AL</b> Favorable	
		<b>R</b>	<b>AM</b>	
		<b>S</b>	<b>AN</b> Favorable	
		<b>T</b>	<b>AO</b>	

# North-South Corridor Study Public Workshops December 2011 Public Involvement Summary - Comment Forms

12

Name/ Date	Mtg/Comment Type	Comment		
Thomas T. Narva, SR.	Public Workshop	<b>Segments:</b>	<b>U</b>	<b>Factors:</b>
12/7/11	Comment Form	<b>A</b> Favorable one of my routes to work (QC) from A.J.	<b>V</b>	Least impact to existing developmt
		<b>B</b> Town would like this route but personally I favor E due to less impact on existing homes	<b>W</b>	Other
		<b>C</b> F to H seems better	<b>X</b>	
		<b>D</b> Favorable	<b>Y</b> Favorable	
		<b>E</b> Favorable	<b>Z</b> Favorable	
		<b>F</b> Town would like this route	<b>AA</b> Unfavorable Existing interchange area is a mess new @ AL better	
		<b>G</b> Favorable	<b>AB</b>	
		<b>H</b> Favorable	<b>AC</b>	<b>Funding:</b>
		<b>I</b> Favorable	<b>AD</b>	No: not support/won't use
		<b>J</b> Favorable	<b>AE</b>	I hate toll roads & will always avoid them!
		<b>K</b> Favorable	<b>AF</b>	
		<b>L</b> Unfavorable	<b>AG</b> Favorable	
		<b>M</b> Favorable	<b>AH</b>	
		<b>N</b>	<b>AI</b>	
		<b>O</b>	<b>AJ</b> Favorable	
		<b>P</b>	<b>AK</b>	<b>Response:</b>
		<b>Q</b>	<b>AL</b> Favorable stay away from AA	
		<b>R</b>	<b>AM</b>	
		<b>S</b>	<b>AN</b>	
		<b>T</b>	<b>AO</b>	

# North-South Corridor Study Public Workshops December 2011 Public Involvement Summary - Comment Forms

13

Name/ Date	Mtg/Comment Type	Comment		
Dennis D. Hall	Public Workshop	<b>Segments:</b>		
12/7/11	Comment Form	<b>A</b>	<b>U</b>	<b>Factors:</b>
		<b>B</b>	<b>V</b>	Best connects to employment ctrs
		<b>C</b>	<b>W</b>	Lowest cost
		<b>D</b>	<b>X</b>	Best use of existing roads/hwys
		<b>E</b>	<b>Y</b>	
		<b>F</b>	<b>Z</b> Favorable	existing road way cheaper-rail line noise already their
		<b>G</b>	<b>AA</b>	
		<b>H</b>	<b>AB</b>	
		<b>I</b> Favorable	<b>AC</b>	<b>Funding:</b>
		straighter shot to florence	<b>AD</b> Favorable	No: not support/won't use
			connect to 87	Depends on toll cost
		<b>J</b> Favorable	<b>AE</b> Favorable	
		straighter shot to florence	connect to 87	
		<b>K</b>	<b>AF</b>	
		<b>L</b>	<b>AG</b>	
		<b>M</b>	<b>AH</b>	
		<b>N</b>	<b>AI</b>	
		<b>O</b> Favorable	<b>AJ</b>	
		straighter shot to florence	<b>AK</b>	<b>Response:</b>
		<b>P</b>	<b>AL</b>	N/A
		<b>Q</b> Favorable	<b>AM</b> Favorable	
		straighter shot to florence	closer access to florence	
		<b>R</b>	<b>AN</b> Favorable	
		<b>S</b>	straighter shot to I-10	
		<b>T</b>	<b>AO</b>	



**North-South Corridor Study Public Workshops December 2011  
Public Involvement Summary - Comment Forms**

14

Name/ Date	Mtg/Comment Type	Comment	
Donald E. Meadows	Public Workshop	<b>Segments:</b>	
12/8/11	Comment Form	<b>U</b>	
<b>Additional comments:</b>		<b>A</b>	<b>V</b>
		<b>B</b>	<b>W</b>
		<b>C</b>	<b>X</b>
		<b>D</b>	<b>Y</b>
		<b>E</b>	<b>Z</b>
		<b>F</b>	<b>AA</b>
		<b>G</b>	<b>AB</b>
		<b>H</b>	<b>AC</b>
		<b>I</b> Favorable    Cost central access	<b>AD</b> Favorable    cost central access
		<b>J</b> Favorable    cost central access	<b>AE</b>
		<b>K</b>	<b>AF</b>
		<b>L</b>	<b>AG</b>
		<b>M</b>	<b>AH</b> Favorable    cost central access to cities town
		<b>N</b>	<b>AI</b>
		<b>O</b> Favorable    cost central access	<b>AJ</b>
		<b>P</b>	<b>AK</b> Favorable    cost central access to cities towns
		<b>Q</b> Favorable    cost central access	<b>AL</b> Favorable    cost central access to cities towns
		<b>R</b>	<b>AM</b> Favorable    cost central access to cities towns
		<b>S</b>	<b>AN</b> Favorable    cost central access to cities towns
		<b>T</b>	<b>AO</b>
		<b>Factors:</b> Best relieves traffic/hwys & frwys Best connects to cities/towns Best connects to other major routes	
		<b>Funding:</b> No: not support/won't use  I travel existing roads three or more times per week. I would rather see a tax to support construction and maintenance.	
		<b>Response:</b> N/A	

# North-South Corridor Study Public Workshops December 2011 Public Involvement Summary - Comment Forms

15

Name/ Date	Mtg/Comment Type	Comment		
Gary W. Sethney	Public Workshop			
12/8/11	Comment Form			
Additional comments:				
		<b>Segments:</b>	<b>U</b> Unfavorable	<b>Factors:</b>
		<b>A</b> Unfavorable Could be alternate if connected to E	<b>V</b> Unfavorable	Best connects to cities/towns
		<b>B</b> Unfavorable	<b>W</b> Unfavorable	Least impact to planned developmt
		<b>C</b> Unfavorable	<b>X</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>D</b> Unfavorable to close to Sun City athem	<b>Y</b>	
		<b>E</b> Unfavorable Could be alternate if connect to G & L to Q	<b>Z</b>	
		<b>F</b> Unfavorable	<b>AA</b>	
		<b>G</b> Unfavorable Could be alternate if connected to L to Q	<b>AB</b>	
		<b>H</b> Unfavorable To close to Sun city anthem	<b>AC</b>	<b>Funding:</b>
		<b>I</b> Access to Apache Junction	<b>AD</b>	Yes: support tolled hwy
		<b>J</b> Favorable	<b>AE</b>	Yes: use tolled hwy
		<b>K</b> Unfavorable	<b>AF</b>	
		<b>L</b> Unfavorable Could be alternate if connected to G	<b>AG</b>	
		<b>M</b> Unfavorable	<b>AH</b>	
		<b>N</b> Unfavorable	<b>AI</b>	
		<b>O</b> Favorable Connect to I	<b>AJ</b>	
		<b>P</b> Unfavorable	<b>AK</b>	<b>Response:</b>
		<b>Q</b> Favorable	<b>AL</b>	N/A
		<b>R</b> Unfavorable	<b>AM</b>	
		<b>S</b> Unfavorable	<b>AN</b>	
		<b>T</b> Unfavorable	<b>AO</b>	

# North-South Corridor Study Public Workshops December 2011 Public Involvement Summary - Comment Forms

16

Name/ Date	Mtg/Comment Type	Comment		
Charles Tuomi	Public Workshop			
12/8/11	Comment Form			
<b>Additional comments:</b> Not that concerned with south alignment				
		<b>Segments:</b>	<b>U</b> Unfavorable	<b>Factors:</b> Best relieves traffic/local streets Best connects to other major routes Least impact to existing developmt
		<b>A</b> Favorable starts closer in to Phoenix/Mesa	<b>V</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>B</b> Unfavorable Bisects too much current development	<b>W</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>C</b> Unfavorable	<b>X</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>D</b> Unfavorable Too close to our development	<b>Y</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>E</b> Favorable	<b>Z</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>F</b> Unfavorable	<b>AA</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>G</b> Favorable	<b>AB</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>H</b> Unfavorable	<b>AC</b> Unfavorable	<b>Funding:</b> Yes: support tolled hwy Yes: use tolled hwy If a toll would get the project built faster I would support it. Toll would/should be no more than \$0.10 per mile.
		<b>I</b> Unfavorable	<b>AD</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>J</b> Unfavorable	<b>AE</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>K</b> Unfavorable	<b>AF</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>L</b> Favorable	<b>AG</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>M</b> Unfavorable	<b>AH</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>N</b> Unfavorable	<b>AI</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>O</b> Unfavorable	<b>AJ</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>P</b> Unfavorable	<b>AK</b> Unfavorable	<b>Response:</b> N/A
		<b>Q</b> Favorable 500kv line already crews up future development, so put road there.	<b>AL</b> Favorable If right of way exists-use it	
		<b>R</b> Unfavorable	<b>AM</b> Favorable	
		<b>S</b> Unfavorable	<b>AN</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>T</b> Unfavorable	<b>AO</b> Unfavorable	

# North-South Corridor Study Public Workshops December 2011 Public Involvement Summary - Comment Forms

17

Name/ Date	Mtg/Comment Type	Comment				
William Pertzborn, Jr.	Public Workshop	<b>Segments:</b>				<b>Factors:</b>
12/8/11	Comment Form	<b>A</b> Favorable	Only option that is still centrally located	<b>U</b> Unfavorable	see P	Best relieves traffic/local streets
<b>Additional comments:</b>		<b>B</b> Unfavorable	Travels thru very populated areas would get crowded with commuters	<b>V</b> Unfavorable	see P	Lowest cost
		<b>C</b> Unfavorable		<b>W</b> Unfavorable	see P	Least impact to existing developmt
		<b>D</b> Unfavorable		<b>X</b> Unfavorable	see P	
		<b>E</b> Favorable	More direct route to Q which is the only decent path	<b>Y</b> Unfavorable	Too close to Coolidge	
		<b>F</b> Unfavorable		<b>Z</b> Unfavorable	Takes over existing highway	
		<b>G</b> Favorable		<b>AA</b> Unfavorable	see Z	
		<b>H</b> Unfavorable	Path to close to Coolidge proper	<b>AB</b> Favorable	Does not follow 500 KVA lines	
		<b>I</b> Unfavorable	Too far out of city might make sense in 20 years not now.	<b>AC</b> Favorable	Future path for Westport Mall	<b>Funding:</b>
		<b>J</b> Unfavorable	see I	<b>AD</b> Favorable	Connect to AC	Yes: support tolled hwy
		<b>K</b> Unfavorable	see I	<b>AE</b> Unfavorable		Yes: use tolled hwy
		<b>L</b> Favorable	Quickest path to Q	<b>AF</b> Unfavorable		
		<b>M</b> Unfavorable	see I	<b>AG</b> Unfavorable		
		<b>N</b> Unfavorable	see I	<b>AH</b> Favorable		
		<b>O</b> Unfavorable	see I	<b>AI</b> Favorable		
		<b>P</b> Unfavorable	Takes the road too close to Florence	<b>AJ</b> Favorable		<b>Response:</b>
		<b>Q</b> Favorable	exellent path. puts road central to both Coolidge and Florence	<b>AK</b> Unfavorable		N/A
		<b>R</b> Unfavorable	see I	<b>AL</b> Favorable		
		<b>S</b> Unfavorable	see I	<b>AM</b> Unfavorable		
		<b>T</b> Unfavorable	see I	<b>AN</b> Unfavorable		
				<b>AO</b> Unfavorable		

**North-South Corridor Study Public Workshops December 2011  
Public Involvement Summary - Comment Forms**

18

Name/ Date	Mtg/Comment Type	Comment		
Lyle Piggott	Public Workshop	<b>Segments:</b>	U	<b>Factors:</b>
12/8/11	Comment Form	A	V	Best relieves traffic/hwys & frwys
<b>Additional comments:</b>		B	W	Best connects to employment ctrs
		C	X Favorable	Best connects to other major routes
		D	Y	Best access to areas of residential and Business- Industry
		E	Z	
		F	AA	
		G	AB	
		H	AC	<b>Funding:</b>
		I	AD Favorable	Yes: support tolled hwy
		J	AE	
		K	AF	
		L	AG	
		M	AH Favorable	Connects AD & AK
		N	AI	
		O	AJ	
		P	AK Favorable	<b>Response:</b>
		Q	AL Favorable	N/A
		R	AM	
		S	AN	
		T	AO	

# North-South Corridor Study Public Workshops December 2011 Public Involvement Summary - Comment Forms

19

Name/ Date	Mtg/Comment Type	Comment		
Gilbert Lopez	Public Workshop	<b>Segments:</b>	<b>U</b>	<b>Factors:</b>
12/8/11	Comment Form	<b>A</b>	<b>V</b>	Best connects to employment ctrs
<b>Additional comments:</b>		<b>B</b>	<b>W</b>	Input rec'd from public
		<b>C</b>	<b>X</b>	Other
		<b>D</b>	<b>Y</b>	
		<b>E</b>	<b>Z</b>	
		<b>F</b>	<b>AA</b>	
		<b>G</b>	<b>AB</b> Favorable    meets Coolidge sitting resolution	
		<b>H</b>	<b>AC</b> Favorable    meets Coolidge sitting resolution	<b>Funding:</b>
		<b>I</b>	<b>AD</b> Favorable    meets Coolidge sitting resolution	Yes: support tolled hwy
		<b>J</b>	<b>AE</b>	Yes: use tolled hwy
		<b>K</b>	<b>AF</b>	As we move forward, we have to look at all forseeable alternatives, that will make this critical corridor a reality. This area is a very important part of the Sun Corridor and also to the economic future of Central AZ.
		<b>L</b>	<b>AG</b>	
		<b>M</b>	<b>AH</b> Favorable    meets Coolidge sitting resolution	
		<b>N</b>	<b>AI</b>	
		<b>O</b>	<b>AJ</b>	
		<b>P</b>	<b>AK</b> Favorable    Preferred by Eloy.	<b>Response:</b>
		<b>Q</b>	<b>AL</b>	N/A
		<b>R</b>	<b>AM</b>	
		<b>S</b>	<b>AN</b>	
		<b>T</b>	<b>AO</b>	

# North-South Corridor Study Public Workshops December 2011 Public Involvement Summary - Comment Forms

20

Name/ Date	Mtg/Comment Type	Comment		
Jill Dusenberry	Public Workshop			
12/8/11	Comment Form			
Additional comments:				
		<b>Segments:</b>	<b>U</b>	<b>Factors:</b>
		<b>A</b>	<b>V</b>	Best relieves traffic/hwys & frwys
		<b>B</b>	<b>W</b>	Best connects to cities/towns
		<b>C</b>	<b>X</b>	Input rec'd from local gov't
		<b>D</b>	<b>Y</b> Unfavorable	would require additional Row. Eliminates businesses in Coolidge
		<b>E</b>	<b>Z</b> Unfavorable	removes existing access roads
		<b>F</b>	<b>AA</b> Unfavorable	removes existing access roads
		<b>G</b>	<b>AB</b> Favorable	
		<b>H</b>	<b>AC</b> Unfavorable	Goes through Development Agreement
		<b>I</b>	<b>AD</b> Favorable	
		<b>J</b>	<b>AE</b> Unfavorable	Too close to 87 and RR
		<b>K</b>	<b>AF</b> Unfavorable	Too close to 87 and RR
		<b>L</b>	<b>AG</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>M</b>	<b>AH</b> Favorable	
		<b>N</b>	<b>AI</b> Favorable	
		<b>O</b>	<b>AJ</b> Favorable	
		<b>P</b>	<b>AK</b> Favorable	
		<b>Q</b>	<b>AL</b> Favorable	
		<b>R</b>	<b>AM</b> Favorable	
		<b>S</b>	<b>AN</b> Favorable	preserves development agreements
		<b>T</b>	<b>AO</b> Unfavorable	
				<b>Funding:</b> Yes: support tolled hwy
				<b>Response:</b> N/A

# North-South Corridor Study Public Workshops December 2011 Public Involvement Summary - Comment Forms

21

Name/ Date	Mtg/Comment Type	Comment			
Scott J. Bowles  12/8/11	Public Workshop	<b>Segments:</b>			
	Comment Form	<b>A</b> Unfavorable	Not approved by Town of Florence	<b>U</b> Favorable	Approved by Town of Florence
<b>Additional comments:</b>		<b>V</b> Favorable	Approved by Town of Florence	<b>W</b> Unfavorable	Not approved by Town of Florence
		<b>B</b> Unfavorable	Not approved by Town of Florence	<b>X</b> Favorable	Would encourage much-needed traffic into the downtown area.
		<b>C</b> Unfavorable	Not approved by Town of Florence	<b>Y</b> Unfavorable	Not approved by City of Coolidge
		<b>D</b> Unfavorable	Not approved by Town of Florence	<b>Z</b> Unfavorable	Not approved by City of Coolidge
		<b>E</b> Unfavorable	Not approved by Town of Florence	<b>AA</b> Unfavorable	Not approved by City of Coolidge
		<b>F</b> Unfavorable	Not approved by Town of Florence	<b>AB</b> Favorable	Approved by City of Coolidge
		<b>G</b> Favorable	Approved by Town of Florence	<b>AC</b> Unfavorable	Not approved by City of Coolidge
		<b>H</b> Unfavorable	Not approved by Town of Florence	<b>AD</b> Favorable	Approved by City of Coolidge
		<b>I</b>		<b>AE</b> Unfavorable	Not approved by City of Coolidge
		<b>J</b>		<b>AF</b> Unfavorable	Not approved by City of Coolidge
		<b>K</b> Favorable	Approved by Town of Florence	<b>AG</b> Unfavorable	Not approved by City of Coolidge
		<b>L</b> Favorable	Approved by Town of Florence	<b>AH</b> Favorable	Approved by City of Coolidge
		<b>M</b>		<b>AI</b> Unfavorable	Not approved by City of Coolidge
		<b>N</b>		<b>AJ</b> Unfavorable	Not approved by City of Coolidge
		<b>O</b> Favorable	Approved by Town of Florence	<b>AK</b> Favorable	Approved by City of Coolidge
		<b>P</b> Favorable	Approved by Town of Florence	<b>AL</b> Favorable	Approved by City of Coolidge
		<b>Q</b> Unfavorable	Not approved by Town of Florence	<b>AM</b> Unfavorable	Not approved by City of Coolidge
		<b>R</b>		<b>AN</b> Favorable	Approved by City of Coolidge
		<b>S</b> Unfavorable	Not approved by Town of Florence	<b>AO</b> Unfavorable	Not approved by City of Coolidge
		<b>T</b> Unfavorable	Not approved by Town of Florence		
					<b>Factors:</b> Best connects to other major routes Input rec'd from local gov't Other
					<b>Funding:</b> No: not support/won't use  Tolled roads divert traffic. This route will greatly impact economic development, but a toll road will divert "customers" from the local economies.
					<b>Response:</b> N/A



# North-South Corridor Study Public Workshops December 2011 Public Involvement Summary - Comment Forms

22

Name/ Date	Mtg/Comment Type	Comment		
Gary Fransen	Public Workshop			
12/8/11	Comment Form			
Additional comments:				
		<b>Segments:</b>	<b>U</b> Unfavorable	<b>Factors:</b>
		<b>A</b> Favorable Makes use of existing right of way. Currently carries very heavy traffic	<b>V</b> Unfavorable	Best connects to other major routes
		<b>B</b> Favorable Existing right of way	<b>W</b> Unfavorable	Least impact to planned developmt
		<b>C</b> Curve adds to length and increases cost	<b>X</b> Unfavorable	Best use of existing roads/hwys
		<b>D</b> Favorable	<b>Y</b> Favorable Uses existing right of way Straightest route least impact on environment	
		<b>E</b> Unfavorable	<b>Z</b> Favorable uses existing right of way. straightest route	
		<b>F</b> Favorable shortest, straightest route	<b>AA</b> Favorable uses existing right of way	
		<b>G</b> Unfavorable	<b>AB</b> Unfavorable Prefer existing routes to carving new routes	
		<b>H</b> Favorable shortest, straightest	<b>AC</b> Unfavorable	<b>Funding:</b>
		<b>I</b> Unfavorable	<b>AD</b> Unfavorable	No: not support/won't use
		<b>J</b> Unfavorable	<b>AE</b> Unfavorable	Toll roads would deter local users from taking them and continue to overload existing roads.
		<b>K</b> Unfavorable	<b>AF</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>L</b> Unfavorable	<b>AG</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>M</b> Unfavorable	<b>AH</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>N</b> Unfavorable	<b>AI</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>O</b> Unfavorable	<b>AJ</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>P</b> Unfavorable	<b>AK</b> Unfavorable	<b>Response:</b>
		<b>Q</b> Unfavorable	<b>AL</b> Unfavorable	N/A
		<b>R</b> Unfavorable	<b>AM</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>S</b> Unfavorable	<b>AN</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>T</b> Unfavorable	<b>AO</b> Unfavorable	

# North-South Corridor Study Public Workshops December 2011 Public Involvement Summary - Comment Forms

Name/ Date	Mtg/Comment Type	Comment		
Mary Ann Fransen	Public Workshop	<b>Segments:</b>	<b>U</b> Unfavorable	<b>Factors:</b>
12/8/11	Comment Form	<b>A</b> Favorable	<b>V</b> Unfavorable	Best connects to other major routes
<b>Additional comments:</b>		<b>B</b> Favorable	<b>W</b> Unfavorable	Least impact to existing developmt
		<b>C</b> Unfavorable	<b>X</b> Unfavorable	Best use of existing roads/hwys
		<b>D</b> Favorable	<b>Y</b> Unfavorable	If connection to 87 were further south it would avoid business at south edge of town
		<b>E</b> Unfavorable	<b>Z</b> Favorable	
		<b>F</b> Favorable	<b>AA</b> Favorable	
		<b>G</b> Unfavorable	<b>AB</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>H</b> Favorable	<b>AC</b> Unfavorable	<b>Funding:</b>
		<b>I</b> Unfavorable	<b>AD</b> Unfavorable	No: not support/won't use
		<b>J</b> Unfavorable	<b>AE</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>K</b> Unfavorable	<b>AF</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>L</b> Unfavorable	<b>AG</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>M</b> Unfavorable	<b>AH</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>N</b> Unfavorable	<b>AI</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>O</b> Unfavorable	<b>AJ</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>P</b> Unfavorable	<b>AK</b> Unfavorable	<b>Response:</b>
		<b>Q</b> Unfavorable	<b>AL</b> Unfavorable	N/A
		<b>R</b> Unfavorable	<b>AM</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>S</b> Unfavorable	<b>AN</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>T</b> Unfavorable	<b>AO</b> Unfavorable	

## North-South Corridor Study Public Workshops December 2011 Public Involvement Summary - Comment Forms

Name/ Date	Mtg/Comment Type	Comment				
Dale Vogelgesang	Public Workshop	<b>Segments:</b>		<b>U</b> Unfavorable	Could be an option	<b>Factors:</b> Best relieves traffic/hwys & frwys Best connects to employment ctrs Best connects to cities/towns Least impact to existing developmt Least impact to planned developmt
12/8/11	Comment Form	<b>A</b> Favorable	Uses existing Roadway	<b>V</b> Favorable	More direct and keeps the freeway away from housing	
		<b>B</b> Unfavorable	To close to existing Residences	<b>W</b> Unfavorable		
		<b>C</b> Unfavorable		<b>X</b> Favorable	Gives Florence an excellent access.	
<b>Additional comments:</b> I would be in favor of using Hunt Highway if the Roadway could be moved West as I have dran on the map and marked CI		<b>D</b> Unfavorable	To close to Merrill Ranch	<b>Y</b> Unfavorable	Bring freeway to close on North portion	
		<b>E</b> Favorable		<b>Z</b> Unfavorable		
		<b>F</b> Unfavorable	To close to existing Housing	<b>AA</b> Unfavorable		
		<b>G</b> Favorable		<b>AB</b> Favorable		
		<b>H</b> Unfavorable	Brings freeway to close to Merrill Ranch existing housing	<b>AC</b> Favorable		<b>Funding:</b> Yes: support tolled hwy Yes: use tolled hwy The freeway is needed and a toll is a good option to get things started ASAP.
		<b>I</b> Unfavorable		<b>AD</b> Favorable		
		<b>J</b> Unfavorable		<b>AE</b> Unfavorable		
		<b>K</b> Unfavorable		<b>AF</b> Unfavorable		
		<b>L</b> Favorable		<b>AG</b> Unfavorable		
		<b>M</b> Unfavorable	To far out	<b>AH</b> Favorable		
		<b>N</b> Unfavorable	To far out	<b>AI</b> Favorable		
		<b>O</b> Unfavorable		<b>AJ</b> Favorable		
		<b>P</b> Favorable	Takes freeway away from housing development	<b>AK</b> Unfavorable		<b>Response:</b> N/A
		<b>Q</b> Unfavorable	To close to Merrill Ranch community	<b>AL</b> Favorable		
		<b>R</b> Unfavorable	To far East	<b>AM</b> Unfavorable	Could be an option	
		<b>S</b> Unfavorable	To far East	<b>AN</b> Unfavorable	Could be an option	
		<b>T</b> Unfavorable		<b>AO</b> Unfavorable	Could be an option	

**Additional comments:**  
I would be in favor of using Hunt Highway if the Roadway could be moved West as I have dran on the map and marked CI

# North-South Corridor Study Public Workshops December 2011 Public Involvement Summary - Comment Forms

25

Name/ Date	Mtg/Comment Type	Comment		
Charlie Anderson	Public Workshop			
12/8/11	Comment Form			
Additional comments:				
		<b>Segments:</b>	<b>U</b> Unfavorable	<b>Factors:</b>
		<b>A</b> Unfavorable Leave existing large roads for ER bypass road(s) alternatives	<b>V</b> Unfavorable	Best relieves traffic/local streets
		<b>B</b> Unfavorable same	<b>W</b>	Best connects to other major routes
		<b>C</b> Unfavorable same	<b>X</b>	Least impact to existing developmt
		<b>D</b> Unfavorable	<b>Y</b> Unfavorable Need to have a Freeway by-pass road for	
		<b>E</b> Unfavorable	<b>Z</b> Unfavorable same as above	
		<b>F</b> Unfavorable	<b>AA</b> Unfavorable same as above	
		<b>G</b> Unfavorable	<b>AB</b>	
		<b>H</b> Unfavorable	<b>AC</b> Unfavorable	<b>Funding:</b>
		<b>I</b>	<b>AD</b>	No: not support/won't use
		<b>J</b> Unfavorable	<b>AE</b> Unfavorable	Once tolls get started for special projects like this, they never go away. I wouldn't save anytime or miles by using this route for my daily commute.
		<b>K</b> Unfavorable	<b>AF</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>L</b> Unfavorable	<b>AG</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>M</b>	<b>AH</b>	
		<b>N</b> Unfavorable	<b>AI</b>	
		<b>O</b> Unfavorable	<b>AJ</b>	
		<b>P</b> Unfavorable	<b>AK</b>	<b>Response:</b>
		<b>Q</b> Unfavorable	<b>AL</b>	N/A
		<b>R</b>	<b>AM</b>	
		<b>S</b>	<b>AN</b>	
		<b>T</b>	<b>AO</b>	

# North-South Corridor Study Public Workshops December 2011 Public Involvement Summary - Comment Forms

Name/ Date	Mtg/Comment Type	Comment			
Jim Nadeau	Public Workshop	<b>Segments:</b>			<b>U</b> Unfavorable
12/8/11	Comment Form	<b>A</b> Unfavorable	Ironwood already is a good surface road	<b>V</b> Unfavorable	<b>Factors:</b> Best relieves traffic/local streets Best relieves traffic/hwys & frwys Best connects to cities/towns
		<b>B</b> Unfavorable	see A	<b>W</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>C</b> Unfavorable	I've eliminated A & B	<b>X</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>D</b> Favorable		<b>Y</b> Favorable	
		<b>E</b> Unfavorable	I've eliminated A	<b>Z</b> Favorable	
		<b>F</b> Unfavorable	I've eliminated A & B	<b>AA</b> Favorable	
		<b>G</b> Favorable		<b>AB</b> Favorable	
		<b>H</b> Favorable		<b>AC</b> Favorable	<b>Funding:</b> No: not support/won't use
		<b>I</b> Favorable		<b>AD</b> Favorable	
		<b>J</b> Favorable		<b>AE</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>K</b> Favorable		<b>AF</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>L</b> Unfavorable		<b>AG</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>M</b> Unfavorable		<b>AH</b> Favorable	
		<b>N</b> Unfavorable		<b>AI</b> Favorable	
		<b>O</b> Favorable		<b>AJ</b> Favorable	<b>Response:</b> N/A
		<b>P</b> Unfavorable		<b>AK</b> Favorable	
		<b>Q</b> Favorable		<b>AL</b> Favorable	
		<b>R</b> Unfavorable		<b>AM</b> Favorable	
		<b>S</b> Unfavorable		<b>AN</b> Favorable	
		<b>T</b> Unfavorable		<b>AO</b> Favorable	

## Additional comments:

A&B Ironwood is a good road that provides an alternative route for locals. I'm very impressed with the valleys surface routes such as Baseline, Southern, Ellsworth, Power, Etal. Please consider a new route

# North-South Corridor Study Public Workshops December 2011 Public Involvement Summary - Comment Forms

Name/ Date	Mtg/Comment Type	Comment		
Stacy Brimhall	Public Workshop	<b>Segments:</b>	<b>U</b> Favorable	<b>Factors:</b>
12/8/11	Comment Form	<b>A</b>	<b>V</b> Unfavorable	
<b>Additional comments:</b>		<b>B</b> Unfavorable	<b>W</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>C</b> Unfavorable	<b>X</b> Favorable	
		<b>D</b> Unfavorable	<b>Y</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>E</b>	<b>Z</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>F</b> Unfavorable	<b>AA</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>G</b> Unfavorable	<b>AB</b> Favorable	
		<b>H</b> Unfavorable	<b>AC</b> Unfavorable	<b>Funding:</b>
		<b>I</b>	<b>AD</b> Favorable	Yes: support tolled hwy
		<b>J</b>	<b>AE</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>K</b> Unfavorable	<b>AF</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>L</b> Unfavorable	<b>AG</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>M</b>	<b>AH</b> Favorable	
		<b>N</b>	<b>AI</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>O</b> Favorable	<b>AJ</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>P</b> Favorable	<b>AK</b> Favorable	<b>Response:</b>
		<b>Q</b> Unfavorable	<b>AL</b> Favorable	N/A
		<b>R</b> Unfavorable	<b>AM</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>S</b> Unfavorable	<b>AN</b> Favorable	
		<b>T</b> Unfavorable	<b>AO</b> Unfavorable	

# North-South Corridor Study Public Workshops December 2011 Public Involvement Summary - Comment Forms

28

Name/ Date	Mtg/Comment Type	Comment		
Jeff Moser	Public Workshop	<b>Segments:</b>	<b>U</b> Unfavorable	<b>Factors:</b>
12/8/11	Comment Form	<b>A</b> Unfavorable	<b>V</b> Favorable	Least impact to existing developmt
<b>Additional comments:</b>		<b>B</b> Unfavorable	<b>W</b> Unfavorable	Input rec'd from public
		<b>C</b> Unfavorable	<b>X</b> Favorable	Input rec'd from local gov't
		<b>D</b> Unfavorable	<b>Y</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>E</b> Unfavorable	<b>Z</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>F</b> Unfavorable	<b>AA</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>G</b> Unfavorable	<b>AB</b> Favorable	
		<b>H</b> Unfavorable	<b>AC</b> Unfavorable	<b>Funding:</b>
		<b>I</b> Favorable	<b>AD</b> Favorable	No: not support/won't use
		<b>J</b> Favorable	<b>AE</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>K</b> Unfavorable	<b>AF</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>L</b> Unfavorable	<b>AG</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>M</b> Unfavorable	<b>AH</b> Favorable	
		<b>N</b> Unfavorable	<b>AI</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>O</b> Favorable	<b>AJ</b> Unfavorable	<b>Response:</b>
		<b>P</b> Favorable	<b>AK</b> Favorable	N/A
		<b>Q</b> Unfavorable	<b>AL</b> Favorable	
		<b>R</b> Unfavorable	<b>AM</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>S</b> Unfavorable	<b>AN</b> Favorable	
		<b>T</b> Unfavorable	<b>AO</b> Unfavorable	

# North-South Corridor Study Public Workshops December 2011 Public Involvement Summary - Comment Forms

29

Name/ Date	Mtg/Comment Type	Comment			
Louis Demarino	Public Workshop	<b>Segments:</b>			
12/8/11	Comment Form	<b>A</b> Favorable	Best way to go to 60 from Anthem	<b>U</b>	<b>Factors:</b> Best relieves traffic/local streets Best connects to cities/towns Best connects to other major routes
		<b>B</b> Favorable	Best way to get to 60 from Anthem	<b>V</b>	
Additional comments:		<b>C</b> Favorable	This could work as well as H	<b>W</b>	
		<b>D</b> Favorable	Best way to go to 60 from Anthem	<b>X</b>	
		<b>E</b>		<b>Y</b> Favorable	Best way to go to I10 to from Anthem
		<b>F</b> Favorable	Best way to go to 60 from Anthem	<b>Z</b> Favorable	Best way to go to I10 from Anthem
		<b>G</b>		<b>AA</b> Favorable	Best way to go to I10 from Anthem
		<b>H</b> Favorable	Best way to go to 60 from Anthem	<b>AB</b>	
		<b>I</b>		<b>AC</b>	<b>Funding:</b> Yes: support tolled hwy Yes: use tolled hwy
		<b>J</b>		<b>AD</b>	
		<b>K</b>		<b>AE</b>	
		<b>L</b>		<b>AF</b>	
		<b>M</b>		<b>AG</b>	
		<b>N</b>		<b>AH</b>	
		<b>O</b>		<b>AI</b>	
		<b>P</b>		<b>AJ</b>	
		<b>Q</b>		<b>AK</b>	<b>Response:</b> N/A
		<b>R</b>		<b>AL</b>	
		<b>S</b>		<b>AM</b>	
		<b>T</b>		<b>AN</b>	
				<b>AO</b>	



# North-South Corridor Study Public Workshops December 2011 Public Involvement Summary - Comment Forms

30

Name/ Date	Mtg/Comment Type	Comment				
Carol Pearson	Public Workshop	<b>Segments:</b>		<b>U</b> Unfavorable	<b>Factors:</b> Best connects to other major routes Least impact to existing developmt Best use of existing roads/hwys	
12/8/11	Comment Form	<b>A</b> Favorable	Continuation of "B" closer to 202 intersecting existing R/W	<b>V</b> Unfavorable		existing agriculture area. impacts natural area
		<b>B</b> Favorable	Good access o Airport in Mesa existing R/W	<b>W</b> Unfavorable		existing agriculture area. impacts natural area
<b>Additional comments:</b>		<b>C</b>		<b>X</b> Unfavorable		to close in proximity for comfort. Road noise and poss. congestion also disruption to agriculsture cond.
		<b>D</b> Favorable	existing R/W	<b>Y</b> Favorable	existing R/W	
		<b>E</b>		<b>Z</b> Favorable	existing R/W	
		<b>F</b> Favorable		<b>AA</b> Favorable	Uses existing Hwy & R/W	
		<b>G</b>		<b>AB</b>		
		<b>H</b> Favorable		<b>AC</b>	<b>Funding:</b> No: not support/won't use	
		<b>I</b> Unfavorable		<b>AD</b>		
		<b>J</b> Unfavorable		<b>AE</b>		
		<b>K</b>		<b>AF</b>		
		<b>L</b>		<b>AG</b>		
		<b>M</b>		<b>AH</b>		
		<b>N</b> Unfavorable		<b>AI</b>		
		<b>O</b> Unfavorable		<b>AJ</b>	<b>Response:</b> N/A	
		<b>P</b> Unfavorable		<b>AK</b>		
		<b>Q</b> Unfavorable		<b>AL</b>		
		<b>R</b> Unfavorable	impacts natural areas.	<b>AM</b>		
		<b>S</b> Unfavorable	impacts natural areas.	<b>AN</b>		
		<b>T</b> Unfavorable	existing a agriculture area impacts natural area	<b>AO</b>		

# North-South Corridor Study Public Workshops December 2011 Public Involvement Summary - Comment Forms

31

Name/ Date	Mtg/Comment Type	Comment			
Mitch Pearson	Public Workshop	<b>Segments:</b>			
12/8/11	Comment Form	<b>A</b> Favorable	Direct, established route	<b>U</b>	<b>Factors:</b>
<b>Additional comments:</b>		<b>B</b> Favorable	D, F, N, below and access to gateway airport	<b>V</b>	Best connects to other major routes
		<b>C</b>		<b>W</b> Unfavorable	Least impact to existing developmt
		<b>D</b> Favorable	Follows present traffic patterns and accesses most municipalities	<b>X</b>	Best use of existing roads/hwys
		<b>E</b>		<b>Y</b> Favorable	
		<b>F</b> Favorable	See D, above and H below		Same as AA, A below and most direct route
		<b>G</b>		<b>Z</b> Favorable	Same as AA Below
		<b>H</b> Favorable	See D above and ease of access from Hunt Highway	<b>AA</b> Favorable	Currently the traffic pattern-least change
		<b>I</b>		<b>AB</b>	
		<b>J</b>		<b>AC</b>	<b>Funding:</b>
		<b>K</b>		<b>AD</b>	No: not support/won't use
		<b>L</b>		<b>AE</b>	
		<b>M</b>		<b>AF</b>	
		<b>N</b>		<b>AG</b>	
		<b>O</b> Unfavorable	Impact agricultural areas	<b>AH</b>	
		<b>P</b> Unfavorable	see o above	<b>AI</b>	
		<b>Q</b>		<b>AJ</b>	<b>Response:</b>
		<b>R</b>		<b>AK</b>	N/A
		<b>S</b>		<b>AL</b>	
		<b>T</b> Unfavorable	see o above	<b>AM</b>	
				<b>AN</b>	
				<b>AO</b>	

## North-South Corridor Study Public Workshops December 2011 Public Involvement Summary - Comment Forms

32

Name/ Date	Mtg/Comment Type	Comment			
Zak Solberg Draskovich	Public Workshop	<b>Segments:</b>			
12/8/11	Comment Form	<b>A</b> Favorable	I see no cause for objection to this	<b>U</b> Favorable	Saves homeowner complaints if any
		<b>V</b> Favorable	Access brings Development.		
		<b>B</b> Favorable	Already is high noise area from the R.R.	<b>W</b> Favorable	Cannot Do much else w/this area.
		<b>C</b> Favorable	Might save money over buying Gila Land	<b>X</b> Favorable	Bring more \$ from Tourists for Florence
		<b>D</b> Favorable	Area already has lots of traffic	<b>Y</b> Favorable	Strait Line Run. Much roadway already there.
		<b>E</b> Favorable	Leaves local traffic roads as they are.	<b>Z</b> Favorable	Strait Run-High Traffic area
		<b>F</b> Favorable	Already High noise area	<b>AA</b> Favorable	Strait Run high Traffic area.
		<b>G</b> Favorable	Already an area with noise, etc.	<b>AB</b> Favorable	Would make easy access for the Developments.
		<b>H</b> Favorable	Pickup traffic from Magic Ranch easier.	<b>AC</b> Favorable	Area is unused (virtually) now.
		<b>I</b> Favorable	I assume land would be cheaper than private or rez.	<b>AD</b> Favorable	Probably avoids potential hazards
		<b>J</b> Favorable	Avoids potential Hazards-Flood etc.	<b>AE</b> Favorable	Probably avoids potential hazards & pollution of Reservoir
		<b>K</b> Favorable	I see no reason to object.	<b>AF</b> Favorable	Parallels existing road-people could have a choice.
		<b>L</b> Favorable	Will probably bring more development.	<b>AG</b> Favorable	Again already a high noise area.
		<b>M</b> Favorable	obviously an area where this is Feasible.	<b>AH</b> Favorable	Again strait Run.
		<b>N</b> Favorable	Seems fairly straight.	<b>AI</b> Favorable	Again strait Run.
		<b>O</b> Favorable	Again, Fairly straight run-lower maintenance.	<b>AJ</b> Favorable	Moves, noise away from developed areas-might bring more devel.
		<b>P</b> Favorable	Again-easy access usually brings more development.	<b>AK</b> Favorable	Again fairly strait. Leaves more desert for view East & West
		<b>Q</b> Favorable	Again seems a compatible use for the area.	<b>AL</b> Favorable	Again in strait Run.
		<b>R</b> Favorable	Strait run-state trust should save \$.	<b>AM</b> Favorable	Already R.O.W for SRP-Why not no one else can use This area.
		<b>S</b> Favorable	Again State Trust Land.	<b>AN</b> Favorable	Avoids complications of P.C. planned area
		<b>T</b> Favorable	Again Access to Hwy's brings more development.	<b>AO</b> Favorable	Avoids potential problems w/cultural areas, Lawsuits, work stoppage, etc.
<b>Additional comments:</b> I personally would like to see the road made as much strait line as practicable. I think the fewer the curves-the more even the flow of traffic & I also think the straighter roads will save lives during Haboobs & Low intensity dust storms.					
				<b>Factors:</b> Best relieves traffic/local streets Best connects to other major routes Lowest cost	
				<b>Funding:</b> No: not support/won't use  I was raised in an area w/Toll roads (midwest) and I despised them-I still do and would not use it. I would drive 30+ miles out of my way to avoid a toll. As a young adult I would get out of my car-cover my plates & run the tolls.	
				<b>Response:</b> N/A	

## North-South Corridor Study Public Workshops December 2011 Public Involvement Summary - Comment Forms

Name/ Date	Mtg/Comment Type	Comment					
Anonymous	Public Workshop	<b>Segments:</b>			<b>U</b> Favorable	good link to set to AZ Farms Road	<b>Factors:</b> Best connects to other destinations Best connects to cities/towns Least impact to existing developmt
12/8/11	Comment Form	<b>A</b> Favorable	good connection to 60		<b>V</b> Favorable	good link to AZ Farms Road	
		<b>B</b> Favorable	serves people of San Tan Valley		<b>W</b> Favorable	Crazy! wrong side of Magma Dam!	
<b>Additional comments:</b> The best route would avoid Hunt Highway and Highway 79. We need these existing highways in addition to a new ADOT freeway.  Also, need to intersect AZ Farms Road in an area that will attract future retail and commercial development.		<b>C</b> Unfavorable	Too close to Hunt		<b>X</b> Favorable	goes around planned housing good option.	
		<b>D</b> Unfavorable	Too close to Hunt		<b>Y</b>		<b>Funding:</b> No: not support/won't use
		<b>E</b> Favorable	serves people in San Tan Valley		<b>Z</b>		
		<b>F</b> Unfavorable	Too close to Railroad		<b>AA</b>		
		<b>G</b> Favorable	Great location. In between 79 & Hunt		<b>AB</b>		
		<b>H</b> Unfavorable	Cuts through existing housing		<b>AC</b>		
		<b>I</b> Unfavorable	too far to the east		<b>AD</b>		
		<b>J</b> Unfavorable	too far to the east		<b>AE</b>		
		<b>K</b> Unfavorable	too close to 79		<b>AF</b>		
		<b>L</b> Favorable	Good crossing at AZ Farms Road		<b>AG</b>		
		<b>M</b> Unfavorable	Too far to the east		<b>AH</b>		
		<b>N</b> Unfavorable	Too far to the east		<b>AI</b>		
		<b>O</b> Favorable	good location if it connects to 60		<b>AJ</b>		
		<b>P</b> Favorable	good connection to AZ Farms Road		<b>AK</b>	<b>Response:</b> N/A	
		<b>Q</b> Unfavorable	Cuts through planned housing		<b>AL</b>		
		<b>R</b> Unfavorable	too far to the east		<b>AM</b>		
		<b>S</b> Unfavorable	too close to 79		<b>AN</b>		
		<b>T</b> Unfavorable	too close to 79, military reservation and Magma Dam		<b>AO</b>		

# North-South Corridor Study Public Workshops December 2011 Public Involvement Summary - Comment Forms

34

Name/ Date	Mtg/Comment Type	Comment		
Hillary Douglas	Public Workshop	<b>Segments:</b>	<b>U</b> Favorable	<b>Factors:</b> Best relieves traffic/local streets Best connects to cities/towns Input rec'd from local gov't
12/8/11	Comment Form	<b>A</b> Unfavorable	<b>V</b> Favorable	
<b>Additional comments:</b>		<b>B</b> Unfavorable	<b>W</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>C</b> Unfavorable	<b>X</b> Favorable	
		<b>D</b> Unfavorable	<b>Y</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>E</b> Favorable	<b>Z</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>F</b> Favorable	<b>AA</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>G</b> Favorable	<b>AB</b> Favorable	
		<b>H</b> Unfavorable	<b>AC</b> Favorable	<b>Funding:</b> Yes: support tolled hwy Yes: use tolled hwy
		<b>I</b> Favorable	<b>AD</b> Favorable	
		<b>J</b> Favorable	<b>AE</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>K</b> Favorable	<b>AF</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>L</b> Favorable	<b>AG</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>M</b> Unfavorable	<b>AH</b> Favorable	
		<b>N</b> Unfavorable	<b>AI</b> Favorable	
		<b>O</b> Favorable	<b>AJ</b> Favorable	<b>Response:</b> N/A
		<b>P</b> Favorable	<b>AK</b> Favorable	
		<b>Q</b> Unfavorable	<b>AL</b> Favorable	
		<b>R</b> Unfavorable	<b>AM</b> Favorable	
		<b>S</b> Unfavorable	<b>AN</b> Favorable	
		<b>T</b> Unfavorable	<b>AO</b> Unfavorable	

## North-South Corridor Study Public Workshops December 2011 Public Involvement Summary - Comment Forms

Name/ Date	Mtg/Comment Type	Comment				
Mark Eckhoff	Public Workshop	<b>Segments:</b>				<b>Factors:</b>
12/8/11	Comment Form	<b>A</b> Unfavorable	Need to preserve ex. surface arterial.	<b>U</b> Favorable	An alternate route to V	Best relieves traffic/local streets Best connects to employment ctrs Best connects to cities/towns
		<b>B</b> Unfavorable	This arterial too critical to lose. Impacts ex. devel.	<b>V</b> Favorable	An alternate route to U	
		<b>C</b> Unfavorable	Florence bypass devastating. Loss of critical arterial. Impacts ex. devel.	<b>W</b> Unfavorable	See T	
<b>Additional comments:</b>		<b>D</b> Unfavorable	See C above. This route would hurt Florence.	<b>X</b> Favorable	Most critical segment for long term sustainability of Florence.	
1. Add segment for E to connect to SR24 or 202.		<b>E</b> Favorable	If connected to SR 24 or 202.	<b>Y</b> Unfavorable	Bypasses Florence	
2. Please consider multi-modal options.		<b>F</b> Favorable	only if it connects to L	<b>Z</b> Unfavorable	Lose 87 w/ this option.	
3. Please recognize adopted preferences of local communities, such as Florence.		<b>G</b> Favorable	Keeps route W of CAP and could connect to SR 24.	<b>AA</b> Unfavorable	Lose 87 w/ this option.	
4. Need to figure out how the N-S will tie into the 24.		<b>H</b> Unfavorable	Dues not seem to be consistent w/ travel models.	<b>AB</b> Favorable	works with Florence alignment	
5. Analyze if NS and 24 built, is the US60 re-route still necessary?		<b>I</b> Favorable	connects to 60, though better options connect to SR 24 or 202	<b>AC</b> Favorable	works with Florence alignment	
6. Avoid impacting Magna Dam and Florence Military Reservation.		<b>J</b> Favorable	Works with preferred Florence alignment.	<b>AD</b> Favorable	Would work with Florence alignment	<b>Funding:</b> Yes: support tolled hwy Yes: use tolled hwy A toll facility is far more profitable to no facility.
		<b>K</b> Favorable	Optional route to get to 60.	<b>AE</b> Unfavorable	better alternatives (not much left of reservoir)	
		<b>L</b> Favorable	Works with most of Florence alignment and consistent with travel models.	<b>AF</b> Unfavorable	better alternatives	
		<b>M</b> Unfavorable	Favors unrealistic eastern routes T and W	<b>AG</b> Unfavorable	better alternatives	
		<b>N</b> Unfavorable	Better to connect to SR 24, 60 or 202	<b>AH</b> Favorable	Better than options to west	
		<b>O</b> Favorable	Works with Florence alignment.	<b>AI</b> Favorable	option to AK	
		<b>P</b> Favorable	Works with Florence alignment.	<b>AJ</b> Favorable	option to AK	<b>Response:</b> N/A
		<b>Q</b> Unfavorable	Further divides AMR and Merrill Ranch.	<b>AK</b> Favorable	works with AL	
		<b>R</b> Unfavorable	Poor start lend location.	<b>AL</b> Favorable	good term invs	
		<b>S</b> Unfavorable	Too far east and away from near & mid-term growth areas.	<b>AM</b> Favorable	could work with X	
		<b>T</b> Unfavorable	Costly. Dam impacts. FMR impacts. Not serving growth areas. Loss of econ. devel.	<b>AN</b> Favorable	works with Florence alignment and AL	
				<b>AO</b> Unfavorable	might work if still connects to X and avoid landfill	

# North-South Corridor Study Public Workshops December 2011 Public Involvement Summary - Comment Forms

36

Name/ Date	Mtg/Comment Type	Comment		
Twyn Armstrong	Public Workshop	<b>Segments:</b>		<b>U</b> Unfavorable
12/8/11	Comment Form	<b>A</b> Unfavorable	Does not increase road	<b>V</b> Unfavorable
<b>Additional comments:</b>		<b>B</b> Unfavorable	same.	<b>W</b>
		<b>C</b> Unfavorable	same.	<b>X</b> Unfavorable
		<b>D</b> Unfavorable	same.	<b>Y</b> Unfavorable
		<b>E</b> Unfavorable	same.	<b>Z</b> Unfavorable
		<b>F</b> Unfavorable	same.	<b>AA</b> Unfavorable
		<b>G</b> Unfavorable	same.	<b>AB</b> Unfavorable
		<b>H</b>		<b>AC</b> Unfavorable
		<b>I</b> Favorable	new road	<b>AD</b> Favorable
		<b>J</b> Favorable	same.	<b>AE</b> Unfavorable
		<b>K</b> Unfavorable		<b>AF</b> Unfavorable
		<b>L</b> Unfavorable		<b>AG</b> Unfavorable
		<b>M</b> Unfavorable		<b>AH</b> Favorable new rod.
		<b>N</b> Favorable		<b>AI</b> Favorable
		<b>O</b> Favorable	new rod	<b>AJ</b> Favorable new rod.
		<b>P</b> Unfavorable		<b>AK</b> Unfavorable
		<b>Q</b> Favorable		<b>AL</b> Favorable
		<b>R</b>		<b>AM</b> Favorable
		<b>S</b>		<b>AN</b> Unfavorable
		<b>T</b> Unfavorable		<b>AO</b> Unfavorable
				<b>Factors:</b> Best relieves traffic/local streets Best relieves traffic/hwys & frwys Best connects to other major routes Least impact to existing developmt
				<b>Funding:</b> Yes: support tolled hwy Yes: use tolled hwy
				<b>Response:</b> N/A

**North-South Corridor Study Public Workshops December 2011  
Public Involvement Summary - Comment Forms**

37

Name/ Date	Mtg/Comment Type	Comment			
Anonymous	Public Workshop	<b>Segments:</b>		<b>U</b> Unfavorable	<b>Factors:</b> Best relieves traffic/hwys & frwys Lowest cost Least impact to natural areas/open space
12/8/11	Comment Form	<b>A</b> Favorable	direct route-use existing situation	<b>V</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>B</b> Favorable	direct route-use existing situation	<b>W</b> Unfavorable	
<b>Additional comments:</b>		<b>C</b> Favorable	direct route	<b>X</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>D</b> Favorable	direct route	<b>Y</b>	
		<b>E</b>		<b>Z</b>	
		<b>F</b>		<b>AA</b>	
		<b>G</b>		<b>AB</b>	
		<b>H</b>		<b>AC</b>	<b>Funding:</b> Yes: support tolled hwy Yes: use tolled hwy For occasional use only. See additional comment. Toll roads in Denver have not produced the income anticipated. Care needs to be taken in not over estimating income if a toll highway is constructed.
		<b>I</b>		<b>AD</b>	
		<b>J</b>		<b>AE</b>	
		<b>K</b>		<b>AF</b>	
		<b>L</b>		<b>AG</b>	
		<b>M</b>		<b>AH</b>	
		<b>N</b>		<b>AI</b>	
		<b>O</b>		<b>AJ</b>	
		<b>P</b> Unfavorable		<b>AK</b>	<b>Response:</b> N/A
		<b>Q</b>		<b>AL</b>	
		<b>R</b> Unfavorable		<b>AM</b>	
		<b>S</b> Unfavorable		<b>AN</b>	
		<b>T</b> Unfavorable		<b>AO</b>	



# North-South Corridor Study Public Workshops December 2011 Public Involvement Summary - Comment Forms

38

Name/ Date	Mtg/Comment Type	Comment		
Earl Stegman	Public Workshop	<b>Segments:</b>	<b>U</b> Unfavorable	<b>Factors:</b>
12/8/11	Comment Form	<b>A</b> Favorable	<b>V</b> Unfavorable	Best connects to other major routes
<b>Additional comments:</b>		<b>B</b> Favorable	<b>W</b> Unfavorable	Least impact to existing developmt
		<b>C</b> Favorable	<b>X</b> Unfavorable	Best use of existing roads/hwys
		<b>D</b> Favorable	<b>Y</b> Favorable	
		<b>E</b> Favorable	<b>Z</b> Favorable	
		<b>F</b> Favorable	<b>AA</b> Favorable	
		<b>G</b> Favorable	<b>AB</b>	
		<b>H</b> Favorable	<b>AC</b> Favorable	<b>Funding:</b>
		<b>I</b> Favorable	<b>AD</b> Favorable	No: not support/won't use
		<b>J</b> Favorable	<b>AE</b>	
		<b>K</b> Favorable	<b>AF</b>	
		<b>L</b> Favorable	<b>AG</b>	
		<b>M</b> Unfavorable	<b>AH</b>	
		<b>N</b> Unfavorable	<b>AI</b>	
		<b>O</b> Favorable	<b>AJ</b>	
		<b>P</b> Unfavorable	<b>AK</b>	<b>Response:</b>
		<b>Q</b> Favorable	<b>AL</b>	N/A
		<b>R</b> Unfavorable	<b>AM</b> Favorable	
		<b>S</b> Unfavorable	<b>AN</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>T</b> Unfavorable	<b>AO</b> Unfavorable	

# North-South Corridor Study Public Workshops December 2011 Public Involvement Summary - Comment Forms

39

Name/ Date	Mtg/Comment Type	Comment			
Leo Strait	Public Workshop	<b>Segments:</b>		<b>U</b>	<b>Factors:</b> Best relieves traffic/local streets Best connects to other destinations Best use of existing roads/hwys
12/8/11	Comment Form	<b>A</b> Favorable	most direct	<b>V</b>	
		<b>B</b> Favorable	most direct	<b>W</b>	
<b>Additional comments:</b> How many access roads to service roads?		<b>C</b>		<b>X</b>	
		<b>D</b> Favorable		<b>Y</b> Favorable	
Would like a copy of table map if possible.		<b>E</b>		<b>Z</b> Favorable	
		<b>F</b> Favorable		<b>AA</b> Favorable	
		<b>G</b>		<b>AB</b>	
		<b>H</b> Favorable		<b>AC</b>	<b>Funding:</b> Yes: use tolled hwy
		<b>I</b>		<b>AD</b>	
		<b>J</b>		<b>AE</b>	
		<b>K</b>		<b>AF</b>	
		<b>L</b>		<b>AG</b>	
		<b>M</b>		<b>AH</b>	
		<b>N</b>		<b>AI</b>	
		<b>O</b>		<b>AJ</b>	<b>Response:</b>
		<b>P</b>		<b>AK</b>	
		<b>Q</b>		<b>AL</b>	
		<b>R</b>		<b>AM</b>	
		<b>S</b>		<b>AN</b>	
		<b>T</b>		<b>AO</b>	

**Additional comments:**  
How many access roads to service roads?

Would like a copy of table map if possible.

## North-South Corridor Study Public Workshops December 2011 Public Involvement Summary - Comment Forms

Name/ Date	Mtg/Comment Type	Comment		
Maryann Kaczmarek	Public Workshop	<b>Segments:</b>	<b>U</b>	<b>Factors:</b>
12/8/11	Comment Form	<b>A</b>	<b>V</b> Unfavorable devalues homes	Best relieves traffic/local streets
		<b>B</b>	<b>W</b>	Lowest cost
		<b>C</b>	<b>X</b> Unfavorable no easy access	Least impact to existing developmt
		<b>D</b>	<b>Y</b>	
		<b>E</b>	<b>Z</b>	
		<b>F</b>	<b>AA</b>	
		<b>G</b>	<b>AB</b>	
		<b>H</b> Unfavorable would cause more of devaluation of property.	<b>AC</b>	<b>Funding:</b>
		<b>I</b> Favorable less disruptive	<b>AD</b>	No: not support/won't use
		<b>J</b> Favorable less disruptive	<b>AE</b>	Maximize taxes & fed money other than putting yet another fiancial burden on tax payers.
		<b>K</b>	<b>AF</b>	avoid overspending and assign contract to lowest bidder. not friends, family or "special interest". Do not raises taxes & fund this. Enough with unethical politicians
		<b>L</b>	<b>AG</b>	
		<b>M</b>	<b>AH</b>	
		<b>N</b>	<b>AI</b>	
		<b>O</b>	<b>AJ</b>	
		<b>P</b> Unfavorable disrupts developments devalues homes.	<b>AK</b>	<b>Response:</b>
		<b>Q</b> Unfavorable devalues homes	<b>AL</b>	N/A
		<b>R</b> Favorable use vacant land	<b>AM</b>	
		<b>S</b> Favorable uses vacant land	<b>AN</b>	
		<b>T</b> Unfavorable too costly	<b>AO</b>	

# North-South Corridor Study Public Workshops December 2011 Public Involvement Summary - Comment Forms

41

Name/ Date	Mtg/Comment Type	Comment		
Dorian Espinoza	Public Workshop	<b>Segments:</b>	<b>U</b> Unfavorable	<b>Factors:</b>
12/8/11	Comment Form	<b>A</b> Unfavorable	<b>V</b> Unfavorable	Best relieves traffic/local streets
		<b>B</b> Unfavorable	<b>W</b> Unfavorable	Best connects to other destinations
		<b>C</b> Unfavorable	<b>X</b> Unfavorable	Best connects to cities/towns
		<b>D</b> Unfavorable	<b>Y</b> Unfavorable	Best connects to other major routes
		<b>E</b> Unfavorable	<b>Z</b> Favorable	Least impact to existing developmt
		<b>F</b> Unfavorable	<b>AA</b> Favorable	Best use of existing roads/hwys
		<b>G</b> Unfavorable	<b>AB</b> Favorable	Other
		<b>H</b> Unfavorable	<b>AC</b> Favorable	<b>Funding:</b>
		<b>I</b> Favorable	<b>AD</b> Favorable	No: not support/won't use
		<b>J</b> Unfavorable	<b>AE</b> Favorable	People would just avoid it so no use building it
		<b>K</b> Unfavorable	<b>AF</b> Favorable	
		<b>L</b> Unfavorable	<b>AG</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>M</b> Favorable	<b>AH</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>N</b> Favorable	<b>AI</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>O</b> Favorable	<b>AJ</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>P</b> Unfavorable	<b>AK</b> Unfavorable	<b>Response:</b>
		<b>Q</b> Favorable	<b>AL</b> Unfavorable	N/A
		<b>R</b> Unfavorable	<b>AM</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>S</b> Unfavorable	<b>AN</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>T</b> Unfavorable	<b>AO</b> Unfavorable	

# North-South Corridor Study Public Workshops December 2011 Public Involvement Summary - Comment Forms

42

Name/ Date	Mtg/Comment Type	Comment		
Jack Hamilton	Public Workshop			
12/8/11	Comment Form			
Additional comments:				
		<b>Segments:</b>	<b>U</b> Unfavorable	<b>Factors:</b>
		<b>A</b> Unfavorable Heavy population	<b>V</b> Unfavorable	Best relieves traffic/local streets
		<b>B</b> Unfavorable	<b>W</b> Unfavorable	Best connects to other major routes
		<b>C</b> Unfavorable	<b>X</b> Unfavorable	Least impact to existing developmt
		<b>D</b> Unfavorable Road already there.	<b>Y</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>E</b> Unfavorable	<b>Z</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>F</b>	<b>AA</b>	
		<b>G</b>	<b>AB</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>H</b> Unfavorable	<b>AC</b> Unfavorable	<b>Funding:</b>
		<b>I</b> Favorable will need to widen 60.	<b>AD</b> Favorable	No: not support/won't use
		<b>J</b> Favorable	<b>AE</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>K</b> Unfavorable	<b>AF</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>L</b> Unfavorable	<b>AG</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>M</b> Unfavorable	<b>AH</b> Favorable	
		<b>N</b> Unfavorable	<b>AI</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>O</b> Favorable	<b>AJ</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>P</b> Unfavorable	<b>AK</b> Favorable	<b>Response:</b>
		<b>Q</b> Favorable	<b>AL</b> Favorable	N/A
		<b>R</b> Unfavorable to far out east	<b>AM</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>S</b> Unfavorable	<b>AN</b> Favorable	
		<b>T</b> Unfavorable to far out east	<b>AO</b> Favorable	

# North-South Corridor Study Public Workshops December 2011 Public Involvement Summary - Comment Forms

Name/ Date	Mtg/Comment Type	Comment		
Barbara Hamilton	Public Workshop	<b>Segments:</b>		<b>U</b> Unfavorable
12/8/11	Comment Form	<b>A</b> Unfavorable	Too much development in place.	<b>V</b> Unfavorable
<b>Additional comments:</b> In general use most direct routes -avoid areas of development or cultural items. -make use of open lands.		<b>B</b> Unfavorable		<b>W</b> Unfavorable
		<b>C</b> Unfavorable	Not necessary	<b>X</b> Unfavorable Too close to development Florence gardens
		<b>D</b> Unfavorable		<b>Y</b> Unfavorable
		<b>E</b> Unfavorable		<b>Z</b> Unfavorable
		<b>F</b> Unfavorable		<b>AA</b>
		<b>G</b> Unfavorable		<b>AB</b> Unfavorable
		<b>H</b> Unfavorable		<b>AC</b> Unfavorable
		<b>I</b> Favorable	Takes advantage of Hwy 60 already in place	<b>AD</b> Favorable
		<b>J</b> Favorable		<b>AE</b> Unfavorable
		<b>K</b> Unfavorable		<b>AF</b> Unfavorable
		<b>L</b> Unfavorable		<b>AG</b> Unfavorable
		<b>M</b> Unfavorable		<b>AH</b> Favorable
		<b>N</b> Unfavorable		<b>AI</b> Unfavorable
		<b>O</b> Favorable		<b>AJ</b> Unfavorable
		<b>P</b> Unfavorable		<b>AK</b> Favorable
		<b>Q</b> Favorable		<b>AL</b> Favorable
		<b>R</b> Unfavorable		<b>AM</b> Unfavorable
		<b>S</b> Unfavorable		<b>AN</b> Favorable
		<b>T</b> Unfavorable		<b>AO</b> Favorable
				<b>Factors:</b> Best relieves traffic/hwys & frwys Best connects to other major routes Least impact to existing developmt
				<b>Funding:</b> No: not support/won't use
				<b>Response:</b> N/A

# North-South Corridor Study Public Workshops December 2011 Public Involvement Summary - Comment Forms

Name/ Date	Mtg/Comment Type	Comment	
Dale Gastaldin	Public Workshop	<b>Segments:</b>	<b>U</b>
12/8/11	Comment Form	<b>A</b> Favorable use of exist Hwy.	<b>V</b>
		<b>B</b> Favorable use of exist Hwy.	<b>W</b>
		<b>C</b>	<b>X</b>
		<b>D</b> Favorable services large development area at Merrill ranch.	<b>Y</b>
		<b>E</b> Favorable Faster more direct route south	<b>Z</b>
		<b>F</b> Favorable Better direct route south	<b>AA</b>
		<b>G</b> Favorable Better direct route south	<b>AB</b>
		<b>H</b> Favorable Better direct route south	<b>AC</b>
		<b>I</b> Favorable Use of new 60 relocation	<b>AD</b>
		<b>J</b> Favorable Better direct route south	<b>AE</b>
		<b>K</b> Favorable Better direct route south	<b>AF</b>
		<b>L</b>	<b>AG</b>
		<b>M</b>	<b>AH</b>
		<b>N</b>	<b>AI</b>
		<b>O</b> Favorable Better direct route south	<b>AJ</b>
		<b>P</b>	<b>AK</b>
		<b>Q</b> Favorable Better direct route south	<b>AL</b>
		<b>R</b>	<b>AM</b>
		<b>S</b>	<b>AN</b>
		<b>T</b>	<b>AO</b>

**Factors:**

Best connects to other destinations  
Best connects to other major routes  
Best use of existing roads/hwys

**Funding:**

Yes: support tolled hwy  
Yes: use tolled hwy

**Response:**

N/A

**Additional comments:**  
Use of exist Hwys or roads would only work if exist. Communities did not have to be bought out for road R/W as the cost would be excessive.

# North-South Corridor Study Public Workshops December 2011 Public Involvement Summary - Comment Forms

45

Name/ Date	Mtg/Comment Type	Comment			
Sharon Gastaldin	Public Workshop	<b>Segments:</b>		<b>U</b>	<b>Factors:</b> Best connects to other destinations Best connects to other major routes Best use of existing roads/hwys
12/8/11	Comment Form	<b>A</b> Favorable	use of existing hwy	<b>V</b>	
		<b>B</b> Favorable	use of existing hwy	<b>W</b>	
<b>Additional comments:</b>		<b>C</b>		<b>X</b>	
		<b>D</b> Favorable	services large population area	<b>Y</b>	
		<b>E</b>		<b>Z</b>	
		<b>F</b> Favorable	Reduces traffic on Hunt Hwy	<b>AA</b>	
		<b>G</b> Favorable	faster route to Hwy 60/Apache Junc. & Gold Canyon	<b>AB</b>	
		<b>H</b> Favorable	faster route to alternative route F/B & A instead of Hunt Hwy	<b>AC</b>	<b>Funding:</b> Yes: support tolled hwy Yes: use tolled hwy
		<b>I</b> Favorable	faster route to Apache Junction	<b>AD</b>	
		<b>J</b> Favorable	faster route to Apache Junction	<b>AE</b>	
		<b>K</b> Favorable	faster route to Apache Junction/Hwy 60/Gold Canyon	<b>AF</b>	
		<b>L</b>		<b>AG</b>	
		<b>M</b>		<b>AH</b>	
		<b>N</b> Favorable	faster route to Gold Canyon.	<b>AI</b>	
		<b>O</b> Favorable	more direct faster route to	<b>AJ</b>	
		<b>P</b>		<b>AK</b>	<b>Response:</b> N/A
		<b>Q</b> Favorable		<b>AL</b>	
		<b>R</b>		<b>AM</b>	
		<b>S</b>		<b>AN</b>	
		<b>T</b>		<b>AO</b>	

**Factors:**  
Best connects to other destinations  
Best connects to other major routes  
Best use of existing roads/hwys

**Funding:**  
Yes: support tolled hwy  
Yes: use tolled hwy

**Response:**  
N/A



# North-South Corridor Study Public Workshops December 2011 Public Involvement Summary - Comment Forms

46

Name/ Date	Mtg/Comment Type	Comment			
Brian Espinoza	Public Workshop	<b>Segments:</b>			
12/8/11	Comment Form	A		U	<b>Factors:</b>
		B		V	Best relieves traffic/local streets
Additional comments:		C		W	Best connects to other destinations
		D		X	Best connects to cities/towns
		E		Y	
		F		Z	
		G		AA	
		H		AB	
		I Favorable	Leads directly to US60	AC	<b>Funding:</b>
		J Favorable	Perfect for everybody	AD Favorable	No: not support/won't use
		K		AE	or ? How much would it cost? Never been tolled in my life so not familiar. If it would be to expensive to drive on people would not use it and it would be useless
		L		AF	
		M		AG	
		N		AH Favorable	No housing developments that will be affected
		O Favorable	Doesn't bother anything much no houses	AI	
		P		AJ	
		Q Favorable	close to me doesn't bother many other area's and 500KW Line is located next to it	AK Favorable	Close to developments that it can be used to travel.
		R		AL Favorable	No developments nearby that could be affected
		S		AM	
		T		AN Favorable	Close to the Coolidge Airport supposed to be new airport so it would be logical to put it next to it.
				AO	
					<b>Response:</b> N/A

# North-South Corridor Study Public Workshops December 2011 Public Involvement Summary - Comment Forms

Name/ Date	Mtg/Comment Type	Comment		
Josh Bagley	Public Workshop	<b>Segments:</b>	<b>U</b> Favorable	<b>Factors:</b>
12/12/11	Comment Form	<b>A</b> Unfavorable	<b>V</b> Favorable	Best connects to employment ctrs
<b>Additional comments:</b> support what the city supports, support commercial development		<b>B</b> Unfavorable	<b>W</b> Unfavorable	Best connects to cities/towns
		<b>C</b> Unfavorable	<b>X</b> Unfavorable	Other
		<b>D</b> Unfavorable	<b>Y</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>E</b> Unfavorable	<b>Z</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>F</b> Unfavorable	<b>AA</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>G</b> Favorable	<b>AB</b> Favorable	
		<b>H</b> Unfavorable	<b>AC</b> Favorable	<b>Funding:</b>
		<b>I</b> Favorable	<b>AD</b> Favorable	Yes: use tolled hwy
		<b>J</b> Favorable	<b>AE</b> Favorable	
		<b>K</b> Unfavorable	<b>AF</b> Favorable	
		<b>L</b> Unfavorable this well become major commercial area & Florence supports it	<b>AG</b> Favorable	
		<b>M</b> Unfavorable	<b>AH</b> Favorable	
		<b>N</b> Favorable	<b>AI</b> Favorable	
		<b>O</b> Favorable The city of Florence supports this area & will create employment & commercial	<b>AJ</b> Favorable	
		<b>P</b> Favorable	<b>AK</b> Favorable	<b>Response:</b>
		<b>Q</b> Unfavorable	<b>AL</b> Favorable	N/A
		<b>R</b> Unfavorable	<b>AM</b> Favorable	
		<b>S</b> Unfavorable	<b>AN</b> Favorable	
		<b>T</b> Unfavorable	<b>AO</b> Favorable	

## North-South Corridor Study Public Workshops December 2011 Public Involvement Summary - Comment Forms

Name/ Date	Mtg/Comment Type	Comment			
Charles Vogel	Public Workshop				
12/12/11	Comment Form				
<b>Additional comments:</b> tried to stay away from existing roads and citizenery straightest route					
		<b>Segments:</b>	<b>U</b>		<b>Factors:</b>
		<b>A</b> Unfavorable Disruption w/ existing traffic-appears more costly might piss off a bunch of citizens	<b>V</b>		Best relieves traffic/local streets
		<b>B</b> Unfavorable same w/a	<b>W</b> Unfavorable	Appears to be in flood plain of diversion dam	Least impact to existing developmt
		<b>C</b> Unfavorable Too Indirect	<b>X</b> Favorable	Helps entry to Florence approach	
		<b>D</b> Unfavorable	<b>Y</b> Unfavorable		
		<b>E</b>	<b>Z</b> Unfavorable		
		<b>F</b>	<b>AA</b>		
		<b>G</b>	<b>AB</b> Favorable	similar to AM-AD AM-no preferrable to disruption on Felix Rd w/AB	
		<b>H</b>	<b>AC</b> Favorable	similar w/AN east of existing power plant	<b>Funding:</b>
		<b>I</b> Favorable	<b>AD</b> Favorable	logical connection w/AC-AN	No: not support/won't use
		<b>J</b>	<b>AE</b>		
		<b>K</b>	<b>AF</b>		
		<b>L</b>	<b>AG</b>		
		<b>M</b> Favorable want to move further east	<b>AH</b> Favorable	Furthest from existing SR87	
		<b>N</b>	<b>AI</b> Unfavorable	Disruption to local traffic & existing farm operations & Vail Rd.	
		<b>O</b>	<b>AJ</b>		
		<b>P</b>	<b>AK</b> Favorable	Least disruptive & straighter path to pt 5 junction	<b>Response:</b>
		<b>Q</b>	<b>AL</b> Favorable	Furthest away from SR87 & local traffic	N/A
		<b>R</b> Furthest eastern route and more central to N/S corridor	<b>AM</b> Favorable	Best location for straight line-should be cheapest of 3 alt. legs could disrupt local traffic on Valley Farms	
		<b>S</b> Favorable	<b>AN</b> Favorable	Similar W/AC Furthest from Power Plant in Randolph	
		<b>T</b> Favorable stays on west side of magma diversion dam	<b>AO</b> Favorable	Best location to minimize impact on locals preferable to AM-AB	

# North-South Corridor Study Public Workshops December 2011 Public Involvement Summary - Comment Forms

Name/ Date	Mtg/Comment Type	Comment		
Jane Vogel	Public Workshop			
12/12/11	Comment Form			
Additional comments:				
		<b>Segments:</b>	<b>U</b>	<b>Factors:</b>
		<b>A</b> Unfavorable Ironwood will be a good surface street as the freeway	<b>V</b>	Best relieves traffic/local streets
		<b>B</b> Unfavorable already too well travelled-heavy traffic	<b>W</b> Unfavorable to close to E side of Magma Dam.	Least impact to existing developmt
		<b>C</b>	<b>X</b> Favorable	Input rec'd from public
		<b>D</b> Unfavorable To close to Sun city Anthem-our home	<b>Y</b> Unfavorable existing residences also 87 is a good alternate to Gilbert/Chandler	
		<b>E</b>	<b>Z</b> Unfavorable same as Y	
		<b>F</b>	<b>AA</b>	
		<b>G</b>	<b>AB</b> Favorable	
		<b>H</b> Unfavorable Too close to residential	<b>AC</b>	<b>Funding:</b>
		<b>I</b> Favorable easily accessible from W60 & e60 to go South not too close to homes yet.	<b>AD</b> Favorable	No: not support/won't use
		<b>J</b>	<b>AE</b>	
		<b>K</b>	<b>AF</b>	
		<b>L</b> Unfavorable proposed development com'l & residential	<b>AG</b>	
		<b>M</b> Favorable	<b>AH</b> Favorable	
		<b>N</b>	<b>AI</b> Favorable	
		<b>O</b>	<b>AJ</b> Favorable	
		<b>P</b> Unfavorable existing homes	<b>AK</b>	<b>Response:</b>
		<b>Q</b> Unfavorable Too close to Sun City, Anthem-our home	<b>AL</b> Favorable	N/A
		<b>R</b>	<b>AM</b>	
		<b>S</b> Favorable	<b>AN</b> Favorable	
		<b>T</b> Favorable	<b>AO</b>	

# North-South Corridor Study Public Workshops December 2011 Public Involvement Summary - Comment Forms

50

Name/ Date	Mtg/Comment Type	Comment	
Kay Stoneburner	Public Workshop	<b>Segments:</b>	<b>U</b>
12/12/11	Comment Form	<b>A</b>	<b>V</b> Favorable
<b>Additional comments:</b>		<b>B</b>	<b>W</b>
		<b>C</b>	<b>X</b> Favorable
		<b>D</b>	<b>Y</b>
		<b>E</b>	<b>Z</b>
		<b>F</b>	<b>AA</b>
		<b>G</b>	<b>AB</b>
		<b>H</b>	<b>AC</b>
		<b>I</b> Favorable	<b>AD</b>
		<b>J</b> Favorable	<b>AE</b>
		<b>K</b>	<b>AF</b>
		<b>L</b>	<b>AG</b>
		<b>M</b>	<b>AH</b>
		<b>N</b>	<b>AI</b>
		<b>O</b> Favorable	<b>AJ</b>
		<b>P</b> Favorable	<b>AK</b>
		<b>Q</b> Unfavorable too close to Anthem	<b>AL</b>
		<b>R</b>	<b>AM</b>
		<b>S</b>	<b>AN</b>
		<b>T</b>	<b>AO</b>
			<b>Factors:</b> Best relieves traffic/local streets Best relieves traffic/hwys & frwys Best connects to cities/towns
			<b>Funding:</b> Yes: support tolled hwy Yes: use tolled hwy
			<b>Response:</b> N/A

## North-South Corridor Study Public Workshops December 2011 Public Involvement Summary - Comment Forms

Name/ Date	Mtg/Comment Type	Comment			
Gerry Stoneburner	Public Workshop	<b>Segments:</b>			
12/12/11	Comment Form	<b>A</b>	Is okay but prefer I where it would be more convenient to build and avoid	<b>U</b> Favorable	will pick up future development
<b>Additional comments:</b> -Road abouts preferred to signals.		<b>B</b> Unfavorable	To disruptive to existing traffic	<b>V</b>	
		<b>C</b> Unfavorable	To much congestion already in the area	<b>W</b>	less favorable
		<b>D</b> Unfavorable		<b>X</b> Favorable	Less disruptive and plans for the future growth. See Florence!
		<b>E</b> Unfavorable	No desirable due to its destination to G	<b>Y</b> Unfavorable	To disruptive
		<b>F</b> Unfavorable	To busy now area	<b>Z</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>G</b> Unfavorable	Not effecient for const w/ existing developmt & vehicle travel.	<b>AA</b>	
		<b>H</b> Unfavorable	same as above	<b>AB</b>	
		<b>I</b> Favorable	seems the most desirable & cleanest.	<b>AC</b>	
		<b>J</b> Favorable	Because it would be most efficient to build less disruptive to existing	<b>AD</b> Favorable	
		<b>K</b> Unfavorable	Would be toward existing problems & development	<b>AE</b>	
		<b>L</b> Unfavorable	Avoid this area which is adjacent to excellent development & Aq.	<b>AF</b>	
		<b>M</b>		<b>AG</b>	
		<b>N</b>		<b>AH</b> Favorable	
		<b>O</b> Favorable	Because it would be most effecient to build	<b>AI</b>	
		<b>P</b> Favorable	Will meet good construction efficiency	<b>AJ</b>	
		<b>Q</b> Unfavorable	Would be disruptive to existing building & Ag.	<b>AK</b> Favorable	
		<b>R</b> Unfavorable	Not desirable	<b>AL</b> Favorable	
		<b>S</b> Unfavorable	Not desirable due to far from any known development	<b>AM</b>	
		<b>T</b> Unfavorable		<b>AN</b> Favorable	
				<b>AO</b> Favorable	It avoids existing traffic & business
		<b>Factors:</b> Least impact to existing developmt Other			
		<b>Funding:</b> No: not support/won't use			
		<b>Response:</b> N/A			

# North-South Corridor Study Public Workshops December 2011 Public Involvement Summary - Comment Forms

Name/ Date	Mtg/Comment Type	Comment			
Dillon Feeney	Public Workshop	<b>Segments:</b>		<b>U</b>	<b>Factors:</b>
12/12/11	Comment Form	<b>A</b> Favorable	Good starting point. Noted on map as FIRST CHOICE	<b>V</b>	Best relieves traffic/local streets
		<b>B</b> Unfavorable	Cuts through large community.	<b>W</b>	Best connects to other major routes
		<b>C</b> Unfavorable	Current work on Hunt. Current house is affected.	<b>X</b>	Least impact to planned developmt
		<b>D</b> Favorable	Good route south. Few homes are affected.	<b>Y</b>	Other
		<b>E</b> Favorable	Possible connection to SR-24	<b>Z</b>	
		<b>F</b> Unfavorable	Homes are affected	<b>AA</b>	
		<b>G</b> Favorable	Direct route South.	<b>AB</b>	
		<b>H</b> Favorable	Direct route South.	<b>AC</b>	<b>Funding:</b>
		<b>I</b> Favorable	Good starting point. Allows for improvement. Noted on map asSECOND CHOICE	<b>AD</b>	No: not support/won't use
		<b>J</b> Favorable	Connection to SR-24. Few homes affected.	<b>AE</b>	
		<b>K</b> Favorable	No homes affected.	<b>AF</b>	
		<b>L</b>		<b>AG</b>	
		<b>M</b>		<b>AH</b>	
		<b>N</b>		<b>AI</b>	
		<b>O</b>		<b>AJ</b>	
		<b>P</b>		<b>AK</b>	<b>Response:</b>
		<b>Q</b>		<b>AL</b>	N/A
		<b>R</b>		<b>AM</b>	
		<b>S</b>		<b>AN</b>	
		<b>T</b>		<b>AO</b>	

**Additional comments:**  
Southern Route is left blank because I should not choose who is affected below the 287.

## North-South Corridor Study Public Workshops December 2011 Public Involvement Summary - Comment Forms

Name/ Date	Mtg/Comment Type	Comment	
Jennifer O'Hare	Public Workshop	<b>Segments:</b>	
12/12/11	Comment Form	<b>A</b> Favorable	On existing road, less environmental effect (nature)
<b>Additional comments:</b> We're waiting for the rail!! We'll use it every day! We'll pay for it! Please use existing roads! They are in the best locations for a path into town!  Don't pull a North 202 and swing it way out of the way! We never use it, it takes too long even though it's empty		<b>B</b> Favorable	straight shot high traffic, high need
		<b>C</b> Unfavorable	Seem like the noise level with the mountain there would be negative/enviro sensitive
		<b>D</b> Favorable	follows existing road less new
		<b>E</b> Unfavorable	stupid route. wastes mileage. out of the way.
		<b>F</b> Favorable	Ok, straight route from Phoenix to Tucson, existing roads
		<b>G</b> Unfavorable	Bad route, over residential area with no high volume roads
		<b>H</b> Favorable	Good route down, less mileage from town
		<b>I</b> Favorable	Ok, not so far out of the way for people coming from Phoenix, kind of out of the way for residents
		<b>J</b> Favorable	
		<b>K</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>L</b> Favorable	
		<b>M</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>N</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>O</b> Favorable	
		<b>P</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>Q</b> Favorable	
		<b>R</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>S</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>T</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>U</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>V</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>W</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>X</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>Y</b> Favorable	Best route, straight shot, existing roads
		<b>Z</b> Favorable	Best route, existing roads
		<b>AA</b> Favorable	Best route, straight shot, existing roads
		<b>AB</b> Favorable	less mileage down
		<b>AC</b> Favorable	Direct route
		<b>AD</b> Favorable	Ok, straight down, roads there
		<b>AE</b> Favorable	Ok, if coming from Q, direct route down
		<b>AF</b> Favorable	Ok, Z is better
		<b>AG</b> Favorable	Ok cuts over for Tucson
		<b>AH</b> Unfavorable	Too close to reservoir
		<b>AI</b> Unfavorable	Reservoir
		<b>AJ</b> Favorable	Ok for going to Tucson, not as good as AA
		<b>AK</b> Unfavorable	off AH, out of the way
		<b>AL</b> Favorable	Direct route down useful.
		<b>AM</b> Favorable	Direct route down, less mileage
		<b>AN</b> Unfavorable	Ok. Already developed, but not a ton of houses
		<b>AO</b> Unfavorable	Out of the way. Not intuitive
		<b>Factors:</b>	
		Best connects to other major routes	
		Least impact to natural areas/open space	
		Best use of existing roads/hwys	
		<b>Funding:</b>	
		Yes: use tolled hwy	
		But I wouldn't like it. Why do we have to pay alone? None of the other towns have to do that.	
		<b>Response:</b>	
		N/A	



## North-South Corridor Study Public Workshops December 2011 Public Involvement Summary - Comment Forms

Name/ Date	Mtg/Comment Type	Comment	
Anthony O'Hare	Public Workshop	<b>Segments:</b>	
12/12/11	Comment Form	<b>A</b> Favorable	Heavily used route already and connects US60 to many commercial center in S.T.V.
		<b>B</b> Favorable	same as "A"
		<b>C</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>D</b> Favorable	
		<b>E</b> Unfavorable	Route does not pass through commercial centers and does not connect to enough existing roads.
		<b>F</b> Favorable	Follows existing RR tracks so noise should not be as large an issue to residents.
		<b>G</b> Unfavorable	No existing homes/roads/business to connect. Poor use of state trust land.
		<b>H</b> Favorable	
		<b>I</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>J</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>K</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>L</b> Favorable	
		<b>M</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>N</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>O</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>P</b>	
		<b>Q</b> Favorable	
		<b>R</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>S</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>T</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>U</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>V</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>W</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>X</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>Y</b> Favorable	Most direct Rt from US 60
		<b>Z</b> Favorable	Most direct Route from US60
		<b>AA</b> Favorable	Most direct route from US60
		<b>AB</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>AC</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>AD</b> Favorable	
		<b>AE</b> Favorable	
		<b>AF</b> Favorable	
		<b>AG</b> Favorable	
		<b>AH</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>AI</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>AJ</b> Favorable	
		<b>AK</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>AL</b> Favorable	
		<b>AM</b> Favorable	
		<b>AN</b> Favorable	
		<b>AO</b> Favorable	
<b>Additional comments:</b>		<b>Factors:</b>	
Not enough homes/people live in the far east valley to require a freeway that connects to US 60 East of Ironwood. The most useful route would be via the existing Ironwood/Gantzel Route which is very heavily used already. A freeway east of Ironwood would not relieve this traffic from Ironwood.		Best connects to other major routes Least impact to natural areas/open space Best use of existing roads/hwys	
This area suffers from a severe lack of public transportation that, if existed, may negate the need for a freeway.		<b>Funding:</b>	
		No: not support/won't use	
		<b>Response:</b>	
		N/A	
		If all freeways in AZ were tollways. I would support this. However, I would pay taxes to maintain Freeways in NW valley that I do not use while also paying a toll for my local tollway that other parts of the valley do not pay for. This does not seem fair.	

# North-South Corridor Study Public Workshops December 2011 Public Involvement Summary - Comment Forms

55

Name/ Date	Mtg/Comment Type	Comment		
Bob & Frances Mutolo	Public Workshop	<b>Segments:</b>	<b>U</b> Unfavorable	<b>Factors:</b> Best relieves traffic/local streets Lowest cost Best use of existing roads/hwys
12/12/11	Comment Form	<b>A</b> Favorable	<b>V</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>B</b> Favorable	<b>W</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>C</b> Favorable	<b>X</b> Unfavorable	
<b>Additional comments:</b> The corridor from N-A to S-AA seems to be the most direct route from I-60 to the I10		<b>D</b> Favorable	<b>Y</b> Favorable	
Looking at the area that has the greater population (now or potential) this seems to be consistant in design principle.		<b>E</b> Unfavorable	<b>Z</b> Favorable	
Also to lessen the traffic on city streets		<b>F</b> Unfavorable	<b>AA</b> Favorable	
		<b>G</b> Unfavorable	<b>AB</b> Unfavorable	<b>Funding:</b> No: not support/won't use
		<b>H</b> Unfavorable	<b>AC</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>I</b> Unfavorable	<b>AD</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>J</b> Unfavorable	<b>AE</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>K</b> Unfavorable	<b>AF</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>L</b> Unfavorable	<b>AG</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>M</b> Unfavorable	<b>AH</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>N</b> Unfavorable	<b>AI</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>O</b> Unfavorable	<b>AJ</b> Unfavorable	<b>Response:</b> N/A
		<b>P</b> Unfavorable	<b>AK</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>Q</b> Unfavorable	<b>AL</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>R</b> Unfavorable	<b>AM</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>S</b> Unfavorable	<b>AN</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>T</b> Unfavorable	<b>AO</b> Unfavorable	

# North-South Corridor Study Public Workshops December 2011 Public Involvement Summary - Comment Forms

Name/ Date	Mtg/Comment Type	Comment		
LeRoy Hall	Public Workshop	<b>Segments:</b>		<b>U</b> Unfavorable
12/12/11	Comment Form	<b>A</b> Favorable	uses existing roads and is the most beneficial to existing developments	<b>V</b> Unfavorable
		<b>B</b> Favorable	same as A	<b>W</b> Unfavorable
		<b>C</b> Favorable	Most beneficial to existing developments	<b>X</b> Unfavorable
		<b>D</b> Favorable	same as A	<b>Y</b> Favorable Uses existing roads and less costly
		<b>E</b> Unfavorable		<b>Z</b> Favorable same as Y
		<b>F</b> Unfavorable		<b>AA</b> Favorable same as Y
		<b>G</b> Unfavorable		<b>AB</b> Unfavorable
		<b>H</b> Unfavorable		<b>AC</b> Unfavorable
		<b>I</b> Unfavorable		<b>AD</b> Unfavorable
		<b>J</b> Unfavorable		<b>AE</b> Unfavorable
		<b>K</b> Unfavorable		<b>AF</b> Unfavorable
		<b>L</b> Unfavorable		<b>AG</b> Unfavorable
		<b>M</b> Unfavorable		<b>AH</b> Unfavorable
		<b>N</b> Unfavorable		<b>AI</b> Unfavorable
		<b>O</b> Unfavorable		<b>AJ</b> Unfavorable
		<b>P</b> Unfavorable		<b>AK</b> Unfavorable
		<b>Q</b> Unfavorable		<b>AL</b> Unfavorable
		<b>R</b> Unfavorable		<b>AM</b> Unfavorable
		<b>S</b> Unfavorable		<b>AN</b> Unfavorable
		<b>T</b> Unfavorable		<b>AO</b> Unfavorable
<b>Additional comments:</b>				<b>Factors:</b>
Using the existing roads and what is the most beneficial to the existing development should be most important points.				Best relieves traffic/local streets
Of all the routes only one fits the needs of the most people and uses the most existing roads.				Best connects to employment ctrs
Also from "C" on Hunt Hwy. Hunt Hwy should be 4 lanes to Maricopa County were it meets Ellsworth Road.				Lowest cost
				<b>Funding:</b>
				No: not support/won't use
				<b>Response:</b>
				N/A

# North-South Corridor Study Public Workshops December 2011 Public Involvement Summary - Comment Forms

57

Name/ Date	Mtg/Comment Type	Comment		
John Bittles	Public Workshop	<b>Segments:</b>	<b>U</b> Unfavorable	<b>Factors:</b>
12/12/11	Comment Form	<b>A</b> Unfavorable	<b>V</b> Unfavorable	Best relieves traffic/hwys & frwys
		<b>B</b> Unfavorable	<b>W</b> Unfavorable	Best connects to other major routes
		<b>C</b> Unfavorable	<b>X</b> Unfavorable	Least impact to natural areas/open space
		<b>D</b> Unfavorable	<b>Y</b> Unfavorable Stay off RT 87 Build new	
		<b>E</b> Unfavorable	<b>Z</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>F</b> Unfavorable	<b>AA</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>G</b> Unfavorable	<b>AB</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>H</b>	<b>AC</b> Unfavorable	<b>Funding:</b>
		<b>I</b> Favorable Farther East more direct N-S to Exit S Take congestion off Ironwood	<b>AD</b> Favorable	Yes: support tolled hwy Yes: use tolled hwy
		<b>J</b> Favorable Most direct N-S.	<b>AE</b> Unfavorable	Open Road Tolling Rent/Purchase Transponders for individual cars
		<b>K</b> Unfavorable	<b>AF</b> Unfavorable Move farther East	Reasonable rate (contrast to will rogers in ok)
		<b>L</b> Unfavorable	<b>AG</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>M</b> Unfavorable	<b>AH</b> Favorable	
		<b>N</b> Unfavorable	<b>AI</b> Favorable	
		<b>O</b> Favorable Most direct N-S Route	<b>AJ</b> Favorable	
		<b>P</b> Unfavorable	<b>AK</b> Unfavorable Closer to Fissures	<b>Response:</b>
		<b>Q</b> Favorable Most Direct N-S	<b>AL</b> Favorable	N/A
		<b>R</b> Unfavorable	<b>AM</b> Favorable Most direct does this conflict w/ "cultural areas?" If so, move to AD	
		<b>S</b> Unfavorable	<b>AN</b>	
		<b>T</b> Unfavorable Stay off existing Rt 87-need additional	<b>AO</b> Favorable Possible if it will not disturb "cultural lands"	

## Additional comments:

My recommendation  
N-S Route  
2 Most Direct route N-S  
I Alleviates Traffic/Congestion  
J on existing roads  
O  
Q  
AM  
AN  
AD  
AH  
AI  
AJ  
AL  
S

Thank you for including the public in  
your considerations

Not just towns & taxing bodies

# North-South Corridor Study Public Workshops December 2011 Public Involvement Summary - Comment Forms

58

Name/ Date	Mtg/Comment Type	Comment		
Penelope Eller	Public Workshop	<b>Segments:</b>	<b>U</b> Unfavorable	<b>Factors:</b>
12/12/11	Comment Form	<b>A</b> Unfavorable	<b>V</b> Unfavorable	Best relieves traffic/local streets
		<b>B</b> Unfavorable	<b>W</b> Unfavorable	Best relieves traffic/hwys & frwys
		<b>C</b> Unfavorable	<b>X</b> Unfavorable	Least impact to natural areas/open space
		<b>D</b> Unfavorable	<b>Y</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>E</b> Unfavorable	<b>Z</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>F</b> Unfavorable	<b>AA</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>G</b> Unfavorable	<b>AB</b> Favorable	Keep west of potential fissure area
		<b>H</b> Unfavorable	<b>AC</b> Unfavorable	<b>Funding:</b>
		<b>I</b> Favorable	<b>AD</b> Favorable	Yes: support tolled hwy
		<b>J</b> Favorable	<b>AE</b> Unfavorable	Absolutely, make a reasonable amt. of toll for all axle sizes-make transponders for vehicles w/ an open toll lane(s) (example ill. dept. of transportation
		<b>K</b> Unfavorable	<b>AF</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>L</b> Unfavorable	<b>AG</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>M</b> Unfavorable	<b>AH</b> Favorable	
		<b>N</b> Unfavorable	<b>AI</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>O</b> Favorable	<b>AJ</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>P</b> Unfavorable	<b>AK</b> Favorable	<b>Response:</b>
		<b>Q</b> Favorable	<b>AL</b> Favorable	N/A
		<b>R</b> Unfavorable	<b>AM</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>S</b> Unfavorable	<b>AN</b> Favorable	
		<b>T</b> Unfavorable	<b>AO</b>	

**Additional comments:**  
This route may keep disruption of residential areas to a minimum during construction. Once completed it will provide a great road w/exit-entrances to the west.  
Keep high residential areas just that...  
Residential!  
This should keep high traffic noise & speed away from residential areas.

# North-South Corridor Study Public Workshops December 2011 Public Involvement Summary - Comment Forms

59

Name/ Date	Mtg/Comment Type	Comment		
Gretchen Garlitz	Public Workshop			
12/12/11	Comment Form			
Additional comments:				
		<b>Segments:</b>	<b>U</b> Unfavorable	<b>Factors:</b>
		<b>A</b> Unfavorable	<b>V</b> Unfavorable	Least impact to existing developmt
		<b>B</b> Unfavorable	<b>W</b> Favorable	Least impact to planned developmt
		<b>C</b> Unfavorable	<b>X</b> Favorable	Least impact to natural areas/open space
		<b>D</b> Unfavorable	<b>Y</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>E</b> Unfavorable	<b>Z</b> Favorable	
		<b>F</b> Unfavorable	<b>AA</b> Favorable	
		<b>G</b> Unfavorable SRP solar plant	<b>AB</b> Favorable	
		<b>H</b> Unfavorable	<b>AC</b> Favorable	<b>Funding:</b>
		<b>I</b> Unfavorable	<b>AD</b> Favorable	No: not support/won't use
		<b>J</b> Unfavorable	<b>AE</b> Favorable	Limited finances for senior's
		<b>K</b> Unfavorable	<b>AF</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>L</b> Unfavorable	<b>AG</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>M</b> Unfavorable	<b>AH</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>N</b> Unfavorable	<b>AI</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>O</b> Unfavorable	<b>AJ</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>P</b> Unfavorable	<b>AK</b> Unfavorable	<b>Response:</b>
		<b>Q</b> Unfavorable	<b>AL</b> Unfavorable	N/A
		<b>R</b> Favorable Cost effect using State Trust	<b>AM</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>S</b> Favorable Undeveloped land	<b>AN</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>T</b> Unfavorable	<b>AO</b> Unfavorable	

## North-South Corridor Study Public Workshops December 2011 Public Involvement Summary - Comment Forms

Name/ Date	Mtg/Comment Type	Comment			
Robert A. Adams	Public Workshop	<b>Segments:</b>		<b>U</b> Unfavorable	<b>Factors:</b>
12/12/11	Comment Form	<b>A</b> Favorable	Direct connection to 60	<b>V</b> Unfavorable	Best relieves traffic/hwys & frwys
		<b>B</b> Favorable	Direct and favorable for convention center future	<b>W</b> Unfavorable	Best connects to cities/towns
		<b>C</b> Favorable	Relieves Hunt Highway congestion.	<b>X</b> Unfavorable	Best connects to other major routes
		<b>D</b> Favorable	Best route for current use.	<b>Y</b>	
		<b>E</b> Unfavorable		<b>Z</b>	
		<b>F</b> Favorable	see comments on next page.	<b>AA</b>	
		<b>G</b> Unfavorable		<b>AB</b>	
		<b>H</b> Unfavorable		<b>AC</b>	
		<b>I</b> Unfavorable		<b>AD</b>	<b>Funding:</b>
		<b>J</b> Unfavorable		<b>AE</b>	Yes: support tolled hwy
		<b>K</b> Unfavorable		<b>AF</b>	Yes: use tolled hwy
		<b>L</b> Unfavorable		<b>AG</b>	As with everything the amount of toll per mile may be an issue.
		<b>M</b>		<b>AH</b>	
		<b>N</b> Unfavorable		<b>AI</b>	
		<b>O</b> Unfavorable		<b>AJ</b>	
		<b>P</b> Unfavorable		<b>AK</b>	<b>Response:</b>
		<b>Q</b> Unfavorable		<b>AL</b>	N/A
		<b>R</b> Unfavorable		<b>AM</b>	
		<b>S</b> Unfavorable		<b>AN</b>	
		<b>T</b> Unfavorable		<b>AO</b>	

**Additional comments:**  
an alternative from "C" may be to jog  
over to "F" and run parrallel to R.R.

This effort is essential to alleviate  
current congestion. Hunt Highway is  
a daily nightmare.

**North-South Corridor Study Public Workshops December 2011  
Public Involvement Summary - Comment Forms**

61

Name/ Date	Mtg/Comment Type	Comment	
Wayne Jenkins	Public Workshop	<b>Segments:</b>	
12/12/11	Comment Form	<b>A</b> Favorable helps unload Ironwood Dr. lower cost-less existing. bldgs more open land.	<b>U</b>
<b>Additional comments:</b>		<b>B</b> Unfavorable Too much impact. expensive.	<b>V</b>
		<b>C</b>	<b>W</b>
		<b>D</b> Favorable	<b>X</b>
		<b>E</b> Favorable	<b>Y</b> Favorable
		<b>F</b>	<b>Z</b> Favorable
		<b>G</b> Favorable	<b>AA</b> Favorable
		<b>H</b> Unfavorable	<b>AB</b>
		<b>I</b>	<b>AC</b>
		<b>J</b>	<b>AD</b> Favorable
		<b>K</b>	<b>AE</b> Favorable
		<b>L</b> Favorable	<b>AF</b>
		<b>M</b>	<b>AG</b>
		<b>N</b>	<b>AH</b>
		<b>O</b>	<b>AI</b>
		<b>P</b>	<b>AJ</b>
		<b>Q</b> Favorable	<b>AK</b>
		<b>R</b>	<b>AL</b>
		<b>S</b>	<b>AM</b> Favorable
		<b>T</b>	<b>AN</b> Favorable
			<b>AO</b>
		<b>Factors:</b>	
		Best relieves traffic/local streets	
		Best relieves traffic/hwys & frwys	
		Best connects to other major routes	
		Lowest cost	
		Least impact to existing developmt	
		Input rec'd from public	
		Input rec'd from local gov't	
		<b>Funding:</b>	
		<b>Response:</b>	
		N/A	



# North-South Corridor Study Public Workshops December 2011 Public Involvement Summary - Comment Forms

62

Name/ Date	Mtg/Comment Type	Comment		
Dennis Boyce	Public Workshop	<b>Segments:</b>		<b>U</b>
12/12/11	Comment Form	<b>A</b> Favorable	existing population need	<b>V</b>
<b>Additional comments:</b>		<b>B</b> Favorable	existing population need	<b>W</b>
		<b>C</b>		<b>X</b>
		<b>D</b>		<b>Y</b>
		<b>E</b>		<b>Z</b>
		<b>F</b> Favorable	Population need	<b>AA</b>
		<b>G</b>		<b>AB</b>
		<b>H</b>		<b>AC</b>
		<b>I</b>		<b>AD</b>
		<b>J</b>		<b>AE</b>
		<b>K</b>		<b>AF</b>
		<b>L</b> Favorable	Population need	<b>AG</b>
		<b>M</b>		<b>AH</b>
		<b>N</b>		<b>AI</b>
		<b>O</b>		<b>AJ</b>
		<b>P</b>		<b>AK</b>
		<b>Q</b> Favorable	More direct to Florence	<b>AL</b>
		<b>R</b>		<b>AM</b>
		<b>S</b>		<b>AN</b>
		<b>T</b>		<b>AO</b>
				<b>Factors:</b> Best relieves traffic/local streets Best connects to cities/towns Best connects to other major routes Input rec'd from public
				<b>Funding:</b> Yes: support tolled hwy Yes: use tolled hwy
				<b>Response:</b> N/A

# North-South Corridor Study Public Workshops December 2011 Public Involvement Summary - Comment Forms

63

Name/ Date	Mtg/Comment Type	Comment		
Lori Goldfinger	Public Workshop		U	<b>Factors:</b>
		<b>Segments:</b>		Best connects to other
		<b>A</b> Favorable	V	major routes
12/12/11	Comment Form	<b>B</b> Unfavorable Traffic noise & too close to my home! Brand new development homes & stores	W	Least impact to existing developmt
<b>Additional comments:</b>		<b>C</b> Unfavorable	X	Least impact to planned developmt
Please! don't put in B		<b>D</b>	Y	
Thank you!!!		<b>E</b> Favorable Further away from home better but close enough to get to.	Z	
		<b>F</b> Unfavorable	AA	
		<b>G</b> Favorable Far enough away from my home.	AB	
		<b>H</b> Favorable	AC	<b>Funding:</b>
		<b>I</b> Favorable	AD	No: not support/won't use
		<b>J</b> Favorable Further from my home.	AE	
		<b>K</b> Favorable	AF	
		<b>L</b> Favorable	AG	
		<b>M</b> Favorable	AH	
		<b>N</b>	AI	
		<b>O</b>	AJ	
		<b>P</b>	AK	<b>Response:</b>
		<b>Q</b>	AL	N/A
		<b>R</b>	AM	
		<b>S</b>	AN	
		<b>T</b>	AO	

# North-South Corridor Study Public Workshops December 2011 Public Involvement Summary - Comment Forms

64

Name/ Date	Mtg/Comment Type	Comment		
Gregory Wolfe	Public Workshop		U	
12/12/11	Comment Form			
Additional comments:				
		<b>Segments:</b>		<b>Factors:</b>
		A Favorable closest to Phoenix	V	Best connects to other major routes
		B Unfavorable Displace too many existing businesses. expensive	W	Lowest cost
		C	X	Least impact to existing developmt
		D Favorable Less existing displacement less expensive	Y	
		E Favorable Less existing displacement less expensive	Z	
		F Unfavorable	AA	
		G Favorable Less existing displacement less expensive	AB	
		H Favorable Less existing displacement less expensive	AC	<b>Funding:</b>
		I	AD	No: not support/won't use
		J	AE	Would re-evaluate
		K	AF	quickest & least expensive way to Phoenix
		L	AG	areas. I'd only use a toll route if I saved time and money spent on fuel.
		M	AH	
		N	AI	
		O	AJ	
		P	AK	<b>Response:</b>
		Q	AL	N/A
		R Unfavorable Too far out.	AM	
		S	AN	
		T	AO	

## North-South Corridor Study Public Workshops December 2011 Public Involvement Summary - Comment Forms

Name/ Date	Mtg/Comment Type	Comment			
D.D. Reimer	Public Workshop	<b>Segments:</b>		<b>U</b>	<b>Factors:</b>
12/12/11	Comment Form	<b>A</b> Favorable	Ok	<b>V</b>	Best connects to cities/towns
<b>Additional comments:</b> We need an additional N/S route- besides Gantzel Rd.		<b>B</b> Unfavorable	Ironwood traffic flows very smoothly now. Gantzel is the only N/S route presently. If it becomes a freeway-	<b>W</b>	Best connects to other major routes
Future development will be to the east of Gantzel. Build the freeway with future development in mind.		<b>C</b> Unfavorable		<b>X</b>	Least impact to existing developmt
Gantzel area is already developed. Freeway would be after the fact.		<b>D</b> Favorable		<b>Y</b>	
The desert is disappearing and will continue to do so in the future! Such is the nature of development		<b>E</b> Favorable		<b>Z</b>	
		<b>F</b> Unfavorable		<b>AA</b>	
		<b>G</b> Favorable		<b>AB</b>	
		<b>H</b> Favorable		<b>AC</b>	<b>Funding:</b>
		<b>I</b> Favorable		<b>AD</b>	No: not support/won't use
		<b>J</b> Favorable		<b>AE</b>	
		<b>K</b> Favorable		<b>AF</b>	
		<b>L</b> Favorable		<b>AG</b>	
		<b>M</b>		<b>AH</b>	
		<b>N</b>		<b>AI</b>	
		<b>O</b>		<b>AJ</b>	
		<b>P</b> Favorable		<b>AK</b>	<b>Response:</b>
		<b>Q</b> Favorable		<b>AL</b>	N/A
		<b>R</b>		<b>AM</b>	
		<b>S</b>		<b>AN</b>	
		<b>T</b>		<b>AO</b>	

# North-South Corridor Study Public Workshops December 2011 Public Involvement Summary - Comment Forms

66

Name/ Date	Mtg/Comment Type	Comment			
Norm Osborn	Public Workshop	<b>Segments:</b>		<b>U</b>	<b>Factors:</b> Best relieves traffic/local streets Least impact to existing developmt Least impact to natural areas/open space
12/12/11	Comment Form	<b>A</b>		<b>V</b>	
		<b>B</b> Unfavorable	Detrimental to existing development.	<b>W</b>	
<b>Additional comments:</b> Not familiar or concerned with Southern section. But, think it should be an alternative to existing Route 87.		<b>C</b> Unfavorable	Negative impact on Hunt Hwy neighborhood traffic.	<b>X</b>	
		<b>D</b>		<b>Y</b> Unfavorable	Build alternative to existing road
		<b>E</b>		<b>Z</b>	
		<b>F</b> Unfavorable	Too close to Copper Basin.	<b>AA</b>	
		<b>G</b>		<b>AB</b>	
		<b>H</b>		<b>AC</b>	<b>Funding:</b> No: not support/won't use
		<b>I</b> Favorable	Quicker to Phx.	<b>AD</b> Favorable	Direct.
		<b>J</b> Favorable	Direct and least impact on existing development.	<b>AE</b>	Not in favor. Would limit use and lessen effectiveness.
		<b>K</b>		<b>AF</b>	
		<b>L</b>		<b>AG</b>	
		<b>M</b>		<b>AH</b> Favorable	Direct
		<b>N</b>		<b>AI</b>	
		<b>O</b> Favorable	Direct and least impact on existing development	<b>AJ</b>	
		<b>P</b>		<b>AK</b> Favorable	Direct
		<b>Q</b> Favorable	Close off ramp to new Florence Hospital.	<b>AL</b> Favorable	Direct
		<b>R</b>		<b>AM</b> Favorable	Direct
		<b>S</b>		<b>AN</b> Favorable	Direct
		<b>T</b>		<b>AO</b>	
<b>Response:</b> N/A					

**Additional comments:**  
Not familiar or concerned with Southern section.  
But, think it should be an alternative to existing Route 87.

# North-South Corridor Study Public Workshops December 2011 Public Involvement Summary - Comment Forms

67

Name/ Date	Mtg/Comment Type	Comment		
Diane Osborn	Public Workshop			
12/12/11	Comment Form			
Additional comments:				
		<b>Segments:</b>	<b>U</b> Unfavorable	<b>Factors:</b>
		<b>A</b> Unfavorable	<b>V</b> Unfavorable	Best relieves traffic/local streets
		<b>B</b> Unfavorable too many homes & businesses impacted	<b>W</b> Unfavorable	Best connects to other major routes
		<b>C</b> Unfavorable too close to homes	<b>X</b> Unfavorable	Least impact to planned developmt
		<b>D</b> Unfavorable too close to homes	<b>Y</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>E</b> Unfavorable too close to homes	<b>Z</b> Favorable	
		<b>F</b> Unfavorable too close to homes-esp our home	<b>AA</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>G</b> Unfavorable too close to homes	<b>AB</b> Favorable	
		<b>H</b> Unfavorable	<b>AC</b> Favorable	<b>Funding:</b>
		<b>I</b> Favorable limit impact	<b>AD</b> Favorable	Yes: support tolled hwy
		<b>J</b> Favorable	<b>AE</b> Favorable	it depends on cost of toll. Would definately pay a toll to get to 10 on southern route.
		<b>K</b> Unfavorable too close to homes	<b>AF</b> Favorable	
		<b>L</b> Unfavorable	<b>AG</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>M</b> Unfavorable	<b>AH</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>N</b> Unfavorable	<b>AI</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>O</b> Favorable	<b>AJ</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>P</b> Unfavorable	<b>AK</b> Unfavorable	<b>Response:</b>
		<b>Q</b> Favorable	<b>AL</b> Unfavorable	N/A
		<b>R</b> Unfavorable	<b>AM</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>S</b> Unfavorable	<b>AN</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>T</b> Unfavorable	<b>AO</b> Unfavorable	

# North-South Corridor Study Public Workshops December 2011 Public Involvement Summary - Comment Forms

68

Name/ Date	Mtg/Comment Type	Comment			
Jane Nadeau	Public Workshop	<b>Segments:</b>		<b>U</b> Unfavorable	<b>Factors:</b> Best relieves traffic/hwys & frwys Least impact to existing developmt Input rec'd from public
12/8/11	Comment Form	<b>A</b> Unfavorable	Ironwood is a good arterial Road	<b>V</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>B</b> Unfavorable	See A	<b>W</b> Unfavorable	
<b>Additional comments:</b>		<b>C</b> Unfavorable	Ironwood/Gantzel are good arterial Roads	<b>X</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>D</b> Unfavorable		<b>Y</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>E</b> Unfavorable		<b>Z</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>F</b> Unfavorable	See A-B	<b>AA</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>G</b> Unfavorable		<b>AB</b> Favorable	
		<b>H</b> Unfavorable		<b>AC</b> Favorable	<b>Funding:</b> No: not support/won't use
		<b>I</b> Favorable		<b>AD</b> Favorable	
		<b>J</b> Favorable		<b>AE</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>K</b> Unfavorable		<b>AF</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>L</b> Unfavorable		<b>AG</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>M</b> Unfavorable		<b>AH</b> Favorable	
		<b>N</b> Unfavorable		<b>AI</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>O</b> Favorable		<b>AJ</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>P</b> Unfavorable		<b>AK</b> Favorable	<b>Response:</b> N/A
		<b>Q</b> Favorable		<b>AL</b> Favorable	
		<b>R</b> Unfavorable		<b>AM</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>S</b> Unfavorable		<b>AN</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>T</b> Unfavorable		<b>AO</b>	

**North-South Corridor Study Public Workshops December 2011  
Public Involvement Summary - Comment Forms**

69

Name/ Date	Mtg/Comment Type	Comment			
Walt Wood	Public Workshop	<b>Segments:</b>		<b>U</b>	<b>Factors:</b> Best relieves traffic/local streets Best relieves traffic/hwys & frwys Best connects to cities/towns
12/12/11	Comment Form	<b>A</b> Favorable	There is already access	<b>V</b>	
		<b>B</b> Favorable		<b>W</b>	
<b>Additional comments:</b>		<b>C</b> Favorable		<b>X</b>	
		<b>D</b> Favorable		<b>Y</b>	Favorable
		<b>E</b>		<b>Z</b>	Favorable
		<b>F</b>		<b>AA</b>	Favorable
		<b>G</b> Favorable	N/A	<b>AB</b>	
		<b>H</b> Favorable	N/A	<b>AC</b>	
		<b>I</b>		<b>AD</b>	
		<b>J</b>		<b>AE</b>	
		<b>K</b>		<b>AF</b>	
		<b>L</b>		<b>AG</b>	
		<b>M</b>		<b>AH</b>	
		<b>N</b>		<b>AI</b>	
		<b>O</b>		<b>AJ</b>	
		<b>P</b>		<b>AK</b>	
		<b>Q</b>		<b>AL</b>	
		<b>R</b>		<b>AM</b>	
		<b>S</b>		<b>AN</b>	
		<b>T</b>		<b>AO</b>	
					<b>Funding:</b> No: not support/won't use
					<b>Response:</b> N/A



**North-South Corridor Study Public Workshops December 2011  
Public Involvement Summary - Comment Forms**

70

Name/ Date	Mtg/Comment Type	Comment	
Loretta Nielsen	Public Workshop	<b>Segments:</b>	<b>U</b>
12/12/11	Comment Form	<b>A</b> Favorable	<b>V</b>
<b>Additional comments:</b>		<b>B</b> Favorable	<b>W</b>
		<b>C</b> Favorable	<b>X</b>
		<b>D</b> Favorable	<b>Y</b> Favorable
		<b>E</b>	<b>Z</b>
		<b>F</b>	<b>AA</b>
		<b>G</b>	<b>AB</b>
		<b>H</b>	<b>AC</b>
		<b>I</b>	<b>AD</b>
		<b>J</b>	<b>AE</b>
		<b>K</b>	<b>AF</b>
		<b>L</b>	<b>AG</b>
		<b>M</b>	<b>AH</b>
		<b>N</b>	<b>AI</b>
		<b>O</b>	<b>AJ</b>
		<b>P</b>	<b>AK</b>
		<b>Q</b>	<b>AL</b>
		<b>R</b>	<b>AM</b>
		<b>S</b>	<b>AN</b>
		<b>T</b>	<b>AO</b>
			<b>Factors:</b> Best relieves traffic/local streets Best relieves traffic/hwys & frwys Best use of existing roads/hwys
			<b>Funding:</b> Yes: use tolled hwy
			<b>Response:</b> N/A

# North-South Corridor Study Public Workshops December 2011 Public Involvement Summary - Comment Forms

71

Name/ Date	Mtg/Comment Type	Comment		
Jim Wallace	Public Workshop	<b>Segments:</b>		<b>U</b>
12/12/11	Comment Form	<b>A</b> Unfavorable	Road OK as is	<b>V</b>
<b>Additional comments:</b>		<b>B</b> Unfavorable	Road OK as is	<b>W</b>
		<b>C</b>	The in with O.Q	<b>X</b>
		<b>D</b>		<b>Y</b>
		<b>E</b>		<b>Z</b>
		<b>F</b>		<b>AA</b>
		<b>G</b>		<b>AB</b> Favorable
		<b>H</b>		<b>AC</b>
		<b>I</b> Favorable	To me looks more direct	<b>AD</b> Favorable
		<b>J</b> Favorable	Continue of I for Sam Reason	<b>AE</b>
		<b>K</b>		<b>AF</b>
		<b>L</b>		<b>AG</b>
		<b>M</b>		<b>AH</b>
		<b>N</b>		<b>AI</b>
		<b>O</b> Favorable	Continue of direct route	<b>AJ</b>
		<b>P</b>		<b>AK</b> Favorable
		<b>Q</b> Favorable	same as I, J, O	<b>AL</b> Favorable
		<b>R</b>		<b>AM</b>
		<b>S</b>		<b>AN</b> Favorable
		<b>T</b>		<b>AO</b>

**Factors:**  
Best relieves traffic/hwys  
& frwys  
Best connects to other  
major routes  
Least impact to planned  
developmt

**Funding:**  
Yes: support tolled hwy  
Yes: use tolled hwy  
Having Tolles provide for  
paying for the Roadways.  
From Chicago have used  
these.

**Response:**  
N/A

# North-South Corridor Study Public Workshops December 2011 Public Involvement Summary - Comment Forms

72

Name/ Date	Mtg/Comment Type	Comment			
Phil Welch	Public Workshop	<b>Segments:</b>		<b>U</b>	<b>Factors:</b>
12/12/11	Comment Form	<b>A</b> Unfavorable	Eliminates good road	<b>V</b>	Best connects to other major routes
		<b>B</b> Unfavorable	Same as A Impacts development	<b>W</b> Favorable	Least impact to existing developmt
		<b>C</b>		<b>X</b> Favorable	Input rec'd from public
		<b>D</b>		<b>Y</b>	
		<b>E</b>		<b>Z</b>	
		<b>F</b>		<b>AA</b>	
		<b>G</b>		<b>AB</b>	
		<b>H</b>		<b>AC</b>	<b>Funding:</b>
		<b>I</b> Favorable	Least impact on existing housing	<b>AD</b> Favorable	No: not support/won't use
		<b>J</b>		<b>AE</b>	Toll road, how proved disastrous in other study- have been entities of themselves
		<b>K</b>		<b>AF</b>	
		<b>L</b>		<b>AG</b>	
		<b>M</b> Favorable		<b>AH</b> Favorable	
		<b>N</b>		<b>AI</b>	
		<b>O</b>		<b>AJ</b>	
		<b>P</b>		<b>AK</b> Favorable	<b>Response:</b>
		<b>Q</b>		<b>AL</b> Favorable	N/A
		<b>R</b>		<b>AM</b>	
		<b>S</b> Favorable		<b>AN</b> Favorable	
		<b>T</b>		<b>AO</b> Favorable	

**Additional comments:**  
Northern Route  
Stay East of CAP canal to minimize  
impact on existing residential areas

Stay off existing major roads-  
Ironwood, Hunt Hwy-needed for  
local traffic. Removing then would  
not improve traffic

Southern Route  
Stay East and off existing major  
roads.

Minimize impact on existing  
residential areas & preserve existing  
roads for use

# North-South Corridor Study Public Workshops December 2011 Public Involvement Summary - Comment Forms

Name/ Date	Mtg/Comment Type	Comment	
Cathy Warbington	Public Workshop	<b>Segments:</b>	<b>U</b>
12/12/11	Comment Form	<b>A</b> Favorable	<b>V</b>
		<b>B</b> Favorable	<b>W</b>
		<b>C</b> Probably should skirt Johnson Ranch & stay on F	<b>X</b>
		<b>D</b> Favorable	<b>Y</b> Favorable
		<b>E</b>	<b>Z</b> Favorable
		<b>F</b> Favorable	<b>AA</b> Favorable
		<b>G</b>	<b>AB</b>
		<b>H</b> Favorable	<b>AC</b>
		<b>I</b>	<b>AD</b>
		<b>J</b>	<b>AE</b>
		<b>K</b>	<b>AF</b>
		<b>L</b>	<b>AG</b>
		<b>M</b>	<b>AH</b>
		<b>N</b>	<b>AI</b>
		<b>O</b>	<b>AJ</b>
		<b>P</b>	<b>AK</b>
		<b>Q</b>	<b>AL</b>
		<b>R</b>	<b>AM</b>
		<b>S</b>	<b>AN</b>
		<b>T</b>	<b>AO</b>

**Factors:**  
Least impact to existing developmt  
Input rec'd from public

**Additional comments:**  
Note on Northern Route Alternatives Map:  
Ironwood is already a mess w/no shoulders to get off of. May as well use it for the freeway & do it right. Still to many rollovers on Ironwood- due to no shoulders!

**Funding:**  
No: not support/won't use

**Response:**  
N/A

# North-South Corridor Study Public Workshops December 2011 Public Involvement Summary - Comment Forms

Name/ Date	Mtg/Comment Type	Comment		
Anonymous	Public Workshop	<b>Segments:</b>		<b>U</b> Unfavorable
12/12/11	Comment Form	<b>A</b> Unfavorable	Ironwood Dr needs to be a reliever	<b>V</b> Favorable
<b>Additional comments:</b>		<b>B</b> Unfavorable	same as above	<b>W</b> Unfavorable
		<b>C</b> Unfavorable	Hunt Hwy is not a feasible option	<b>X</b> Favorable
		<b>D</b> Unfavorable	Same as above	<b>Y</b> Favorable
		<b>E</b> Favorable	New route is the only logical option	<b>Z</b> Favorable
		<b>F</b> Favorable	New route is an option only if RR supports	<b>AA</b> Favorable
		<b>G</b> Favorable		<b>AB</b> Favorable
		<b>H</b> Favorable		<b>AC</b> Favorable
		<b>I</b> Unfavorable		<b>AD</b> Favorable
		<b>J</b> Unfavorable		<b>AE</b> Favorable
		<b>K</b> Unfavorable		<b>AF</b> Favorable
		<b>L</b> Favorable		<b>AG</b> Favorable
		<b>M</b> Unfavorable		<b>AH</b> Favorable
		<b>N</b> Unfavorable		<b>AI</b> Favorable
		<b>O</b> Unfavorable		<b>AJ</b> Favorable
		<b>P</b> Favorable		<b>AK</b> Favorable
		<b>Q</b> Unfavorable		<b>AL</b> Favorable
		<b>R</b> Unfavorable		<b>AM</b> Favorable
		<b>S</b> Unfavorable		<b>AN</b> Favorable
		<b>T</b> Unfavorable		<b>AO</b> Favorable
				<b>Factors:</b> Best connects to other major routes Least impact to existing developmt Input rec'd from local gov't
				<b>Funding:</b> Yes: support tolled hwy Yes: use tolled hwy
				<b>Response:</b> N/A

## North-South Corridor Study Public Workshops December 2011 Public Involvement Summary - Comment Forms

Name/ Date	Mtg/Comment Type	Comment		
W. Kent Milroy	Public Workshop	<b>Segments:</b>		<b>U</b> Unfavorable
12/15/11	Comment Form	<b>A</b> Favorable		<b>V</b> Unfavorable
<b>Additional comments:</b> Indicated routes would appear to be very central to Pinal while funneling traffic towards Phoenix which is the established pattern. Road needs to service both east and west slots. Indicated route allows for less disruption of existing development. Existing surface routes are maintained and can be enhanced. Thank you for the opportunity to offer input!!		<b>B</b> Unfavorable	Surface roads are 4-lane now.	<b>W</b> Unfavorable
		<b>C</b> Unfavorable	No development available to the west of why. Not central.	<b>X</b> Unfavorable
		<b>D</b> Unfavorable		<b>Y</b> Unfavorable
		<b>E</b> Favorable	Funnels traffic to 60 and 202 towards Phoenix or SR 24.	<b>Z</b> Unfavorable
		<b>F</b> Unfavorable		<b>AA</b> Unfavorable
		<b>G</b> Favorable		<b>AB</b> Unfavorable
		<b>H</b> Unfavorable		<b>AC</b> Unfavorable
		<b>I</b> Unfavorable		<b>AD</b> Favorable
		<b>J</b> Unfavorable		<b>AE</b> Unfavorable
		<b>K</b> Unfavorable		<b>AF</b> Unfavorable
		<b>L</b> Favorable	moves traffic further east from mountains and indian land.	<b>AG</b> Unfavorable
		<b>M</b> Unfavorable		<b>AH</b> Favorable
		<b>N</b> Unfavorable		<b>AI</b> Unfavorable
		<b>O</b> Unfavorable		<b>AJ</b> Unfavorable
		<b>P</b> Unfavorable		<b>AK</b> Favorable
		<b>Q</b> Favorable	Brings hwy. away from mountains to allow service to both east & west sides.	<b>AL</b> Favorable
		<b>R</b> Unfavorable		<b>AM</b> Favorable
		<b>S</b> Unfavorable		<b>AN</b> Favorable
		<b>T</b> Unfavorable		<b>AO</b> Unfavorable
				<b>Factors:</b> Best relieves traffic/hwys & frwys Best connects to other major routes Least impact to existing developmt Least impact to planned developmt
				<b>Funding:</b> No: not support/won't use
				<b>Response:</b> N/A
				<b>Provides for new interchange development. Away from SR87 at I-10.</b>

**North-South Corridor Study Public Workshops December 2011  
Public Involvement Summary - Comment Forms**

76

Name/ Date	Mtg/Comment Type	Comment		
Roc Arnett	Public Workshop	<b>Segments:</b>	<b>U</b>	<b>Factors:</b>
12/8/11	Comment Form	<b>A</b>	<b>V</b>	Best use of existing roads/hwys
<b>Additional comments:</b>		<b>B</b>	<b>W</b> Favorable	Best connects to other major routes
		<b>C</b>	<b>X</b> Favorable	
		<b>D</b>	<b>Y</b>	
		<b>E</b>	<b>Z</b>	
		<b>F</b>	<b>AA</b>	
		<b>G</b>	<b>AB</b>	
		<b>H</b>	<b>AC</b>	<b>Funding:</b>
		<b>I</b> Favorable	<b>AD</b>	
		<b>J</b>	<b>AE</b>	
		<b>K</b>	<b>AF</b>	
		<b>L</b>	<b>AG</b>	
		<b>M</b> Favorable	<b>AH</b>	
		<b>N</b>	<b>AI</b>	
		<b>O</b>	<b>AJ</b>	
		<b>P</b>	<b>AK</b>	<b>Response:</b>
		<b>Q</b>	<b>AL</b>	N/A
		<b>R</b>	<b>AM</b>	
		<b>S</b> Favorable	<b>AN</b>	
		<b>T</b> Favorable	<b>AO</b>	

# North-South Corridor Study Public Workshops December 2011 Public Involvement Summary - Comment Forms

77

Name/ Date	Mtg/Comment Type	Comment		
Lela Steffey	Public Workshop			
12/07/11	Comment Form			
Additional comments:				
		<b>Segments:</b>	<b>U</b>	<b>Factors:</b>
		<b>A</b> Favorable    avoid farming areas & areas already congested	<b>V</b>	Best relieves traffic/hwys & frwys
		<b>B</b>	<b>W</b> Favorable	Best connects to employment ctrs
		<b>C</b>	<b>X</b> Favorable    By all means this freeway need to be close to county seat	Best connects to cities/towns
		<b>D</b>	<b>Y</b>	
		<b>E</b> Favorable	<b>Z</b>	
		<b>F</b>	<b>AA</b>	
		<b>G</b>	<b>AB</b>	
		<b>H</b>	<b>AC</b>	<b>Funding:</b>
		<b>I</b>	<b>AD</b>	No: not support/won't use
		<b>J</b>	<b>AE</b>	
		<b>K</b>	<b>AF</b>	
		<b>L</b>	<b>AG</b>	
		<b>M</b>	<b>AH</b>	
		<b>N</b>	<b>AI</b>	
		<b>O</b>	<b>AJ</b>	
		<b>P</b>	<b>AK</b>	<b>Response:</b>
		<b>Q</b>	<b>AL</b>	N/A
		<b>R</b>	<b>AM</b>	
		<b>S</b> Favorable	<b>AN</b>	
		<b>T</b> Favorable	<b>AO</b>	



# North-South Corridor Study Public Workshops December 2011 Public Involvement Summary - Comment Forms

78

Name/ Date	Mtg/Comment Type	Comment	
Warren Steffey	Public Workshop	<b>Segments:</b>	
12/7/11	Comment Form	<b>A</b> Favorable share a lot of existing development	<b>U</b>
<b>Additional comments:</b> Serves a lot of existing development direct logical		<b>B</b> Favorable very logical	<b>V</b> Favorable
		<b>C</b>	<b>W</b>
		<b>D</b>	<b>X</b> Favorable need to serve Florence the county seat
		<b>E</b>	<b>Y</b>
		<b>F</b>	<b>Z</b>
		<b>G</b>	<b>AA</b>
		<b>H</b>	<b>AB</b>
		<b>I</b>	<b>AC</b>
		<b>J</b>	<b>AD</b>
		<b>K</b>	<b>AE</b>
		<b>L</b> Favorable	<b>AF</b>
		<b>M</b>	<b>AG</b>
		<b>N</b>	<b>AH</b>
		<b>O</b>	<b>AI</b>
		<b>P</b> Favorable	<b>AJ</b>
		<b>Q</b>	<b>AK</b>
		<b>R</b>	<b>AL</b>
		<b>S</b>	<b>AM</b>
		<b>T</b>	<b>AN</b>
			<b>AO</b>
		<b>Factors:</b> Best relieves traffic/hwys & frwys Best connects to employment ctrs Best connects to other major routes	
		<b>Funding:</b> No: not support/won't use	
		<b>Response:</b> N/A	

# North-South Corridor Study Public Workshops December 2011 Public Involvement Summary - Comment Forms

79

Name/ Date	Mtg/Comment Type	Comment		
Charles Heinssen	Public Workshop	<b>Segments:</b>		
12/7/11	Comment Form	<b>A</b> Favorable	Direct route to 10	<b>U</b>
<b>Additional comments:</b> Route #2-#5 I,J,O,Q,AO AC AD AH AK AL Less impact on population		<b>B</b> Favorable	Direct route to 10	<b>V</b>
		<b>C</b> Favorable	Direct route to 10	<b>W</b>
		<b>D</b> Favorable	Direct route to 10	<b>X</b>
		<b>E</b> Favorable	A to E,G,H,D,Y,Z,AA, Less impact on existing population	<b>Y</b> Favorable
		<b>F</b>		<b>Z</b> Favorable
		<b>G</b> Favorable		<b>AA</b> Favorable
		<b>H</b> Favorable		<b>AB</b>
		<b>I</b>		<b>AC</b>
		<b>J</b>		<b>AD</b>
		<b>K</b>		<b>AE</b>
		<b>L</b>		<b>AF</b>
		<b>M</b>		<b>AG</b>
		<b>N</b>		<b>AH</b>
		<b>O</b>		<b>AI</b>
		<b>P</b>		<b>AJ</b>
		<b>Q</b>		<b>AK</b>
		<b>R</b>		<b>AL</b>
		<b>S</b>		<b>AM</b>
		<b>T</b>		<b>AN</b>
				<b>AO</b>
		<b>Factors:</b>		
		Best relieves traffic/local streets		
		Best relieves traffic/hwys & frwys		
		Best connects to cities/towns		
		Lowest cost		
		Least impact to existing developmt		
		Best use of existing roads/hwys		
		Other		
		<b>Funding:</b>		
		No: not support/won't use		
		Tolls never go away, traffic jams		
		<b>Response:</b>		
		N/A		

# North-South Corridor Study Public Workshops December 2011 Public Involvement Summary - Comment Forms

80

Name/ Date	Mtg/Comment Type	Comment		
Kathleen Van Dan Elzen	Public Workshop	<b>Segments:</b>	<b>U</b> Unfavorable	<b>Factors:</b>
12/8/11	Comment Form	<b>A</b> Favorable	<b>V</b> Unfavorable	
<b>Additional comments:</b>		<b>B</b> Favorable	<b>W</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>C</b> Unfavorable	<b>X</b>	
		<b>D</b> Favorable	<b>Y</b> Favorable	
		<b>E</b> Unfavorable	<b>Z</b> Favorable	
		<b>F</b> Favorable	<b>AA</b> Favorable	
		<b>G</b> Unfavorable	<b>AB</b>	
		<b>H</b> Favorable	<b>AC</b>	<b>Funding:</b>
		<b>I</b> Unfavorable	<b>AD</b>	This is an abject lesson in futility
		<b>J</b> Unfavorable	<b>AE</b>	
		<b>K</b> Unfavorable	<b>AF</b>	
		<b>L</b> Unfavorable	<b>AG</b>	
		<b>M</b> Unfavorable	<b>AH</b>	
		<b>N</b> Unfavorable	<b>AI</b>	
		<b>O</b> Unfavorable	<b>AJ</b>	
		<b>P</b> Unfavorable	<b>AK</b>	<b>Response:</b>
		<b>Q</b> Unfavorable	<b>AL</b>	N/A
		<b>R</b> Unfavorable	<b>AM</b>	
		<b>S</b> Unfavorable	<b>AN</b>	
		<b>T</b> Unfavorable	<b>AO</b>	

**North-South Corridor Study Public Workshops December 2011  
Public Involvement Summary - Comment Forms**

81

Name/ Date	Mtg/Comment Type	Comment		
Robert Flatley	Public Workshop	Segments:	U	Factors: Best relieves traffic/hwys & frwys Best connects to employment ctrs Least impact to planned developmt
12/8/11	Comment Form	A	V	
		B	W	
Additional comments:		C	X	
		D	Y Unfavorable	
		E	Z Unfavorable	
		F	AA Unfavorable	
		G	AB Favorable	
		H	AC Unfavorable	Funding: Yes: support tolled hwy Yes: use tolled hwy
		I	AD Favorable	
		J	AE Unfavorable	
		K	AF Unfavorable	
		L	AG Unfavorable	
		M	AH Favorable	
		N	AI Unfavorable	
		O	AJ Unfavorable	
		P	AK	Response: N/A
		Q	AL	
		R	AM Unfavorable	
		S	AN Favorable	
		T	AO Unfavorable	

# North-South Corridor Study Public Workshops December 2011 Public Involvement Summary - Comment Forms

82

Name/ Date	Mtg/Comment Type	Comment		
H.W. Brock	Public Workshop		<b>Segments:</b>	<b>U</b>
12/8/11	Comment Form		<b>A</b> Unfavorable	<b>V</b>
<b>Additional comments:</b> using existing right of ways saves money and can speed construction of job. Connect to I10 at point H Some people want the road to go through thier areas-Not thinking of traffic and the cost as long at it makes their cities. Best route point 2 to point 4 using Christenson-Clemence Rd. straight shot.			<b>B</b> Unfavorable	<b>W</b>
			<b>C</b> Unfavorable	<b>X</b>
			<b>D</b> Unfavorable Too much traffic now.	<b>Y</b> Favorable
			<b>E</b> Unfavorable	<b>Z</b> Favorable
			<b>F</b> Unfavorable	<b>AA</b> Favorable
			<b>G</b> Unfavorable	<b>AB</b> Unfavorable
			<b>H</b>	<b>AC</b>
			<b>I</b> Favorable	<b>AD</b> Favorable
			<b>J</b> Favorable	<b>AE</b> Favorable
			<b>K</b> Favorable	<b>AF</b>
			<b>L</b> Unfavorable	<b>AG</b> Unfavorable
			<b>M</b> Favorable	<b>AH</b> Unfavorable
			<b>N</b>	<b>AI</b> Unfavorable
			<b>O</b> Favorable	<b>AJ</b> Unfavorable
			<b>P</b> Unfavorable	<b>AK</b>
			<b>Q</b> Favorable Should follow Christenson Rd.!	<b>AL</b> Unfavorable cost of re-doing I-10 just completed
			<b>R</b> Unfavorable	<b>AM</b>
			<b>S</b>	<b>AN</b>
			<b>T</b>	<b>AO</b>
				<b>Factors:</b>
				Best relieves traffic/local streets
				Best relieves traffic/hwys & frwys
				Best connects to cities/towns
				Best connects to other major routes
				Lowest cost
				Least impact to existing developmt
				Best use of existing roads/hwys
				Input rec'd from public
				<b>Funding:</b>
				No: not support/won't use
				Too many contractors want state-feds to pay for the road then turn it over to toll rd. no expense for them.
				<b>Response:</b>
				N/A

# North-South Corridor Study Public Workshops December 2011 Public Involvement Summary - Comment Forms

83

Name/ Date	Mtg/Comment Type	Comment		
Mary Reidling	Public Workshop			
12/8/11	Comment Form			
Additional comments:				
		<b>Segments:</b>	<b>U</b> Unfavorable	<b>Factors:</b> Best connects to employment ctrs Best connects to other destinations Input rec'd from public
		<b>A</b> Favorable	<b>V</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>B</b> Unfavorable	<b>W</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>C</b> Unfavorable	<b>X</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>D</b> Unfavorable	<b>Y</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>E</b> Favorable	<b>Z</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>F</b> Unfavorable	<b>AA</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>G</b> Favorable	<b>AB</b> Favorable	
		<b>H</b> Unfavorable	<b>AC</b> Unfavorable	<b>Funding:</b> No: not support/won't use
		<b>I</b> Unfavorable	<b>AD</b> Favorable	
		<b>J</b> Unfavorable	<b>AE</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>K</b> Unfavorable	<b>AF</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>L</b> Favorable	<b>AG</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>M</b> Unfavorable	<b>AH</b> Favorable	
		<b>N</b> Unfavorable	<b>AI</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>O</b> Unfavorable	<b>AJ</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>P</b> Unfavorable	<b>AK</b> Favorable	<b>Response:</b> N/A
		<b>Q</b> Favorable	<b>AL</b> Favorable	
		<b>R</b> Unfavorable	<b>AM</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>S</b> Unfavorable	<b>AN</b> Favorable	
		<b>T</b> Unfavorable	<b>AO</b> Unfavorable	

# North-South Corridor Study Public Workshops December 2011 Public Involvement Summary - Comment Forms

84

Name/ Date	Mtg/Comment Type	Comment			
Ed Croyle	Public Workshop	Segments:		U	<b>Factors:</b> Best relieves traffic/local streets Best connects to other major routes Other
12/7/11	Comment Form	A	V		
		B	W		
<b>Additional comments:</b> input from builder of the road as to best route Any of the segments could work so I do not find any to be unfavorable		C	X		
		D	Y		
		E	Z		
		F	AA		
		G	AB		
		H	AC		<b>Funding:</b> Yes: support tolled hwy Yes: use tolled hwy
		I Favorable      uses #2 start/end point	AD		
		J	AE		
		K	AF		
		L	AG		
		M	AH		
		N	AI		
		O	AJ		
		P	AK		<b>Response:</b> N/A
		Q	Favorable      uses #5 start/ent point		
		R	AM		
		S	AN		
		T	AO		

**Additional comments:**  
input from builder of the road as to best route  
Any of the segments could work so I do not find any to be unfavorable

# North-South Corridor Study Public Workshops December 2011 Public Involvement Summary - Comment Forms

85

Name/ Date	Mtg/Comment Type	Comment		
Kathleen Waldron	Public Workshop	<b>Segments:</b>	<b>U</b>	<b>Factors:</b>
12/7/11	Comment Form	<b>A</b> Unfavorable to much traffic	<b>V</b>	Best relieves traffic/local streets
		<b>B</b> Unfavorable	<b>W</b> Unfavorable	Best connects to other major routes
		<b>C</b> Unfavorable	<b>X</b> Unfavorable No	Least impact to existing developmt
		<b>D</b> Favorable	<b>Y</b> Favorable	
		<b>E</b> Unfavorable	<b>Z</b> Favorable	
		<b>F</b> Unfavorable	<b>AA</b> Favorable	
		<b>G</b>	<b>AB</b>	
		<b>H</b>	<b>AC</b>	<b>Funding:</b>
		<b>I</b>	<b>AD</b>	No: not support/won't use
		<b>J</b>	<b>AE</b> Favorable	
		<b>K</b>	<b>AF</b>	
		<b>L</b>	<b>AG</b>	
		<b>M</b>	<b>AH</b>	
		<b>N</b>	<b>AI</b>	
		<b>O</b>	<b>AJ</b>	
		<b>P</b>	<b>AK</b>	<b>Response:</b>
		<b>Q</b>	<b>AL</b>	N/A
		<b>R</b>	<b>AM</b> Favorable	
		<b>S</b>	<b>AN</b> Favorable	
		<b>T</b>	<b>AO</b> Favorable	

**Additional comments:**  
These choices are very confusing

Why have so many?

You can't please all the people

Run road where there is less cost.

Run road where less people are up  
set about the road in their back yard.



# North-South Corridor Study Public Workshops December 2011 Public Involvement Summary - Comment Forms

86

Name/ Date	Mtg/Comment Type	Comment		
Anonymous	Public Workshop	<b>Segments:</b>	<b>U</b> Unfavorable	<b>Factors:</b>
12/8/11	Comment Form	<b>A</b> Unfavorable	<b>V</b> Unfavorable	
<b>Additional comments:</b>		<b>B</b> Unfavorable	<b>W</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>C</b> Unfavorable	<b>X</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>D</b> Unfavorable	<b>Y</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>E</b> Unfavorable	<b>Z</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>F</b> Unfavorable	<b>AA</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>G</b> Unfavorable	<b>AB</b> Favorable	<b>Funding:</b>
		<b>H</b> Unfavorable	<b>AC</b> Favorable	
		<b>I</b> Unfavorable	<b>AD</b> Favorable	creates commercial corridors, optimizes 3 avenues of transportation same as above
		<b>J</b> Unfavorable	<b>AE</b> Unfavorable	same
		<b>K</b> Unfavorable	<b>AF</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>L</b> Unfavorable	<b>AG</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>M</b> Unfavorable	<b>AH</b> Favorable	
		<b>N</b> Favorable	<b>AI</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>O</b> Favorable	<b>AJ</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>P</b> Unfavorable	<b>AK</b> Favorable	<b>Response:</b> N/A
		<b>Q</b> Favorable	<b>AL</b> Favorable	
		<b>R</b> Unfavorable	<b>AM</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>S</b> Unfavorable	<b>AN</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>T</b> Unfavorable	<b>AO</b> Unfavorable	

# North-South Corridor Study Public Workshops December 2011 Public Involvement Summary - Comment Forms

87

Name/ Date	Mtg/Comment Type	Comment		
Gilbert Olgin  12/12/11	Public Workshop	<b>Segments:</b>	<b>U</b> Favorable	<b>Factors:</b> Best relieves traffic/hwys & frwys Best connects to cities/towns Input rec'd from local gov't
	Comment Form	<b>A</b> Unfavorable	<b>V</b> Favorable	
<b>Additional comments:</b> 1. AP Tie into SR24 2. Important to locate corridor close to ex. development & where development forecasted over next 10,20,30, 40 years. Locating too far east in Superstition vistas does not seem to address current transportation route needs. 3. Try to avoid existing using surface arterials as we'll need those to work with the new corridor. 4. Follow preferences of local jurisdictions. 5. Try to avoid taking existing homes and commercial developments, e.g. along Hunt or Ironwood.		<b>B</b> Unfavorable	<b>W</b> Unfavorable	<b>Funding:</b> No: not support/won't use
		<b>C</b> Unfavorable	<b>X</b> Favorable	
		<b>D</b> Unfavorable	<b>Y</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>E</b> Favorable	<b>Z</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>F</b> Favorable	<b>AA</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>G</b> Favorable	<b>AB</b> Favorable	
		<b>H</b> Unfavorable	<b>AC</b> Favorable	
		<b>I</b> Favorable	<b>AD</b> Favorable	
		<b>J</b> Favorable	<b>AE</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>K</b> Favorable	<b>AF</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>L</b> Favorable	<b>AG</b> Unfavorable	<b>Response:</b> N/A
		<b>M</b> Unfavorable	<b>AH</b> Favorable	
		<b>N</b> Unfavorable	<b>AI</b> Favorable	
		<b>O</b> Favorable	<b>AJ</b> Favorable	
		<b>P</b> Favorable	<b>AK</b> Favorable	
		<b>Q</b> Unfavorable	<b>AL</b> Favorable	
		<b>R</b> Unfavorable	<b>AM</b> Favorable	
		<b>S</b> Unfavorable	<b>AN</b> Favorable	
		<b>T</b> Unfavorable	<b>AO</b>	

# North-South Corridor Study Public Workshops December 2011 Public Involvement Summary - Comment Forms

88

Name/ Date	Mtg/Comment Type	Comment		
Peter Burtoft	Public Workshop	<b>Segments:</b>	<b>U</b> Unfavorable	<b>Factors:</b>
12/8/11	Comment Form	<b>A</b> Unfavorable	<b>V</b> Unfavorable	Best connects to cities/towns
<b>Additional comments:</b>		<b>B</b> Unfavorable	<b>W</b> Unfavorable	Best connects to other major routes
		<b>C</b> Unfavorable	<b>X</b> Unfavorable	Input rec'd from public
		<b>D</b> Unfavorable	<b>Y</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>E</b> Unfavorable	<b>Z</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>F</b> Unfavorable	<b>AA</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>G</b> Unfavorable	<b>AB</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>H</b> Unfavorable	<b>AC</b> Unfavorable	<b>Funding:</b>
		<b>I</b> Favorable Lower cost	<b>AD</b> Favorable	Yes: support tolled hwy
		<b>J</b> Favorable	<b>AE</b> Unfavorable	Yes: use tolled hwy
		<b>K</b> Unfavorable	<b>AF</b> Unfavorable	Toll highway can be built a.s.a.p. with chinese investors...they would snap it up in a N.Y. minute!
		<b>L</b> Unfavorable	<b>AG</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>M</b> Unfavorable	<b>AH</b> Favorable	
		<b>N</b> Unfavorable	<b>AI</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>O</b> Favorable	<b>AJ</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>P</b> Unfavorable	<b>AK</b> Favorable	<b>Response:</b>
		<b>Q</b> Favorable	<b>AL</b> Favorable	N/A
		<b>R</b> Unfavorable	<b>AM</b> Favorable	
		<b>S</b> Unfavorable	<b>AN</b> Favorable	
		<b>T</b> Unfavorable	<b>AO</b> Unfavorable	

# North-South Corridor Study Public Workshops December 2011 Public Involvement Summary - Comment Forms

89

Name/ Date	Mtg/Comment Type	Comment	
Susan Waltz	Public Workshop	<b>Segments:</b>	
12/7/11	Comment Form	<b>A</b>	<b>U</b>
		<b>B</b>	<b>V</b>
<b>Additional comments:</b> The other map doesn't really affect me to get to coolidge		<b>C</b>	<b>W</b>
		<b>D</b> Favorable      Why the curve though-make it straight.	<b>X</b>
		<b>E</b>	<b>Y</b>
		<b>F</b>	<b>Z</b>
		<b>G</b> Favorable      straight run to coolidge	<b>AA</b>
		<b>H</b> Favorable      Great strait run to Coolidge-will cut down on farm equipment.	<b>AB</b>
		<b>I</b> Favorable      It will cut out a lot of traffic through Bold Canyon-destination for work is Coolidge	<b>AC</b>
		<b>J</b>	<b>AD</b>
		<b>K</b> Favorable      On the way to Coolidge. Otherwise I have to go to 79 up and around	<b>AE</b>
		<b>L</b>	<b>AF</b>
		<b>M</b>	<b>AG</b>
		<b>N</b>	<b>AH</b>
		<b>O</b>	<b>AI</b>
		<b>P</b>	<b>AJ</b>
		<b>Q</b>	<b>AK</b>
		<b>R</b>	<b>AL</b>
		<b>S</b>	<b>AM</b>
		<b>T</b>	<b>AN</b>
			<b>AO</b>
			<b>Factors:</b> Best relieves traffic/local streets Best relieves traffic/hwys & frwys Best connects to employment ctrs Best connects to cities/towns Lowest cost Least impact to natural areas/open space
			<b>Funding:</b> No: not support/won't use Have the snow pay for the toll roads
			<b>Response:</b> N/A

## North-South Corridor Study Public Workshops December 2011 Public Involvement Summary - Comment Forms

Name/ Date	Mtg/Comment Type	Comment	
George E. Lewis	Public Workshop	<b>Segments:</b>	<b>U</b>
12/8/11	Comment Form	<b>A</b> Unfavorable	<b>V</b>
		<b>B</b> Favorable	<b>W</b>
		<b>C</b>	<b>X</b>
		<b>D</b>	<b>Y</b>
		<b>E</b> Unfavorable	<b>Z</b> Unfavorable
		<b>F</b> Favorable	<b>AA</b> Unfavorable
		<b>G</b> Unfavorable	<b>AB</b> Unfavorable
		<b>H</b>	<b>AC</b>
		<b>I</b>	<b>AD</b> Unfavorable
		<b>J</b>	<b>AE</b> Unfavorable
		<b>K</b>	<b>AF</b>
		<b>L</b> Unfavorable	<b>AG</b>
		<b>M</b>	<b>AH</b>
		<b>N</b>	<b>AI</b>
		<b>O</b>	<b>AJ</b>
		<b>P</b>	<b>AK</b>
		<b>Q</b> Unfavorable	<b>AL</b>
		<b>R</b>	<b>AM</b>
		<b>S</b>	<b>AN</b> Unfavorable
		<b>T</b>	<b>AO</b>
<b>Additional comments:</b>			<b>Factors:</b>
Above I have marked the desired route by "x" over the markers. It appears to me that the least upheaval would be to build E to G but Ironwood A,B,F is currently in place.			Lowest cost
At points F & G there is a merging to the point L to Point Q then Point AB then Point AC then AD to AC at which time there is a merge with the 87 at Z then AA			Least impact to existing developmt
Special consideration The Felix family was living in the area prior to the Mexican War of 1845 after he surrender the family lost all theri properties, which were thousands acres. The U.S. government gave them the choice of moving to present Mexico or purchasing a square mile of property and becoming citizens. They are still here.			Least impact to natural areas/open space
I think the Felix name should be considered in the naming of the road. GL.			Best use of existing roads/hwys
			<b>Funding:</b>
			No: not support/won't use
			My association with Toll Roads is that there is a projected price of use that is raised by request to the legislature. More lies.
			<b>Response:</b>
			N/A

# North-South Corridor Study Public Workshops December 2011 Public Involvement Summary - Comment Forms

91

Name/ Date	Mtg/Comment Type	Comment			
Carroll Michael	Public Workshop				
12/16/11	Comment Form				
Additional comments:					
		<b>Segments:</b>	<b>U</b> Favorable	Will encourage new development	<b>Factors:</b>
		<b>A</b> Unfavorable	<b>V</b> Favorable		Best relieves traffic/local streets
		<b>B</b> Unfavorable	<b>W</b> Unfavorable		Best connects to employment ctrs
		<b>C</b> Unfavorable	<b>X</b> Favorable		Best connects to other destinations
		<b>D</b> Unfavorable	<b>Y</b> Unfavorable		Best connects to cities/towns
		<b>E</b> Unfavorable	<b>Z</b> Unfavorable		Best connects to other major routes
		<b>F</b> Unfavorable	<b>AA</b> Unfavorable		Least impact to existing developmt
		<b>G</b> Unfavorable	<b>AB</b> Unfavorable		Input rec'd from public
		<b>H</b> Unfavorable	<b>AC</b> Unfavorable		<b>Funding:</b>
		<b>I</b> Favorable Will encourage new development & located on state land.	<b>AD</b> Favorable		No: not support/won't use
		<b>J</b> Favorable Will encourage new development & in state land.	<b>AE</b> Unfavorable		
		<b>K</b> Unfavorable	<b>AF</b> Unfavorable		
		<b>L</b> Unfavorable	<b>AG</b> Unfavorable		
		<b>M</b> Favorable Will encourage new development & in state land.	<b>AH</b> Favorable		
		<b>N</b> Favorable	<b>AI</b> Unfavorable		
		<b>O</b> Favorable Will encourage new development & in state land.	<b>AJ</b> Unfavorable		
		<b>P</b> Favorable Will encourage new development & in state land.	<b>AK</b> Favorable		<b>Response:</b>
		<b>Q</b> Unfavorable	<b>AL</b> Favorable		N/A
		<b>R</b> Unfavorable	<b>AM</b> Favorable		
		<b>S</b> Unfavorable	<b>AN</b> Favorable		
		<b>T</b> Unfavorable	<b>AO</b> Favorable		

## 92

Name/ Date	Mtg/Comment Type	Comment			
Frank Goodard	Public Workshop				
		<b>Segments:</b>	<b>U</b>	Favorable	Will bring new growth to Florence.
12/16/11	Comment Form	<b>A</b> Unfavorable Existing road	<b>V</b>	Favorable	Makes most commercial sense
		<b>B</b> Unfavorable Existing road	<b>W</b>	Unfavorable	
<b>Additional comments:</b>		<b>C</b> Unfavorable	<b>X</b>	Favorable	Will help Florence grow.
		<b>D</b> Unfavorable	<b>Y</b>	Unfavorable	
		<b>E</b> Unfavorable	<b>Z</b>	Unfavorable	
		<b>F</b> Unfavorable	<b>AA</b>	Unfavorable	
		<b>G</b> Unfavorable	<b>AB</b>	Unfavorable	
		<b>H</b> Unfavorable	<b>AC</b>	Unfavorable	
		<b>I</b> Favorable Desired residential and commercial growth/state land	<b>AD</b>	Favorable	
		<b>J</b> Favorable Will bring new homes and retail store to state land	<b>AE</b>	Unfavorable	
		<b>K</b> Unfavorable	<b>AF</b>	Unfavorable	
		<b>L</b> Unfavorable	<b>AG</b>	Unfavorable	
		<b>M</b> Unfavorable	<b>AH</b>	Favorable	
		<b>N</b> Unfavorable	<b>AI</b>	Unfavorable	
		<b>O</b> Favorable Commercial corridors on state land.	<b>AJ</b>	Unfavorable	
		<b>P</b> Favorable New corridor for transportation.	<b>AK</b>	Favorable	
		<b>Q</b> Unfavorable	<b>AL</b>	Favorable	
		<b>R</b> Unfavorable	<b>AM</b>	Unfavorable	
		<b>S</b> Unfavorable	<b>AN</b>	Favorable	
		<b>T</b> Unfavorable	<b>AO</b>	Favorable	
					<b>Factors:</b> Best relieves traffic/hwys & frwys Best connects to employment ctrs Best connects to other destinations Best connects to cities/towns Best connects to other major routes
					<b>Funding:</b> No: not support/won't use  No toll road, if a toll road is installed I would not use it.
					<b>Response:</b> N/A

# North-South Corridor Study Public Workshops December 2011

## Public Involvement Summary - Comment Forms

Name/ Date	Mtg/Comment Type	Comment		
Anonymous	Public Workshop	<b>Segments:</b>	<b>U</b> Unfavorable	<b>Factors:</b>
12/8/11	Comment Form	<b>A</b> Unfavorable	<b>V</b> Unfavorable	Lowest cost
		<b>B</b> Unfavorable	<b>W</b> Unfavorable	Least impact to existing developmt
		<b>C</b> Unfavorable	<b>X</b> Unfavorable	Least impact to planned developmt
		<b>D</b> Unfavorable	<b>Y</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>E</b> Unfavorable	<b>Z</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>F</b> Unfavorable	<b>AA</b>	
		<b>G</b> Unfavorable	<b>AB</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>H</b> Unfavorable	<b>AC</b> Unfavorable	<b>Funding:</b>
		<b>I</b> Favorable	<b>AD</b> Favorable	Yes: support tolled hwy
		<b>J</b> Favorable	<b>AE</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>K</b> Unfavorable	<b>AF</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>L</b> Unfavorable	<b>AG</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>M</b> Unfavorable	<b>AH</b> Favorable	
		<b>N</b> Unfavorable	<b>AI</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>O</b> Favorable	<b>AJ</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>P</b> Unfavorable	<b>AK</b> Favorable	<b>Response:</b>
		<b>Q</b> Favorable	<b>AL</b> Favorable	N/A
		<b>R</b> Unfavorable	<b>AM</b> Favorable	
		<b>S</b> Unfavorable	<b>AN</b> Favorable	
		<b>T</b> Unfavorable	<b>AO</b> Unfavorable	

**Additional comments:**  
Try to keep it next to Power lines & canals & train tracks. These are usually unfavorable areas for homes & families. Keep to the east for future use by people buying future homes & having business' out there.



# North-South Corridor Study Public Workshops December 2011 Public Involvement Summary - Comment Forms

Name/ Date	Mtg/Comment Type	Comment		
Anonymous	Public Workshop	<b>Segments:</b>	<b>U</b> Unfavorable	<b>Factors:</b> Least impact to existing developmt Least impact to planned developmt
12/16/11	Comment Form	<b>A</b> Unfavorable	<b>V</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>B</b> Unfavorable	<b>W</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>C</b> Unfavorable	<b>X</b> Unfavorable	
<b>Additional comments:</b> come near all communities but not through them		<b>D</b> Unfavorable	<b>Y</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>E</b> Unfavorable	<b>Z</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>F</b> Unfavorable	<b>AA</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>G</b> Unfavorable	<b>AB</b> Favorable bypasses coolidge	<b>Funding:</b>
		<b>H</b> Unfavorable	<b>AC</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>I</b> Favorable aAuids conjection	<b>AD</b> Favorable	
		<b>J</b> Favorable shorter no structures	<b>AE</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>K</b> Unfavorable	<b>AF</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>L</b> Unfavorable	<b>AG</b> Unfavorable does not follow 87	
		<b>M</b> Unfavorable	<b>AH</b> Favorable	
		<b>N</b> Unfavorable	<b>AI</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>O</b> Favorable less development in area	<b>AJ</b> Unfavorable	<b>Response:</b> N/A
		<b>P</b> Unfavorable comes near florence	<b>AK</b> Favorable does not follow 87	
		<b>Q</b> Favorable	<b>AL</b> Favorable least congested	
		<b>R</b> Unfavorable	<b>AM</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>S</b> Unfavorable	<b>AN</b> Favorable	
		<b>T</b> Unfavorable	<b>AO</b> Unfavorable	

# North-South Corridor Study Public Workshops December 2011 Public Involvement Summary - Comment Forms

95

Name/ Date	Mtg/Comment Type	Comment	
Bob Putz	Public Workshop	<b>Segments:</b>	<b>U</b>
12/16/11	Comment Form	<b>A</b> Favorable	<b>V</b>
		<b>B</b>	<b>W</b>
		<b>C</b>	<b>X</b>
		<b>D</b> Favorable	<b>Y</b> Favorable
		<b>E</b> Favorable	<b>Z</b>
		<b>F</b>	<b>AA</b>
		<b>G</b> Favorable	<b>AB</b>
		<b>H</b> Favorable	<b>AC</b>
		<b>I</b>	<b>AD</b>
		<b>J</b>	<b>AE</b> Favorable
		<b>K</b>	<b>AF</b>
		<b>L</b>	<b>AG</b>
		<b>M</b>	<b>AH</b> Favorable
		<b>N</b>	<b>AI</b> Favorable
		<b>O</b>	<b>AJ</b>
		<b>P</b>	<b>AK</b>
		<b>Q</b>	<b>AL</b> Favorable
		<b>R</b>	<b>AM</b>
		<b>S</b>	<b>AN</b>
		<b>T</b>	<b>AO</b>

**Factors:**  
Best relieves traffic/hwys & frwys  
Best connects to other major routes  
Least impact to existing developmt

**Funding:**  
No: not support/won't use

**Response:**  
N/A

**Additional comments:**  
A route east of picacho mountains to 79 could be a shorter less costly route to 60. Route marked with A will serve the current population best.

# North-South Corridor Study Public Workshops December 2011 Public Involvement Summary - Comment Forms

96

Name/ Date	Mtg/Comment Type	Comment		
Anonymous	Public Workshop			
12/19/11	Comment Form			
<b>Additional comments:</b> I would still use Rt 87 to Rt 10				
		<b>Segments:</b>	<b>U</b>	<b>Factors:</b>
		<b>A</b> Favorable	<b>V</b> Favorable	Best connects to cities/towns
		<b>B</b> Favorable	<b>W</b>	Least impact to existing developmt
		<b>C</b>	<b>X</b> Favorable	Least impact to natural areas/open space
		<b>D</b>	<b>Y</b>	Best use of existing roads/hwys
		<b>E</b>	<b>Z</b>	
		<b>F</b> Favorable	<b>AA</b>	
		<b>G</b>	<b>AB</b>	
		<b>H</b>	<b>AC</b>	<b>Funding:</b>
		<b>I</b>	<b>AD</b>	
		<b>J</b> Favorable	<b>AE</b>	
		<b>K</b>	<b>AF</b>	
		<b>L</b>	<b>AG</b>	
		<b>M</b>	<b>AH</b>	
		<b>N</b>	<b>AI</b>	
		<b>O</b>	<b>AJ</b>	
		<b>P</b> Favorable	<b>AK</b>	<b>Response:</b> N/A
		<b>Q</b>	<b>AL</b>	
		<b>R</b>	<b>AM</b>	
		<b>S</b>	<b>AN</b>	
		<b>T</b>	<b>AO</b>	

# North-South Corridor Study Public Workshops December 2011 Public Involvement Summary - Comment Forms

97

Name/ Date	Mtg/Comment Type	Comment			
Emily Webster	Public Workshop				
12/8/11	Comment Form				
Additional comments:					
		<b>Segments:</b>	<b>U</b> Unfavorable	too costly for bridges & to. far east for aiding traffic in San Tan Valley	<b>Factors:</b> Best relieves traffic/local streets Best connects to other major routes Least impact to existing developmt
		<b>A</b> Unfavorable Ironwood Dr was recently upgraded as local collector- shouldn't be limited access or toll road way	<b>V</b>		
		<b>B</b>	<b>W</b>		
		<b>C</b>	<b>X</b> Unfavorable	too close to Hwy 79 with no benefit to town center local roads need to link Florence center with Hunt Hwy.	
		<b>D</b>	<b>Y</b>		
		<b>E</b>	<b>Z</b> Unfavorable	see AA please	
		<b>F</b>	<b>AA</b> Unfavorable	do not use current 87-it's a good artery with local access. not good for limiting access/tolls	
		<b>G</b>	<b>AB</b> Favorable		
		<b>H</b>	<b>AC</b>		<b>Funding:</b> Yes: support tolled hwy Yes: use tolled hwy
		<b>I</b> Favorable first really available route to south if one is on 60 going toward east; would gather some of AJ & western	<b>AD</b> Favorable		
		<b>J</b> Favorable nice split of future expected growth traffic for houses & industry	<b>AE</b>		
		<b>K</b>	<b>AF</b>		
		<b>L</b>	<b>AG</b>		
		<b>M</b>	<b>AH</b> Favorable		
		<b>N</b>	<b>AI</b>		
		<b>O</b> Favorable good collector point for improved Bella Vista to west with dense housing & expected growth to east	<b>AJ</b>		
		<b>P</b> Unfavorable interferes with planned development	<b>AK</b> Favorable		<b>Response:</b> N/A
		<b>Q</b> Favorable takes advantage of-utility easements & expected growth link roads	<b>AL</b> Favorable		
		<b>R</b>	<b>AM</b>		
		<b>S</b>	<b>AN</b> Favorable		
		<b>T</b>	<b>AO</b>		

# North-South Corridor Study Public Workshops December 2011 Public Involvement Summary - Comment Forms

98

Name/ Date	Mtg/Comment Type	Comment			
Keith Greig	Public Workshop				
12/12/11	Comment Form				
<b>Additional comments:</b>					
I live in the San Tan Valley area. Nearly all of my travel is to the North West, to the area enclosed by the 202 loop.					
This new route should tie into the 202 loop, not procede north to 60 at Apache Junction					
This would avoid duplicating tow major North/South highways from 60 to Warner Rd within 5 miles of each other.					
		<b>Segments:</b>	<b>U</b>		<b>Factors:</b>
		<b>A</b> Favorable most westerly route traffic flow will be to the NW from/to the S.E	<b>V</b>		Best connects to other destinations
		<b>B</b> Favorable 1. Most direct route 2.Uses land already committed to a roadway	<b>W</b>		Best connects to cities/towns
		<b>C</b> Unfavorable No population base on the west side	<b>X</b>		Best use of existing roads/hwys
		<b>D</b> Favorable Most direct way South	<b>Y</b> Favorable	Most direct route. Hwy 87 would be redundant if passed.	
		<b>E</b> Unfavorable Second alternative to B and F	<b>Z</b> Favorable	Same as Y. Best use of Hwy 87 corridor	
		<b>F</b> Favorable Most direct route more central than C	<b>AA</b> Favorable	Same as Y and Z	
		<b>G</b> Unfavorable Second alternative to B and F	<b>AB</b>		
		<b>H</b> Favorable Most direct route South to I10	<b>AC</b> Favorable	Does not contribute to NW/SE flow pattern	<b>Funding:</b>
		<b>I</b> Unfavorable Too far west to facilitate NW/SE traffic flow	<b>AD</b>		No: not support/won't use
		<b>J</b> Unfavorable Traffic flow will be NW/SE from the Phoenix metropolitan area	<b>AE</b> Unfavorable	Unecessary duplication. Hwy 87 becomes redundant.	Highways should remain public property. I avoid toll roads or much as 2 can
		<b>K</b> Unfavorable Costly and unnecessary crossing of the canal	<b>AF</b> Unfavorable	same as AE	
		<b>L</b> Unfavorable	<b>AG</b>		
		<b>M</b>	<b>AH</b>		
		<b>N</b>	<b>AI</b>		
		<b>O</b>	<b>AJ</b>		
		<b>P</b>	<b>AK</b>		<b>Response:</b>
		<b>Q</b>	<b>AL</b>		N/A
		<b>R</b> Unfavorable goes wrong way.	<b>AM</b>		
		<b>S</b>	<b>AN</b>		
		<b>T</b>	<b>AO</b> Unfavorable	To far west, leads the wrong way	

# North-South Corridor Study Public Workshops December 2011 Public Involvement Summary - Comment Forms

99

Name/ Date	Mtg/Comment Type	Comment				
James R. Tyus	Public Workshop	<b>Segments:</b>		<b>U</b>	<b>Factors:</b>	
12/20/11	Comment Form	<b>A</b> Favorable	Direct access to I10 to the 60. Most direct.	<b>V</b>		
<b>Additional comments:</b> The route as marked appears to be the most economical as well.		<b>B</b> Favorable	Direct access I-10 to the 60 most direct.	<b>W</b>		
		<b>C</b> Favorable	Direct access I1-0 to the 60. Most direct.	<b>X</b>		
		<b>D</b> Favorable	Direct route I-10 to the 60 most direct	<b>Y</b> Favorable	Direct route I-10 to the 60. Easy access to Coolidge	
		<b>E</b> Favorable	Direct route I-10 to the 60. Most direct.	<b>Z</b> Favorable	Direct route I-10 to the 60. Most direct.	
		<b>F</b> Favorable	Direct route I-10 to the 60. Most direct.	<b>AA</b> Favorable	Most direct route from the I-10-To the 60. Most direct	
		<b>G</b> Favorable	Direct route I-10 to the 60. Most direct.	<b>AB</b>		
		<b>H</b> Favorable	Direct route I-10 to the 60. Most direct.	<b>AC</b>	<b>Funding:</b>	
		<b>I</b>		<b>AD</b>		
		<b>J</b>		<b>AE</b>		
		<b>K</b>		<b>AF</b>		
		<b>L</b>		<b>AG</b>		
		<b>M</b>		<b>AH</b>		
		<b>N</b>		<b>AI</b>		
		<b>O</b>		<b>AJ</b>		
		<b>P</b>		<b>AK</b>	<b>Response:</b> N/A	
		<b>Q</b>		<b>AL</b>		
		<b>R</b>		<b>AM</b>		
		<b>S</b>		<b>AN</b>		
		<b>T</b>		<b>AO</b>		

# North-South Corridor Study Public Workshops December 2011 Public Involvement Summary - Comment Forms

100

Name/ Date	Mtg/Comment Type	Comment			
Anonymous	Public Workshop	<b>Segments:</b>		<b>U</b> Favorable	<b>Factors:</b> Least impact to existing developmt Least impact to natural areas/open space Input rec'd from public
12/12/11	Comment Form	<b>A</b> Favorable	works well or move E to Idaho.	<b>V</b> Favorable	
		<b>B</b> Unfavorable	developed areas	<b>W</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>C</b> Unfavorable	dumb-developed areas exsist. to many homes impacted	<b>X</b> Favorable	
		<b>D</b> Favorable		<b>Y</b> Favorable	
		<b>E</b> Favorable		<b>Z</b> Favorable	
		<b>F</b> Unfavorable		<b>AA</b> Favorable	
		<b>G</b> Favorable		<b>AB</b> Favorable	
		<b>H</b> Favorable		<b>AC</b> Favorable	
		<b>I</b> Unfavorable		<b>AD</b> Favorable	
		<b>J</b> Unfavorable		<b>AE</b> Favorable	
		<b>K</b> Unfavorable		<b>AF</b> Favorable	
		<b>L</b> Favorable		<b>AG</b> Favorable	
		<b>M</b> Unfavorable		<b>AH</b> Favorable	
		<b>N</b> Unfavorable		<b>AI</b> Favorable	
		<b>O</b> Unfavorable		<b>AJ</b> Favorable	
		<b>P</b> Favorable		<b>AK</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>Q</b>		<b>AL</b> Favorable	
		<b>R</b> Unfavorable		<b>AM</b> Favorable	
		<b>S</b> Unfavorable		<b>AN</b> Favorable	
		<b>T</b> Unfavorable		<b>AO</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>Additional comments:</b> Keep freeway from existing communities			
					<b>Response:</b> N/A

## North-South Corridor Study Public Workshops December 2011 Public Involvement Summary - Comment Forms

Name/ Date	Mtg/Comment Type	Comment			
Anonymous	Public Workshop	<b>Segments:</b>			
12/12/11	Comment Form	<b>A</b> Unfavorable	preserve existing surface arterial	<b>U</b> Favorable	an alternative route to V
		<b>B</b> Unfavorable	preserve critical arterial	<b>V</b> Favorable	an alternative route to U
		<b>C</b> Unfavorable	Bad to bypass Florence, need arterial	<b>W</b> Unfavorable	see T
		<b>D</b> Unfavorable	see C above.	<b>X</b> Favorable	most critical segment for long term sustainability of Florence
		<b>E</b> Favorable	if connected to SR24 or 202	<b>Y</b> Unfavorable	bypass Florence
		<b>F</b> Favorable	only if it connects to L	<b>Z</b> Unfavorable	jLose 87 w this option
		<b>G</b> Favorable	Keeps route w of cap and could connect to SR24	<b>AA</b> Unfavorable	see Z
		<b>H</b> Unfavorable	not consistent w/travel models	<b>AB</b> Favorable	works with Florence alignment
		<b>I</b> Favorable	connects to 60 though better options connect to SR24 or 202	<b>AC</b> Favorable	works with Florence alignment
		<b>J</b> Favorable	works with preferred Florence alignment	<b>AD</b> Favorable	would work with Florence alignment
		<b>K</b> Favorable	optional route to get to 60.	<b>AE</b> Unfavorable	other alternatives are better
		<b>L</b> Favorable	consistent with travel model & connects Florence	<b>AF</b> Unfavorable	see AE
		<b>M</b> Unfavorable	Favors unrealistic eastern routes T and W	<b>AG</b> Unfavorable	see AF
		<b>N</b> Unfavorable	Better to connect to SR24, 60, or 202	<b>AH</b> Favorable	better than other option to west
		<b>O</b> Favorable	Works with Florence alignment	<b>AI</b> Favorable	option to AK
		<b>P</b> Favorable	works with Florence alignment	<b>AJ</b> Favorable	option to AK
		<b>Q</b> Unfavorable	Divides Anthem & Merrill Ranch	<b>AK</b> Favorable	work with AL
		<b>R</b> Unfavorable	Poor start/end location	<b>AL</b> Favorable	good terminus
		<b>S</b> Unfavorable	too far east to meet growth demands	<b>AM</b> Favorable	could work with X
		<b>T</b> Unfavorable	costly. dam impact. FMR impacts-Loss of econ.dev.	<b>AN</b> Favorable	works with Florence alignment of AL
				<b>AO</b> Unfavorable	
<b>Additional comments:</b> Please recognize the long term sustainability & economic development opportunities for town like Florence & Coolidge.		<b>Factors:</b> Best connects to cities/towns			
		<b>Funding:</b> Yes: support tolled hwy Yes: use tolled hwy			
		<b>Response:</b> N/A			



# North-South Corridor Study Public Workshops December 2011 Public Involvement Summary - Comment Forms

102

Name/ Date	Mtg/Comment Type	Comment	
Kathleen Banks	Public Workshop	<b>Segments:</b>	<b>U</b>
12/12/11	Comment Form	<b>A</b> Unfavorable	<b>V</b>
		<b>B</b> Unfavorable	<b>W</b>
<b>Additional comments:</b> Route #2 I circled is what I like.		<b>C</b>	<b>X</b>
		<b>D</b>	<b>Y</b>
I really don't have any strong feelings about the southern route alternatives		<b>E</b>	<b>Z</b>
		<b>F</b> Unfavorable	<b>AA</b>
		<b>G</b>	<b>AB</b>
		<b>H</b>	<b>AC</b>
		<b>I</b> Favorable	<b>AD</b>
		<b>J</b> Favorable	<b>AE</b>
		<b>K</b>	<b>AF</b>
		<b>L</b>	<b>AG</b>
		<b>M</b>	<b>AH</b>
		<b>N</b>	<b>AI</b>
		<b>O</b> Favorable	<b>AJ</b>
		<b>P</b>	<b>AK</b>
		<b>Q</b> Favorable	<b>AL</b>
		<b>R</b>	<b>AM</b>
		<b>S</b>	<b>AN</b>
		<b>T</b>	<b>AO</b>
			<b>Factors:</b> Best relieves traffic/local streets Best relieves traffic/hwys & frwys Best connects to other major routes
			<b>Funding:</b> No: not support/won't use  I don't like tollways-some are confusing also. Once they're in place, they never disappear
			<b>Response:</b> N/A

# North-South Corridor Study Public Workshops December 2011 Public Involvement Summary - Comment Forms

103

Name/ Date	Mtg/Comment Type	Comment	
Robert Mullins	Public Workshop	<b>Segments:</b>	<b>U</b>
12/12/11	Comment Form	<b>A</b>	<b>V</b>
		<b>B</b>	<b>W</b>
		<b>C</b>	<b>X</b>
		<b>D</b>	<b>Y</b>
		<b>E</b>	<b>Z</b>
		<b>F</b>	<b>AA</b>
		<b>G</b>	<b>AB</b>
		<b>H</b>	<b>AC</b>
		<b>I</b> Favorable I think it would be better to have a new road	<b>AD</b>
		<b>J</b> Favorable same as I	<b>AE</b>
		<b>K</b>	<b>AF</b>
		<b>L</b>	<b>AG</b>
		<b>M</b>	<b>AH</b>
		<b>N</b>	<b>AI</b>
		<b>O</b> Favorable	<b>AJ</b>
		<b>P</b>	<b>AK</b>
		<b>Q</b> Favorable I think it is better to have a new road, that you don't have to move anything	<b>AL</b>
		<b>R</b>	<b>AM</b>
		<b>S</b>	<b>AN</b>
		<b>T</b>	<b>AO</b>

**Factors:**  
Best relieves traffic/hwys  
& frwys  
Best connects to other  
destinations  
Best connects to other  
major routes

**Funding:**  
No: not support/won't use  
No-once in place the  
funds will be used for  
other purposes and  
probably be put in a slush  
fund and everone will  
have their fingers in it.  
(Bad idea-I would not use  
it.)

**Response:**  
N/A

**Additional comments:**  
I think it would be better to have a  
new road, that nothing has to be  
moved.

# North-South Corridor Study Public Workshops December 2011 Public Involvement Summary - Comment Forms

Name/ Date	Mtg/Comment Type	Comment		
Jane Malek	Public Workshop		<b>U</b> Unfavorable	<b>Factors:</b> Least impact to natural areas/open space Best use of existing roads/hwys Input rec'd from public
12/7/11	Comment Form	<b>Segments:</b>		
		<b>A</b> Favorable existing right of way	<b>V</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>B</b> Favorable existing roadway	<b>W</b> Unfavorable	
<b>Additional comments:</b> I feel it is better to use existing right of ways whenever possible. Land has already been purchased, environmental issues dealt with, and it is serving an existing population. These factors may result in expedited construction.  My concern with using existing right of ways is the upheaval to traffic already using this crowded roadway during construction.  I very much favor including consideration & planning for alternative transportation at the same time.		<b>C</b> Unfavorable	<b>X</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>D</b> Favorable near residential development	<b>Y</b> Favorable existing roadway	
		<b>E</b> Unfavorable	<b>Z</b> Favorable existing roadway	
		<b>F</b> Favorable more direct	<b>AA</b> Favorable existing roadway	
		<b>G</b> Unfavorable	<b>AB</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>H</b> Favorable more direct	<b>AC</b> Unfavorable	<b>Funding:</b> No: not support/won't use
		<b>I</b> Unfavorable	<b>AD</b> Unfavorable	I am against toll roads in AZ. Our roads should be available for all to use.
		<b>J</b> Unfavorable	<b>AE</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>K</b> Unfavorable	<b>AF</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>L</b> Unfavorable	<b>AG</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>M</b> Unfavorable	<b>AH</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>N</b> Unfavorable	<b>AI</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>O</b> Unfavorable	<b>AJ</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>P</b> Unfavorable	<b>AK</b> Unfavorable	<b>Response:</b> N/A
		<b>Q</b> Unfavorable	<b>AL</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>R</b> Unfavorable	<b>AM</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>S</b> Unfavorable	<b>AN</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>T</b> Unfavorable	<b>AO</b> Unfavorable	

## North-South Corridor Study Public Workshops December 2011 Public Involvement Summary - Comment Forms

105

Name/ Date	Mtg/Comment Type	Comment		
B. Thoma	Public Workshop	<b>Segments:</b>	<b>U</b>	<b>Factors:</b>
	Comment Form	<b>A</b>	<b>V</b>	Lowest cost
12/22/11		<b>B</b>	<b>W</b>	Least impact to existing developmt
		<b>C</b>	<b>X</b>	Least impact to natural areas/open space
		<b>D</b>	<b>Y</b>	Best use of existing roads/hwys
		<b>E</b>	<b>Z</b>	
		<b>F</b>	<b>AA</b>	
		<b>G</b>	<b>AB</b>	
		<b>H</b>	<b>AC</b>	<b>Funding:</b>
		<b>I</b>	<b>AD</b>	No: not support/won't use
		<b>J</b>	<b>AE</b>	
		<b>K</b>	<b>AF</b>	
		<b>L</b>	<b>AG</b>	
		<b>M</b>	<b>AH</b>	
		<b>N</b>	<b>AI</b>	
		<b>O</b>	<b>AJ</b>	
		<b>P</b>	<b>AK</b>	<b>Response:</b>
		<b>Q</b>	<b>AL</b>	N/A
		<b>R</b>	<b>AM</b>	
		<b>S</b>	<b>AN</b>	
		<b>T</b>	<b>AO</b>	

### Additional comments:

Why can't you existing route? The proceeding questions are irrelevant to me. I am a member of the working poor. The only thing I own besides a vehicle is my mobile home. I realize that those empowered to make this decision will not regard my wishes. I have a greedy landlord who raises our space rent to the maximum % at each legal opportunity.

My rent was \$140=monthly in 2003. Now 8 years later it is \$312+.

I just wish someone would make me, an offer, which would allow me to move where I can live the rest of my life with dignity.

I am 78 years of age-and still work my 40 hrs. per week.

NOW THIS!

Welcome to my American Dream.

B. Thoma  
654 E Ranch Sp 171  
San Tan Valley  
85140

using existing routes has minimal impact on wildlife. I no longer hear the coyotes at night. I miss them.

# North-South Corridor Study Public Workshops December 2011 Public Involvement Summary - Comment Forms

Name/ Date	Mtg/Comment Type	Comment			
Thomas Krukow	Public Workshop	<b>Segments:</b>		<b>U</b>	<b>Factors:</b>
12/7/11	Comment Form	<b>A</b>	Unfavorable N end of A can't be widened enough at US60 bridge.	<b>V</b>	Best relieves traffic/hwys & frwys
<b>Additional comments:</b> On Northern Route Alternatives map: Road drawn from Peralta Rd to I; Could be county road link to N-S freeway  Widening existing roads like Ironwood, Gantsville & Hunt Hwy should not be done. For all the years of disruption you get minimal additional capacity. They are cost ineffective. Where do all the people go to get around the construction? They over tax other roads. RE: US60 bypass around Gold Canyon. If SR24 was completed first, I believe the traffic on 60 would be diminished enough to eliminate that by-pass.		<b>B</b>	Unfavorable already improved; dollars spent; huge disruption to whole area; won't increase traffic capacity by 3 more	<b>W</b>	Least impact to existing developmt
		<b>C</b>	Unfavorable Where does all current traffic go for years of construction.	<b>X</b>	Least impact to planned developmt
		<b>D</b>	Unfavorable same	<b>Y</b>	
		<b>E</b>		<b>Z</b>	
		<b>F</b>		<b>AA</b>	
		<b>G</b>		<b>AB</b>	
		<b>H</b>		<b>AC</b>	<b>Funding:</b>
		<b>I</b>		<b>AD</b>	No: not support/won't use
		<b>J</b>		<b>AE</b>	Toll road construction thru public lands is a benefit for the affluent. I gives them a way to live further from work, and not have to put up with the traffic congestion, that less affluent people must put up with.
		<b>K</b>		<b>AF</b>	
		<b>L</b>		<b>AG</b>	
		<b>M</b>		<b>AH</b>	
		<b>N</b>		<b>AI</b>	
		<b>O</b>		<b>AJ</b>	
		<b>P</b>		<b>AK</b>	<b>Response:</b>
		<b>Q</b>		<b>AL</b>	N/A
		<b>R</b>		<b>AM</b>	
		<b>S</b>		<b>AN</b>	
		<b>T</b>		<b>AO</b>	

**North-South Corridor Study Public Workshops December 2011  
Public Involvement Summary - Comment Forms**

107

Name/ Date	Mtg/Comment Type	Comment	
Diann Lesueur	Public Workshop	<b>Segments:</b>	<b>U</b> Unfavorable
12/8/11	Comment Form	<b>A</b> Favorable	<b>V</b> Unfavorable
<b>Additional comments:</b>		<b>B</b> Unfavorable	<b>W</b> Unfavorable
		<b>C</b> Favorable	<b>X</b> Favorable
		<b>D</b> Favorable	<b>Y</b> Favorable
		<b>E</b>	<b>Z</b> Favorable
		<b>F</b> Unfavorable	<b>AA</b> Favorable
		<b>G</b> Unfavorable	<b>AB</b> Favorable
		<b>H</b> Unfavorable	<b>AC</b> Unfavorable
		<b>I</b> Favorable	<b>AD</b> Favorable
		<b>J</b> Favorable	<b>AE</b> Unfavorable
		<b>K</b> Unfavorable	<b>AF</b> Favorable
		<b>L</b> Favorable	<b>AG</b> Favorable
		<b>M</b> Favorable	<b>AH</b> Favorable
		<b>N</b> Favorable	<b>AI</b> Favorable
		<b>O</b> Favorable	<b>AJ</b> Favorable
		<b>P</b> Favorable	<b>AK</b>
		<b>Q</b> Favorable	<b>AL</b> Favorable
		<b>R</b> Unfavorable	<b>AM</b>
		<b>S</b> Favorable	<b>AN</b> Favorable
		<b>T</b> Favorable	<b>AO</b> Favorable
			<b>Factors:</b>
			<b>Funding:</b> No: not support/won't use
			<b>Response:</b> N/A

# North-South Corridor Study Public Workshops December 2011 Public Involvement Summary - Comment Forms

108

Name/ Date	Mtg/Comment Type	Comment		
Jon Thompson	Public Workshop		U	
		<b>Segments:</b>		<b>Factors:</b>
		A	V	Best connects to other major routes
12/22/11	Comment Form	B	W	
<b>Additional comments:</b>		C	X Unfavorable	
am cont: route that city of coolidge supported. councilmember curry wanted new route to the west but he resigned from city council so his opinion is out. This route makes the most sense. There is already an easement as well as an "established dont's" I support this contz.		D Unfavorable stay away from Hunt Hwy.	Y Unfavorable	disrubs to many people in Coolidge on East side-wipes out eastside of town.
		E	Z Unfavorable	Bad news for current 2ESL Curts to much relocation to many problems with law suits
		F	AA Unfavorable	
		G	AB Unfavorable	Do not like city vote-in route was much better
		H	AC	<b>Funding:</b>
		I	AD Favorable	Avoids Picacho reservoir which has environmental impact and endangered species.
		J	AE Favorable	Easement already in-close to railroad
		K	AF Favorable	easements already in close to Railroad
		L	AG	
		M	AH	
		N	AI	
		O	AJ	
		P	AK	<b>Response:</b> N/A
		Q	AL Favorable	closer to pima county/proposed railroad yard/new development
		R	AM Favorable	This area is already compromised with power lines. Why compromise 2 area? Put everything here is all
		S	AN Favorable	Less disruptive to future mall, airport, and existing citizens.
		T	AO	

# North-South Corridor Study Public Workshops December 2011 Public Involvement Summary - Comment Forms

Name/ Date	Mtg/Comment Type	Comment			
Mark Reidling	Public Workshop				
12/8/11	Comment Form				
Additional comments:					
		<b>Segments:</b>	<b>U</b> Unfavorable	they won't like it	<b>Factors:</b>
		<b>A</b> Favorable Route already exists along Ironwood	<b>V</b> Unfavorable	they won't like that at Merrill Ranch	
		<b>B</b> Unfavorable too populated-xxx subdivisions	<b>W</b> Unfavorable	it would cost more \$ from the impact on nat'l guard	
		<b>C</b> Favorable waste to tax \$\$ too curvy adds \$\$ but better choice	<b>X</b> Favorable		
		<b>D</b> Favorable easier access for populated areas	<b>Y</b> Favorable	more reasonable	
		<b>E</b>	<b>Z</b> Favorable		
		<b>F</b> Unfavorable	<b>AA</b> Favorable	follow railroad	
		<b>G</b> Unfavorable Too much impact on housing-\$	<b>AB</b> Favorable		
		<b>H</b> Unfavorable Too close to magic ranch homes	<b>AC</b> Unfavorable	why curve over \$\$\$	<b>Funding:</b>
		<b>I</b> Favorable Less invasive to subdivisions	<b>AD</b> Favorable		No: not support/won't use
		<b>J</b> Favorable	<b>AE</b> Favorable	take the strighter way	
		<b>K</b> Unfavorable why???	<b>AF</b> Favorable		
		<b>L</b> Favorable	<b>AG</b> Favorable		
		<b>M</b> Favorable Ok to connect up N-O or S	<b>AH</b> Favorable	staighter	
		<b>N</b> Favorable Ok to connect to O	<b>AI</b> Favorable		
		<b>O</b> Favorable straighter saves \$	<b>AJ</b> Favorable	why curves xxx?	
		<b>P</b> Favorable	<b>AK</b>		<b>Response:</b>
		<b>Q</b> Favorable straighter line	<b>AL</b> Favorable		N/A
		<b>R</b> Unfavorable waste of \$\$	<b>AM</b>		
		<b>S</b> Favorable	<b>AN</b> Favorable		
		<b>T</b> Favorable	<b>AO</b> Favorable		



# North-South Corridor Study Public Workshops December 2011 Public Involvement Summary - Comment Forms

110

Name/ Date	Mtg/Comment Type	Comment		
Debbie Marrs	Public Workshop	<b>Segments:</b>	<b>U</b> Unfavorable	<b>Factors:</b>
12/7/11	Comment Form	<b>A</b> Unfavorable	<b>V</b> Unfavorable	Best relieves traffic/local streets
<b>Additional comments:</b>		<b>B</b> Unfavorable	<b>W</b> Favorable	Best relieves traffic/hwys & frwys
		<b>C</b> Unfavorable	<b>X</b> Favorable	Input rec'd from public
		<b>D</b> Unfavorable	<b>Y</b>	
		<b>E</b> Unfavorable	<b>Z</b>	
		<b>F</b> Unfavorable	<b>AA</b>	
		<b>G</b> Favorable	<b>AB</b>	
		<b>H</b> Unfavorable	<b>AC</b>	<b>Funding:</b>
		<b>I</b> Favorable	<b>AD</b>	Yes: use tolled hwy
		<b>J</b> Favorable	<b>AE</b>	
		<b>K</b> Favorable	<b>AF</b>	
		<b>L</b> Favorable	<b>AG</b>	
		<b>M</b> Unfavorable	<b>AH</b>	
		<b>N</b> Unfavorable	<b>AI</b>	
		<b>O</b> Favorable	<b>AJ</b>	
		<b>P</b> Unfavorable	<b>AK</b>	<b>Response:</b>
		<b>Q</b> Favorable	<b>AL</b>	N/A
		<b>R</b> Favorable	<b>AM</b>	
		<b>S</b> Favorable	<b>AN</b>	
		<b>T</b> Unfavorable	<b>AO</b>	

# North-South Corridor Study Public Workshops December 2011 Public Involvement Summary - Comment Forms

111

Name/ Date	Mtg/Comment Type	Comment			
Roc Arnett	Public Workshop				
12/28/11	Comment Form				
<b>Additional comments:</b> XXX- the 24 xxx-indicated- & the N-South become the proposed by pass-					
		<b>Segments:</b>	<b>U</b>	Favorable	Preferred #1
		<b>A</b> Unfavorable to far west, does not assist development of S.V.	<b>V</b>	Favorable	#3 preferred
		<b>B</b> Unfavorable Ironwood already developed-	<b>W</b>	Favorable	Preferred #3
		<b>C</b> Unfavorable same	<b>X</b>	Favorable	
		<b>D</b> Unfavorable same	<b>Y</b>		
		<b>E</b> Unfavorable does no do good for econ.dev. behind the CAP-	<b>Z</b>		
		<b>F</b> Unfavorable	<b>AA</b>		
		<b>G</b> Unfavorable	<b>AB</b>		
		<b>H</b> Unfavorable	<b>AC</b>		<b>Funding:</b>
		<b>I</b> Favorable 1. Better econ dev. for S.V. 2. possible alternate to by-pass-	<b>AD</b>		
		<b>J</b> Unfavorable	<b>AE</b>		Extensive study will be needed to support a toll road-
		<b>K</b> Unfavorable	<b>AF</b>		
		<b>L</b> Unfavorable	<b>AG</b>		
		<b>M</b> Favorable	<b>AH</b>		
		<b>N</b> Favorable favor #2	<b>AI</b>		
		<b>O</b> alternate-#2	<b>AJ</b>		
		<b>P</b>	<b>AK</b>		<b>Response:</b> N/A
		<b>Q</b>	<b>AL</b>		
		<b>R</b>	<b>AM</b>		
		<b>S</b> Favorable favor #1 preferred	<b>AN</b>		
		<b>T</b> Favorable Preferred 1	<b>AO</b>		

# North-South Corridor Study Public Workshops December 2011 Public Involvement Summary - Comment Forms

Name/ Date	Mtg/Comment Type	Comment	
Danny Owen	Public Workshop	<b>Segments:</b>	<b>U</b>
12/28/11	Comment Form	<b>A</b>	<b>V</b>
<b>Additional comments:</b> Existing facilities such as Ironwood Dr. & Hunt Highway will be needed in addition to the new freeway. Any segments that replace these roadways should be eliminated.		<b>B</b> Unfavorable Ironwood Dr. will be needed in addition to the freeway, adjacent to lots of existing residential	<b>W</b>
		<b>C</b> Unfavorable Hunt Hwy will be needed in addition to freeway, this segment is also adjacent to existing residential	<b>X</b>
		<b>D</b> Unfavorable Hunt Hwy will be needed in addition to freeway, also impacts both existing & planned residential dev.	<b>Y</b>
		<b>E</b>	<b>Z</b>
		<b>F</b> Unfavorable Ultimately leads to segment "B" (see comments on segment "B" above)	<b>AA</b>
		<b>G</b>	<b>AB</b>
		<b>H</b> Unfavorable Must connect to segment "D" (see comments on segment "D" above)	<b>AC</b>
		<b>I</b>	<b>AD</b>
		<b>J</b>	<b>AE</b>
		<b>K</b>	<b>AF</b>
		<b>L</b> Unfavorable Potentially connects to segments "F" & "B" (see comments on segment "E" above)	<b>AG</b>
		<b>M</b>	<b>AH</b>
		<b>N</b>	<b>AI</b>
		<b>O</b>	<b>AJ</b>
		<b>P</b>	<b>AK</b>
		<b>Q</b>	<b>AL</b>
		<b>R</b>	<b>AM</b>
		<b>S</b>	<b>AN</b>
		<b>T</b>	<b>AO</b>
			<b>Factors:</b> Other
			<b>Funding:</b> Yes: support tolled hwy Yes: use tolled hwy
			<b>Response:</b> N/A

# North-South Corridor Study Public Workshops December 2011 Public Involvement Summary - Comment Forms

113

Name/ Date	Mtg/Comment Type	Comment		
Paul Prechel	Public Workshop	<b>Segments:</b>	<b>U</b> Unfavorable	<b>Factors:</b> Best connects to other major routes Lowest cost Least impact to existing developmt
12/8/11	Comment Form	<b>A</b> Favorable	<b>V</b> Unfavorable	
<b>Additional comments:</b>		<b>B</b> Favorable	<b>W</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>C</b> Unfavorable	<b>X</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>D</b> Unfavorable	<b>Y</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>E</b> this could be an alternate to B	<b>Z</b> Favorable	
		<b>F</b> Favorable	<b>AA</b> Favorable	
		<b>G</b> this could be an alternate to F	<b>AB</b> Unfavorable	<b>Funding:</b> Yes: support tolled hwy Yes: use tolled hwy
		<b>H</b> Unfavorable	<b>AC</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>I</b> Unfavorable	<b>AD</b> Favorable	
		<b>J</b> Unfavorable	<b>AE</b> Favorable	
		<b>K</b> Unfavorable	<b>AF</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>L</b> Favorable	<b>AG</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>M</b> Unfavorable	<b>AH</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>N</b> Unfavorable	<b>AI</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>O</b> Unfavorable	<b>AJ</b> Unfavorable	<b>Response:</b> N/A
		<b>P</b> Unfavorable	<b>AK</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>Q</b> Favorable	<b>AL</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>R</b> Unfavorable	<b>AM</b> Favorable	
		<b>S</b> Unfavorable	<b>AN</b> Favorable	
		<b>T</b> Unfavorable	<b>AO</b> Unfavorable	

# North-South Corridor Study Public Workshops December 2011 Public Involvement Summary - Comment Forms

Name/ Date	Mtg/Comment Type	Comment			
Travis Welton	Public Workshop	<b>Segments:</b>		<b>U</b> Unfavorable	<b>Factors:</b> Best relieves traffic/local streets Best connects to employment ctrs Best connects to cities/towns
12/30/11	Comment Form	<b>A</b> Favorable	Not my 1st choice. would rather see a new road. It is already crowded at that stretch of road.	<b>V</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>B</b> Unfavorable	This street is already busy.	<b>W</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>C</b> Unfavorable	This roadway is already to busy.	<b>X</b> Unfavorable	
<b>Additional comments:</b> I would propose that we take advantage of there not being an off ramp on the meridian Rd. and use it to create a new road.		<b>D</b> Favorable	I would like to see a new road to Coolidge	<b>Y</b> Favorable	Would like to se road expanded
I do not think that following an existing road would be benefical to traffic issue than one already preventent.		<b>E</b> Favorable	This would be a great roadway to help me get into town for work.	<b>Z</b> Favorable	Would like to see road expanded
		<b>F</b> Favorable	this would be a good road to get around Hunt Hwy.	<b>AA</b> Favorable	Would like to see road expanded
		<b>G</b> Favorable	This would be a good road to help get through the back roads.	<b>AB</b> Favorable	
		<b>H</b> Favorable	This route would be perfered to help connect G & F to D.	<b>AC</b> Favorable	<b>Funding:</b> No: not support/won't use
		<b>I</b> Unfavorable	Doesn't seen reasonable to me.	<b>AD</b> Favorable	
		<b>J</b> Unfavorable	Unsure about road.	<b>AE</b> Favorable	
		<b>K</b> Favorable	This would be a good route from Sun Tan to Gold Canyon/Apache Jct.	<b>AF</b> Favorable	
		<b>L</b> Favorable	Would be a good addition to the back roads at STV.	<b>AG</b> Favorable	
		<b>M</b> Unfavorable	Don't see the reason for it.	<b>AH</b> Favorable	
		<b>N</b> Favorable	Would be a good connection point from US60 to K & O	<b>AI</b> Favorable	
		<b>O</b> Favorable	Good route from STV to Gold Canyon/Apache Jct.	<b>AJ</b> Favorable	<b>Response:</b> N/A
		<b>P</b> Unfavorable		<b>AK</b> Favorable	
		<b>Q</b> Favorable	Nice addition to Florence/Coolidge	<b>AL</b> Favorable	
		<b>R</b> Unfavorable		<b>AM</b> Favorable	
		<b>S</b> Unfavorable		<b>AN</b> Favorable	
		<b>T</b> Unfavorable		<b>AO</b> Favorable	

# North-South Corridor Study Public Workshops December 2011 Public Involvement Summary - Comment Forms

115

Name/ Date	Mtg/Comment Type	Comment	
Susan & Barry Wilson	Public Workshop	<b>Segments:</b>	
12/12/11	Comment Form	<b>U</b>	
<b>Additional comments:</b> By using existing road impact on communities will be less.		<b>Factors:</b> Best relieves traffic/local streets Best connects to other major routes Least impact to existing developmt	
		<b>A</b> Favorable Existing road	<b>V</b>
		<b>B</b> Favorable Existing Road	<b>W</b>
		<b>C</b>	<b>X</b>
		<b>D</b> Favorable existing road	<b>Y</b> Favorable Existing Road
		<b>E</b>	<b>Z</b> Favorable Existing Road
		<b>F</b> Favorable would bring business were SRP is already working	<b>AA</b> Favorable Existing Road
		<b>G</b>	<b>AB</b>
		<b>H</b> Favorable missing most of existing homes	<b>AC</b>
		<b>I</b>	<b>AD</b>
		<b>J</b>	<b>AE</b>
		<b>K</b>	<b>AF</b>
		<b>L</b>	<b>AG</b>
		<b>M</b>	<b>AH</b>
		<b>N</b>	<b>AI</b>
		<b>O</b>	<b>AJ</b>
		<b>P</b>	<b>AK</b>
		<b>Q</b>	<b>AL</b>
		<b>R</b>	<b>AM</b>
		<b>S</b>	<b>AN</b>
		<b>T</b>	<b>AO</b>
		<b>Funding:</b> Yes: support tolled hwy Yes: use tolled hwy Tolls: Only if guarantee that after a specified time period they went away. Tolls should be at exits & entrances only	
		<b>Response:</b> N/A	

# North-South Corridor Study Public Workshops December 2011 Public Involvement Summary - Comment Forms

116

Name/ Date	Mtg/Comment Type	Comment	
Ed Spilo	Public Workshop	<b>Segments:</b>	
12/12/11	Comment Form	<b>A</b> Favorable Best access for existing residence	<b>U</b>
<b>Additional comments:</b> Overall route should be the shortest, most direct path between US 60 and I-10. However the access for existing and near term residence should receive priority over long term development. In addition, access to Coolidge Airport and Banner Ironwood Hospital should be considered.		<b>B</b> Favorable Best access for existing residence. And sooner connection to SR24	<b>V</b>
		<b>C</b> Unfavorable	<b>W</b> Unfavorable Too far from existing residence
		<b>D</b>	<b>X</b>
		<b>E</b>	<b>Y</b>
		<b>F</b> Favorable	<b>Z</b>
		<b>G</b>	<b>AA</b> Favorable Intersect with I-10 as far west as possible for better access to I8
		<b>H</b>	<b>AB</b>
		<b>I</b>	<b>AC</b>
		<b>J</b>	<b>AD</b>
		<b>K</b>	<b>AE</b>
		<b>L</b>	<b>AF</b>
		<b>M</b>	<b>AG</b>
		<b>N</b>	<b>AH</b>
		<b>O</b>	<b>AI</b>
		<b>P</b>	<b>AJ</b>
		<b>Q</b>	<b>AK</b>
		<b>R</b>	<b>AL</b>
		<b>S</b>	<b>AM</b>
		<b>T</b> Unfavorable Too far from existing residence	<b>AN</b>
			<b>AO</b>
		<b>Factors:</b> Best connects to employment ctrs Best connects to other major routes Best use of existing roads/hwys	
		<b>Funding:</b> No: not support/won't use	
		<b>Response:</b> N/A	

**North-South Corridor Study Public Workshops December 2011  
Public Involvement Summary - Comment Forms**

117

Name/ Date	Mtg/Comment Type	Comment	
Robert Brantley	Public Workshop	<b>Segments:</b>	
12/07/11	Comment Form	<b>A</b>	<b>U</b>
<b>Additional comments:</b>		<b>B</b>	<b>V</b>
		<b>C</b>	<b>W</b>
		<b>D</b> Favorable    Most direct route	<b>X</b>
		<b>E</b>	<b>Y</b> Favorable    Most direct route
		<b>F</b>	<b>Z</b> Favorable    Most direct route
		<b>G</b> Favorable    Most direct route	<b>AA</b> Favorable    Most direct route
		<b>H</b> Favorable    Most direct route	<b>AB</b>
		<b>I</b> Favorable    State Trust Land	<b>AC</b>
		<b>J</b> Favorable    State Trust Land	<b>AD</b>
		<b>K</b> Favorable    Most direct route	<b>AE</b>
		<b>L</b>	<b>AF</b>
		<b>M</b>	<b>AG</b>
		<b>N</b>	<b>AH</b>
		<b>O</b>	<b>AI</b>
		<b>P</b>	<b>AJ</b>
		<b>Q</b>	<b>AK</b>
		<b>R</b>	<b>AL</b>
		<b>S</b>	<b>AM</b>
		<b>T</b>	<b>AN</b>
			<b>AO</b>

**Factors:**  
Best relieves traffic/hwys  
& frwys  
Best connects to other  
major routes  
Least impact to existing  
developmt

**Funding:**  
Yes: use tolled hwy

**Response:**



# North-South Corridor Study Public Workshops December 2011 Public Involvement Summary - Comment Forms

118

Name/ Date	Mtg/Comment Type	Comment			
Scott Lenz	Public Workshop	<b>Segments:</b>	<b>U</b>	Unfavorable	Expensive condemnation w/ entitled land
12/12/11	Comment Form	<b>A</b>	<b>V</b>	Unfavorable	Expensive condemnation w/ entitled land
<b>Additional comments:</b>		<b>B</b> Unfavorable Does not avoid existing development	<b>W</b>	Favorable	Combine w/ "T"
		<b>C</b> Unfavorable Does not avoid existing development	<b>X</b>		
		<b>D</b> Unfavorable Does not avoid existing development	<b>Y</b>		
		<b>E</b> Unfavorable Too many issues w/ CAP/Wild-cat lot owners	<b>Z</b>		
		<b>F</b>	<b>AA</b>		
		<b>G</b> Unfavorable It's close to, but not adjacent to SRP power line thus create huge "Void" area	<b>AB</b>		
		<b>H</b> Unfavorable Too may RR crossings	<b>AC</b>		
		<b>I</b>	<b>AD</b>		
		<b>J</b>	<b>AE</b>		
		<b>K</b>	<b>AF</b>		
		<b>L</b> Unfavorable Traverses near existing homes & final plats in Mesquite Trails & Felix Farms	<b>AG</b>		
		<b>M</b>	<b>AH</b>		
		<b>N</b>	<b>AI</b>		
		<b>O</b> Unfavorable Ignores difficulty w/ crossing Magma RR/CAP and huge dam	<b>AJ</b>		
		<b>P</b> Unfavorable Total invasion of existing homes in Crestfield Manor	<b>AK</b>		
		<b>Q</b> Unfavorable Expensive condemnation for Final Plat lots in Mesquite Trails	<b>AL</b>		
		<b>R</b>	<b>AM</b>		
		<b>S</b> Favorable Avoids existing development	<b>AN</b>		
		<b>T</b> Favorable Can avoid Magma Ranch (by combining w/ "W")	<b>AO</b>		
					<b>Factors:</b> Lowest cost Least impact to existing developmt Least impact to planned developmt
					<b>Funding:</b> Yes: support tolled hwy Yes: use tolled hwy This seems to be a model that has worked well in other cities. (Including Austin, Dallas, Fort Worth)
					<b>Response:</b>

# North-South Corridor Study Public Workshops December 2011 Public Involvement Summary - Comment Forms

119

Name/ Date	Mtg/Comment Type	Comment			
Linda Henderson	Public Workshop				
12/23/11	Comment Form				
<b>Additional comments:</b>					
Overall would prefer to end up a bit East on 60 but not to far E.					
Concerned about housing development (Wheeler Tract) on Wheeler Rd.					
		<b>Segments:</b>	<b>U</b>		<b>Factors:</b>
		<b>A</b> Favorable Like to end up East at least this far (not farther E)	<b>V</b>		Best relieves traffic/hwys & frwys
		<b>B</b> Favorable	<b>W</b>		Best connects to employment ctrs
		<b>C</b>	<b>X</b> Unfavorable To far to the East. No gain.		Best connects to other destinations
		<b>D</b> Favorable	<b>Y</b> Favorable May help town of Coolidge growth. Close to future mall on Bartlett		
		<b>E</b> Favorable	<b>Z</b>		
		<b>F</b> Favorable	<b>AA</b> Favorable Existing route		
		<b>G</b> Favorable	<b>AB</b>		
		<b>H</b>	<b>AC</b>		<b>Funding:</b>
		<b>I</b> Unfavorable Too far East	<b>AD</b>		No: not support/won't use
		<b>J</b>	<b>AE</b>		
		<b>K</b>	<b>AF</b>		
		<b>L</b>	<b>AG</b>		
		<b>M</b>	<b>AH</b>		
		<b>N</b>	<b>AI</b>		
		<b>O</b>	<b>AJ</b> Unfavorable Close to residential on Wheeler Rd. & too close to future Prison		<b>Response:</b>
		<b>P</b>	<b>AK</b>		N/A
		<b>Q</b>	<b>AL</b> Favorable No fissures		
		<b>R</b>	<b>AM</b> Favorable Keep East of Valley Farms Rd. - Align w/ power lines		
		<b>S</b>	<b>AN</b> Unfavorable Too close to homeowners		
		<b>T</b>	<b>AO</b>		

# North-South Corridor Study Public Workshops December 2011 Public Involvement Summary - Comment Forms

120

Name/ Date	Mtg/Comment Type	Comment		
Varr Myers	Public Workshop	<b>Segments:</b>		
12/08/11	Comment Form	<b>A</b> Favorable	Good rt for commuters	<b>U</b>
<b>Additional comments:</b> XX Disturbs few currently developed/settled areas  Straight line much cheaper to build  Leaves 87 a viable alternate route  Opens new lands to future development  Lower acquisition costs  Much State & Busi Land on this route		<b>B</b> Favorable	Good rt for commuters	<b>V</b>
		<b>C</b>		<b>W</b>
		<b>D</b>		<b>X</b>
		<b>E</b>		<b>Y</b>
		<b>F</b>		<b>Z</b>
		<b>G</b>		<b>AA</b>
		<b>H</b> Favorable		<b>AB</b>
		<b>I</b> Unfavorable		<b>AC</b>
		<b>J</b>		<b>AD</b>
		<b>K</b>		<b>AE</b>
		<b>L</b>		<b>AF</b>
		<b>M</b>		<b>AG</b>
		<b>N</b>		<b>AH</b>
		<b>O</b>		<b>AI</b>
		<b>P</b>		<b>AJ</b>
		<b>Q</b>		<b>AK</b>
		<b>R</b>		<b>AL</b>
		<b>S</b>		<b>AM</b>
		<b>T</b>		<b>AN</b>
				<b>AO</b>
		<b>Factors:</b>		
		Best relieves traffic/hwys & frwys		
		Best connects to cities/towns		
		Lowest cost		
		Least impact to existing developmt		
		<b>Funding:</b>		
		No: not support/won't use		
		<b>Response:</b>		
		N/A		

# North-South Corridor Study Public Workshops December 2011 Public Involvement Summary - Comment Forms

121

Name/ Date	Mtg/Comment Type	Comment		
Thomas M. Wood	Public Workshop	<b>Segments:</b>	<b>U</b> Unfavorable	<b>Factors:</b>
1/3/12	Comment Form	<b>A</b> Unfavorable	<b>V</b> Unfavorable	Best relieves traffic/local streets
<b>Additional comments:</b>		<b>B</b> Unfavorable	<b>W</b> Favorable	Best relieves traffic/hwys & frwys
		<b>C</b> Unfavorable	<b>X</b> Favorable	Best connects to employment ctrs
		<b>D</b> Unfavorable	<b>Y</b> Unfavorable	Best connects to other destinations
		<b>E</b> Unfavorable	<b>Z</b> Unfavorable	Best connects to cities/towns
		<b>F</b> Unfavorable	<b>AA</b> Unfavorable	Best connects to other major routes
		<b>G</b> Unfavorable	<b>AB</b> Unfavorable	Least impact to existing developmt
		<b>H</b> Unfavorable	<b>AC</b> Favorable	Least impact to planned
		<b>I</b> Favorable	<b>AD</b> Favorable	<b>Funding:</b>
		<b>J</b> Unfavorable	<b>AE</b> Unfavorable	Yes: support tolled hwy
		<b>K</b> Unfavorable	<b>AF</b> Unfavorable	Yes: use tolled hwy
		<b>L</b> Unfavorable	<b>AG</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>M</b> Favorable	<b>AH</b> Favorable	
		<b>N</b> Unfavorable	<b>AI</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>O</b> Unfavorable	<b>AJ</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>P</b> Unfavorable	<b>AK</b> Favorable	<b>Response:</b>
		<b>Q</b> Unfavorable	<b>AL</b> Favorable	N/A
		<b>R</b> Favorable	<b>AM</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>S</b> Favorable	<b>AN</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>T</b> Unfavorable	<b>AO</b> Unfavorable	

## North-South Corridor Study Public Workshops December 2011 Public Involvement Summary - Comment Forms

122

Name/ Date	Mtg/Comment Type	Comment		
Salvador Chavez	Public Workshop		<b>Segments:</b>	<b>U</b>
1/6/12	Comment Form		<b>A</b>	<b>V</b>
<b>Additional comments:</b> Dont let the liberals or their non sense stop or pro-long the construction. Get this starte ASAP if the state or liberals trys to get in the way put it out in public and we will put pressure on those who are trying to stop it. Many people dont know about this FWY. You neen to put it out more so you can get more support.  The reason why I chose the rout I chose is because I believe the county could realy use some growth to the east of the rout I chose. It is good for the county because it would bring more business, people, and money to the county.		<b>B</b> Unfavorable	its a main rd. Already why would you want to make it into a freeway. Also trafic would be a nightmare since	<b>W</b>
		<b>C</b>		<b>X</b>
		<b>D</b>		<b>Y</b> Unfavorable same as B & E
		<b>E</b> Favorable	construction or trafic wont be in the way of each other. I think by going that rout the job can get done faster	<b>Z</b>
		<b>F</b>		<b>AA</b> Unfavorable same as B & E but instea of I-60 to I-10
		<b>G</b> Favorable	same as E	<b>AB</b>
		<b>H</b>		<b>AC</b>
		<b>I</b>		<b>AD</b> Favorable same as E
		<b>J</b>		<b>AE</b>
		<b>K</b>		<b>AF</b>
		<b>L</b> Favorable	same as E	<b>AG</b>
		<b>M</b>		<b>AH</b> Favorable same as E
		<b>N</b>		<b>AI</b> Favorable same as E
		<b>O</b>		<b>AJ</b> Favorable same as E
		<b>P</b>		<b>AK</b>
		<b>Q</b> Favorable	this rout wold go between Florence & Coolidge and we wont have to hear bouth towns cry about the FWY	<b>AL</b> Favorable same as E
		<b>R</b>		<b>AM</b> Favorable same as E
		<b>S</b>		<b>AN</b> Favorable same as E
		<b>T</b>		<b>AO</b>
				<b>Factors:</b> Best relieves traffic/local streets Best connects to employment ctrs Best connects to other destinations Best connects to cities/towns Best connects to other major routes Lowest cost Least impact to existing developmt Least impact to planned development
				<b>Funding:</b> No: not support/won't use
				Tolled roads have to many tolled booths and can get very expensive. I could change my mind if I knew how mutch it would cost to use and how many booths would exist.
				<b>Response:</b> N/A

# North-South Corridor Study Public Workshops December 2011 Public Involvement Summary - Comment Forms

123

Name/ Date	Mtg/Comment Type	Comment		
David Faulkner	Public Workshop	<b>Segments:</b>		<b>U</b>
1/6/12	Comment Form	<b>A</b> Unfavorable	goes through residential areas, trailer park, golf course	<b>V</b>
<b>Additional comments:</b> If both SR 24 and Section I joined E at an interchange it would give anybody going North A choice of Hwy 202 or by the superstition mountains.		<b>B</b> Unfavorable	goes in front of Banner Medical Center	<b>W</b>
		<b>C</b> Unfavorable	goes through residential & shopping area	<b>X</b>
		<b>D</b> Unfavorable	goes through Coolidge central area	<b>Y</b>
		<b>E</b>		<b>Z</b> Unfavorable good existing road, leave for business frontage off freeway
		<b>F</b>		<b>AA</b> Unfavorable good existing road, leave as alternate route
		<b>G</b>		<b>AB</b>
		<b>H</b>		<b>AC</b>
		<b>I</b>		<b>AD</b>
		<b>J</b>		<b>AE</b>
		<b>K</b>		<b>AF</b>
		<b>L</b>		<b>AG</b>
		<b>M</b>		<b>AH</b>
		<b>N</b>		<b>AI</b>
		<b>O</b>		<b>AJ</b>
		<b>P</b>		<b>AK</b>
		<b>Q</b>		<b>AL</b>
		<b>R</b>		<b>AM</b>
		<b>S</b>		<b>AN</b>
		<b>T</b>		<b>AO</b>
				<b>Factors:</b> Best connects to cities/towns Least impact to existing developmt Other
				<b>Funding:</b>
				<b>Response:</b> N/A

# North-South Corridor Study Public Workshops December 2011 Public Involvement Summary - Comment Forms

124

Name/ Date	Mtg/Comment Type	Comment		
Sandra Wood	Public Workshop	<b>Segments:</b>	<b>U</b> Unfavorable	<b>Factors:</b>
1/6/12	Comment Form	<b>A</b> Unfavorable	<b>V</b> Unfavorable	Best relieves traffic/local streets
<b>Additional comments:</b>		<b>B</b> Unfavorable	<b>W</b> Favorable	Best relieves traffic/hwys & frwys
		<b>C</b> Unfavorable	<b>X</b> Favorable	Best connects to employment ctrs
		<b>D</b> Unfavorable	<b>Y</b> Unfavorable	Best connects to other destinations
		<b>E</b> Unfavorable	<b>Z</b> Unfavorable	Best connects to cities/towns
		<b>F</b> Unfavorable	<b>AA</b> Unfavorable	Best connects to other major routes
		<b>G</b> Unfavorable	<b>AB</b> Unfavorable	Least impact to existing developmt
		<b>H</b> Unfavorable	<b>AC</b> Favorable	Least impact to planned
		<b>I</b> Favorable	<b>AD</b> Favorable	<b>Funding:</b>
		<b>J</b> Unfavorable	<b>AE</b> Unfavorable	Yes: support tolled hwy
		<b>K</b> Unfavorable	<b>AF</b> Unfavorable	Yes: use tolled hwy
		<b>L</b> Unfavorable	<b>AG</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>M</b> Favorable	<b>AH</b> Favorable	
		<b>N</b> Unfavorable	<b>AI</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>O</b> Unfavorable	<b>AJ</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>P</b> Unfavorable	<b>AK</b> Favorable	<b>Response:</b>
		<b>Q</b> Unfavorable	<b>AL</b> Favorable	
		<b>R</b> Favorable	<b>AM</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>S</b> Favorable	<b>AN</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>T</b> Unfavorable	<b>AO</b> Unfavorable	

# North-South Corridor Study Public Workshops December 2011 Public Involvement Summary - Comment Forms

Name/ Date	Mtg/Comment Type	Comment			
Dana Gallagher	Public Workshop	<b>Segments:</b>			
1/6/11	Comment Form	<b>A</b> Favorable	eases congestion coming off US60 focuses on Queen Creek San Tan Valley residents	<b>U</b> Unfavorable	widen Felix Rd / Hunt Hwy
<b>Additional comments:</b> I have traveled this corridor in which all of these proposals exist many, many times.  I like the idea of using existing rds/highways as much as possible. Specifically with the southern half of the corridor.  I feel that short term plans should be focused on the Northern half of the corridor, with emphasis on alleviating the congestion at the US 60 & Ironwood area.  Thank You.		<b>B</b> Favorable	continues from section "A" allows for higher volume of traffic lowers commute times	<b>V</b> Unfavorable	widen Felix Rd / Hunt Hwy
		<b>C</b> Unfavorable	just use existing Hunt Hwy	<b>W</b> Unfavorable	widen Felix Rd / Hunt Hwy
		<b>D</b> Favorable	same as sections E, G, & H	<b>X</b> Unfavorable	just use existing 287 or 79. widen Felix Rd / Hunt Hwy
		<b>E</b> Favorable	allows for more of a direct route towards Coolidge & I -10, bypasses Queen Creek/San Tan Valley traffic	<b>Y</b> Favorable	uses already existing rds
		<b>F</b> Unfavorable	don't feel its needed if sections B,G & H are developed	<b>Z</b> Favorable	see section Y
		<b>G</b> Favorable	direct route to Coolidge & I-10	<b>AA</b> Favorable	see section Y
		<b>H</b> Favorable	same as G section	<b>AB</b> Unfavorable	widen/re-structure existing rds to accomodate new developments
		<b>I</b> Favorable	direct access to developments in the long term. bypasses gold canyon	<b>AC</b> Unfavorable	see AB
		<b>J</b> Unfavorable	too close to proposed section E & not close enough too long term development near section S	<b>AD</b> Unfavorable	see AB
		<b>K</b> Unfavorable	same as section J	<b>AE</b> Unfavorable	see AB
		<b>L</b> Favorable	would help tie in sections G, H, D with M,S,T	<b>AF</b> Unfavorable	see AB
		<b>M</b> Favorable	same as I	<b>AG</b> Unfavorable	see AB
		<b>N</b> Unfavorable	same as section J & K	<b>AH</b> Unfavorable	see AB
		<b>O</b> Unfavorable	same as section J, K, N	<b>AI</b> Unfavorable	see AB
		<b>P</b> Unfavorable	widen Felix Rd & Hunt Hwy	<b>AJ</b> Unfavorable	see AB
		<b>Q</b> Unfavorable	widen Felix Rd / Hunt Hwy	<b>AK</b> Unfavorable	see AB
		<b>R</b> Favorable	same as sections I, M, S, & T	<b>AL</b> Unfavorable	see AB
		<b>S</b> Favorable	same as section I & M	<b>AM</b> Unfavorable	see AB
		<b>T</b> Favorable	same as I, M & S. Tie in T with L	<b>AN</b> Unfavorable	see AB
				<b>AO</b> Unfavorable	see AB
				<b>Factors:</b>	
				Best relieves traffic/local streets	
				Best relieves traffic/hwys & frwys	
				Best connects to other major routes	
				<b>Funding:</b>	
				Yes: use tolled hwy	
				I would use the tolled highway. However, with the projected development(s), wouldn't the increase in taxpayers make it possible to fund as needed??	
				<b>Response:</b>	
				N/A	



## North-South Corridor Study Public Workshops December 2011 Public Involvement Summary - Comment Forms

Name/ Date	Mtg/Comment Type	Comment			
Terry Makdad	Public Workshop	<b>Segments:</b>			<b>U</b> Unfavorable see A
1/6/12	Comment Form	<b>A</b> Unfavorable	routes south affect existing	RESIDENTIAL!	<b>V</b> Unfavorable see A
<b>Additional comments:</b> My preferred option is the "No Build" option - My rationale is that once the road is built the entire valley from Hwy 60 South will be filled with houses and strip malls. The evidence is clear that this will happen, all one has to do is look at the E-470 road around the East side of Denver, Co. When E-470 was built there was nothing near it but farms and ranches, now it is completely surrounded by homes and strip malls as far as the eye can see. That is our future if this project is allowed to proceed. If the EPA is really concerned with the health of people in this area it would stop this project before Pinal County becomes another Maricopa County with the violations of EPA air quality standards. The study that projects the massive growth and the need for this project has been rendered obsolete by the economic conditions that have occurred since this study was started.  Fro the most part I-10 is only four lanes and should be widened to eight lanes from Phoenix to Tucson before any more money is spent on this project.  EPA environmental impact studies are a waste of time and money given that this project will result in what I have stated in the first paragraph. The result will be air and noise		<b>B</b> Unfavorable	see A		<b>W</b> Favorable not next to existing residential
		<b>C</b> Unfavorable	see A		<b>X</b> Favorable not next to existing residential
		<b>D</b> Unfavorable	see A		<b>Y</b>
		<b>E</b> Unfavorable	see A		<b>Z</b>
		<b>F</b> Unfavorable	see A		<b>AA</b>
		<b>G</b> Unfavorable	see A		<b>AB</b>
		<b>H</b> Unfavorable	see A		<b>AC</b>
		<b>I</b> Favorable	not next to existing residential		<b>AD</b>
		<b>J</b> Unfavorable	see A		<b>AE</b>
		<b>K</b> Unfavorable	see A		<b>AF</b>
		<b>L</b> Unfavorable	see A		<b>AG</b>
		<b>M</b> Favorable	not next to existing residential		<b>AH</b>
		<b>N</b> Unfavorable	see A		<b>AI</b>
		<b>O</b> Unfavorable	see A		<b>AJ</b>
		<b>P</b> Unfavorable	see A		<b>AK</b>
		<b>Q</b> Unfavorable	see A		<b>AL</b>
		<b>R</b> Favorable	not next to existing residential		<b>AM</b>
		<b>S</b> Favorable	not next to existing residential		<b>AN</b>
		<b>T</b> Unfavorable	see A		<b>AO</b>
					<b>Factors:</b> Least impact to existing developmt Other
					<b>Funding:</b> No: not support/won't use
					<b>Response:</b> N/A

**North-South Corridor Study Public Workshops December 2011  
Public Involvement Summary - Comment Forms**

127

Name/ Date	Mtg/Comment Type	Comment
Sandra Walker	Public Workshop	<b>Segments:</b>
1/8/12	Comment Form	<b>U</b>
		<b>Factors:</b>
		Least impact to existing developmt
		Least impact to natural areas/open space
<b>Additional comments:</b>		
		<b>V</b>
		<b>W</b> Favorable
		<b>X</b> Favorable
		<b>Y</b>
		<b>Z</b>
		<b>AA</b>
		<b>AB</b>
		<b>AC</b>
		<b>AD</b>
		<b>AE</b>
		<b>AF</b>
		<b>AG</b>
		<b>AH</b>
		<b>AI</b>
		<b>AJ</b>
		<b>AK</b>
		<b>AL</b>
		<b>AM</b>
		<b>AN</b>
		<b>AO</b>
		<b>Funding:</b>
		<b>Response:</b>

## North-South Corridor Study Public Workshops December 2011 Public Involvement Summary - Comment Forms

128

Name/ Date	Mtg/Comment Type	Comment			
Chris Webb	Public Workshop	<b>Segments:</b>	<b>U</b>		<b>Factors:</b>
1/9/12	Comment Form	<b>A</b>	<b>V</b>		Best connects to employment ctrs
		<b>B</b>	<b>W</b>		Input rec'd from local gov't
		<b>C</b>	<b>X</b>		Other
<b>Additional comments:</b>		<b>D</b>	<b>Y</b> Unfavorable	SR87 will be needed in addition to freeway (see also additional comment #1)	
This letter, and the attached comment form from the December 2011 open house meetings, are sent on behalf of the corridor study area property owners and stakeholders listed below. This group owns and/or manages approximately 13,700 total acres within the corridor study area. The attached comment form represents the collective alignment preferences of this group for the southern area route alternatives.		<b>E</b>	<b>Z</b> Unfavorable	See comment on segment "Y" above	
		<b>F</b>	<b>AA</b> Unfavorable	See comment on segment "Y" above	
		<b>G</b>	<b>AB</b> Favorable	Supported by major area property owners and Coolidge City Council (Also see additional comment	
		<b>H</b>	<b>AC</b> Unfavorable	Puts freeway on West side of future mall site which is undesireable to mall developer of City	<b>Funding:</b>
		<b>I</b>	<b>AD</b> Favorable	Supported by major area property owners and Coolidge City. Good transition between "AH" & "AN"	Yes: support tolled hwy
		<b>J</b>	<b>AE</b> Unfavorable	Too close to SR87/UPRR corridor (see additional comment #1)	Yes: use tolled hwy
		<b>K</b>	<b>AF</b> Unfavorable	See comment on Segment "AE" above	
		<b>L</b>	<b>AG</b> Unfavorable	See comment on Segment "AE" above	
		<b>M</b>	<b>AH</b> Unfavorable	Keeps separation from SR87/UPRR corridor and is supported by property owners & City of Eloy	
		<b>N</b>	<b>AI</b> Unfavorable	Inadequate seperation from SR87/UPRR corridor due to location in Eloy's planned employment corridor	
		<b>O</b>	<b>AJ</b> Unfavorable	See comment on Segment "AI" above	
		<b>P</b>	<b>AK</b> Favorable	Compatible with Eloy's planned employment corridor, supported by City and property owners (see segment	<b>Response:</b>
		<b>Q</b>	<b>AL</b> Favorable	Keeps adequate spacing with SR87/UPRR corridor & is supported by property owners and City of Eloy	N/A
		<b>R</b>	<b>AM</b> Unfavorable	Cuts diagonally through major land holdings west of Valley Farms Rd and is not supported by City of	
		<b>S</b>	<b>AN</b> Favorable	Keeps freeway on east side of future mall site per developer and City of Coolidge Resolution. (Also see	
		<b>T</b>	<b>AO</b> Unfavorable	See comment on Segment "AM"	
-Property Reserve, Inc. - 3,860 acres -Walton Development & Management (USA), Inc. - 1,546 acres -Langley Properties - 2,250 acres -WDP Partners - 320 acres -Cardon-Hiatt Companies - 5,724 acres					
While our stakeholder group has met extensively with ADOT and the corridor study team, we felt it was important to formally convey our group's alignment preferences through the comment forms provided at the December open house meetings. You will note that the alignment preferences indicated are consistent with those supported by the City of Eloy, the City of Coolidge and the Town of Florence. Please feel free to contact me directly at (480)240-5648 if you have any questions.					

## North-South Corridor Study Public Workshops December 2011 Public Involvement Summary - Comment Forms

Name/ Date	Mtg/Comment Type	Comment			
Anne Quackenbush	Public Workshop	<b>Segments:</b>			<b>U</b> Unfavorable See A
1/9/12	Comment Form	<b>A</b> Unfavorable	near residential area	<b>V</b> Unfavorable See A	<b>Factors:</b> Least impact to existing developmt Input rec'd from public Other
		<b>B</b> Unfavorable	See A	<b>W</b> See I	
		<b>C</b> Unfavorable	See A	<b>X</b> See I	
		<b>D</b> Unfavorable	See A	<b>Y</b> Unfavorable See A	
		<b>E</b> Unfavorable	See A	<b>Z</b> Unfavorable See A	
		<b>F</b> Unfavorable	See A	<b>AA</b> Unfavorable See A	
		<b>G</b> Unfavorable	See A	<b>AB</b> Unfavorable See A	
		<b>H</b> Unfavorable	See A	<b>AC</b> Unfavorable See A	<b>Funding:</b> No: not support/won't use
		<b>I</b> Favorable	Doesn't affect homes	<b>AD</b> Unfavorable See A	
		<b>J</b> Unfavorable	See A	<b>AE</b> Unfavorable See A	
		<b>K</b> Unfavorable	See A	<b>AF</b> Unfavorable See A	
		<b>L</b> Unfavorable	See A	<b>AG</b> Unfavorable See A	
		<b>M</b> Favorable	See I	<b>AH</b> Unfavorable See A	
		<b>N</b> Unfavorable	See A	<b>AI</b> Unfavorable See A	
		<b>O</b> Unfavorable	See A	<b>AJ</b> Unfavorable See A	<b>Response:</b> N/A
		<b>P</b> Unfavorable	See A	<b>AK</b> Unfavorable See A	
		<b>Q</b> Unfavorable	See A	<b>AL</b> Unfavorable See A	
		<b>R</b> Favorable	See I	<b>AM</b> Unfavorable See A	
		<b>S</b> Favorable	See I	<b>AN</b> Unfavorable See A	
		<b>T</b> Favorable	See I	<b>AO</b> Unfavorable See A	

### Additional comments:

You NEED to stay away from all existing homes & neighborhoods your maps are incorrect. I have found that almost all your areas marked in yellow have homes or existing neighborhoods. I feel this is how you will justify your route. There is a lot of unused land out there find a route away from homes & neighborhoods!

Redo your maps and redo your study!

# North-South Corridor Study Public Workshops December 2011 Public Involvement Summary - Comment Forms

130

Name/ Date	Mtg/Comment Type	Comment	
Rob & Carolyn Cox	Public Workshop	<b>Segments:</b>	<b>U</b>
1/9/12	Comment Form	<b>A</b>	<b>V</b>
<b>Additional comments:</b>		<b>B</b>	<b>W</b>
		<b>C</b>	<b>X</b>
		<b>D</b>	<b>Y</b>
		<b>E</b> Unfavorable Abuts our development. Noise, property value depreciation, increase traffic in and around	<b>Z</b>
		<b>F</b>	<b>AA</b>
		<b>G</b>	<b>AB</b>
		<b>H</b>	<b>AC</b>
		<b>I</b>	<b>AD</b>
		<b>J</b>	<b>AE</b>
		<b>K</b>	<b>AF</b>
		<b>L</b>	<b>AG</b>
		<b>M</b>	<b>AH</b>
		<b>N</b>	<b>AI</b>
		<b>O</b>	<b>AJ</b>
		<b>P</b>	<b>AK</b>
		<b>Q</b>	<b>AL</b>
		<b>R</b>	<b>AM</b>
		<b>S</b>	<b>AN</b>
		<b>T</b>	<b>AO</b>
			<b>Factors:</b> Least impact to existing developmt
			<b>Funding:</b> No: not support/won't use
			<b>Response:</b>

# North-South Corridor Study Public Workshops December 2011 Public Involvement Summary - Comment Forms

131

Name/ Date	Mtg/Comment Type	Comment	
Anonymous	Public Workshop	<b>Segments:</b>	<b>U</b>
1/9/12	Comment Form	<b>A</b>	<b>V</b>
<b>Additional comments:</b>		<b>B</b> Favorable Gantzel already busy- traffic would flow better with new corridor	<b>W</b>
		<b>C</b>	<b>X</b>
		<b>D</b>	<b>Y</b>
		<b>E</b> Unfavorable too close to our residential area	<b>Z</b>
		<b>F</b>	<b>AA</b>
		<b>G</b>	<b>AB</b>
		<b>H</b>	<b>AC</b>
		<b>I</b> Favorable join another section of US60	<b>AD</b>
		<b>J</b>	<b>AE</b>
		<b>K</b>	<b>AF</b>
		<b>L</b>	<b>AG</b>
		<b>M</b>	<b>AH</b>
		<b>N</b>	<b>AI</b>
		<b>O</b>	<b>AJ</b>
		<b>P</b>	<b>AK</b>
		<b>Q</b>	<b>AL</b>
		<b>R</b>	<b>AM</b>
		<b>S</b>	<b>AN</b>
		<b>T</b>	<b>AO</b>
			<b>Factors:</b> Best connects to other major routes Least impact to existing developmt Input rec'd from public
			<b>Funding:</b> Yes: use tolled hwy
			<b>Response:</b>

**North-South Corridor Study Public Workshops December 2011  
Public Involvement Summary - Comment Forms**

132

Name/ Date	Mtg/Comment Type	Comment
Anonymous	Public Workshop	<b>Segments:</b>
1/10/12	Comment Form	<b>U</b> Favorable
<b>Additional comments:</b>		<b>V</b> Favorable
		<b>W</b>
		<b>X</b> Favorable
		<b>Y</b>
		<b>Z</b>
		<b>AA</b>
		<b>AB</b>
		<b>AC</b>
		<b>AD</b>
		<b>AE</b>
		<b>AF</b>
		<b>AG</b>
		<b>AH</b>
		<b>AI</b>
		<b>AJ</b>
		<b>AK</b>
		<b>AL</b>
		<b>AM</b>
		<b>AN</b>
		<b>AO</b>

**Factors:**

**Funding:**

**Response:**

## North-South Corridor Study Public Workshops December 2011 Public Involvement Summary - Comment Forms

Name/ Date	Mtg/Comment Type	Comment			
Carrie Sears	Public Workshop	<b>Segments:</b>			
1/9/12	Comment Form	<b>A</b> Favorable	This the route that most residents take to get from Queen Creek, Coolidge and Johnson Ranch to get to	<b>V</b> Unfavorable	To many latge properties that house animals.
		<b>B</b> Unfavorable	There is already a 4 lane road that leads to that area. With residents and homes.	<b>W</b> Favorable	Leads closer to Florence CITY and has no homes that would be effected.
		<b>C</b> Unfavorable	There has to many residential communities this will effect.	<b>X</b> Favorable	Leads closer to Florence CITY and has no homes that would be effected.
		<b>D</b> Favorable	Does not effect a lot of residents it is mostly farm land.	<b>Y</b> Favorable	Very little homes will be effected. Good routine to the Coolidge and the I-10.
		<b>E</b> Favorable	Does not effect as many residents and give people a nother choice to use other than Ironnwood.	<b>Z</b> Favorable	Not to many houses. Great access for the I-10.
		<b>F</b> Unfavorable	There has to many residential communities this will effect.	<b>AA</b> Favorable	Not to many houses. Great access for the I-10.
		<b>G</b>		<b>AB</b> Unfavorable	This effects to many homes and property that house animals.
		<b>H</b> Favorable	Has very few residential homes is mostly farm land.	<b>AC</b> Unfavorable	This effects to many homes and property that house animals.
		<b>I</b> Favorable	Has very few if any resident homes.	<b>AD</b> Unfavorable	This effects to many homes and property that house animals.
		<b>J</b> Favorable	Has very few if any resident homes.	<b>AE</b> Unfavorable	This effects to many homes and property that house animals.
		<b>K</b> Favorable	Has very few if any resident homes.	<b>AF</b> Unfavorable	This effects to many homes and property that house animals. And does not make sense not to use the 87.
		<b>L</b> Unfavorable	Leads to homes that have large properties that house many animals.	<b>AG</b> Unfavorable	This effects to many homes and property that house animals. And does not make sense not to use the 87.
		<b>M</b> Favorable	Has very few if any resident homes.	<b>AH</b> Unfavorable	This effects to many homes and property that house animals. And does not make sense not to use the 87.
		<b>N</b> Favorable	Has very few if any resident homes.	<b>AI</b> Unfavorable	This effects to many homes and property that house animals. And does not make sense not to use the 87.
		<b>O</b> Unfavorable	Way to many residential homes that will be effected	<b>AJ</b> Unfavorable	This effects to many homes and property that house animals. And does not make sense not to use the 87.
		<b>P</b> Unfavorable	Way to many residential homes that will be effected. And large property that house many animals.	<b>AK</b> Unfavorable	This effects to many homes and property that house animals. And does not make sense not to use the 87.
		<b>Q</b> Unfavorable	Way to many residential homes that will be effected. And large property that house many animals.	<b>AL</b> Unfavorable	This effects to many homes and property that house animals. And does not make sense not to use the 87.
		<b>R</b> Favorable	Does not have many residential homes.	<b>AM</b> Unfavorable	This effects to many homes and property that house animals.
		<b>S</b> Favorable	Does not have many residential homes.	<b>AN</b> Unfavorable	This effects to many homes and property that house animals.
		<b>T</b> Favorable	Does not have many residential homes.	<b>AO</b> Unfavorable	This effects to many homes and property that house animals.
<b>Additional comments:</b> It doesn't make sense to use areas that will effect the residents that moved out here to get away from the city life. I understand that there is a need for people to travel through but a lot of these routes that you have presented will effect many of us. I do not understand why you would not take the 60 to the 79 and cross through the East side of Florence and Coolidge and go down through Eloy. There is a lot of farm land needed to produce crops, residential homes, and large properties that this will effect when just east of the 79 running all the way down east of Coolidge there is open land not being used for any crop, very little residents and very little property being used for animals. I live off of Felix between Arizona Farms and Hunt Hwy. On your maps you do not have my acre lot subdivision or the 2 residential home subdivisions next to me listed. This is not open land we have families with small childern, horses, and other annimals that we enjoy and the loud 6 to 8 lane hwy will effect us. Please feel free to contact me if you have any questions about our subdivision and were we are located. 480-244-1841. Thank you, Wild Horse Estate Resident.		<b>Factors:</b> Least impact to existing developmt Input rec'd from public Other			
		<b>Funding:</b> I think a toll hwy keeps traffic down and it helps thw hwy maintain. But I am not sure if people would use the hwy or still use the back roads as they do now. If the toll was reasonable I think it might work but like California the tolls are 3-8 dollars and I do not think the people would pay that kind of money <b>Response:</b> N/A			



# North-South Corridor Study Public Workshops December 2011 Public Involvement Summary - Comment Forms

Name/ Date	Mtg/Comment Type	Comment					
Wendy Fuller	Public Workshop	<b>Segments:</b>			<b>U</b> Unfavorable	where is this	<b>Factors:</b> Best connects to other major routes Least impact to existing developmt Input rec'd from public
1/9/12	Comment Form	<b>A</b> Favorable	More open road without to much interruption of residences already there.	<b>V</b> Unfavorable	neighborhood already exists		
		<b>B</b> Unfavorable	To much upheaval to the residences already in proposed area, other areas should be proposed so as needs further explanation	<b>W</b> Favorable	as long as it does not disrupt current dwellings		
<b>Additional comments:</b> Please always include affected neighborhoods in planning before decissions are made		<b>C</b> Unfavorable		<b>X</b> Favorable	as long as it does not disrupt current dwellings		
		<b>D</b> Unfavorable	neighborhoods already exist what happens to them?	<b>Y</b> Favorable			
		<b>E</b> Favorable	only it it does not disrupt existing neighborhoods	<b>Z</b> Favorable			
		<b>F</b> Unfavorable	Neighborhood exists too much displacement	<b>AA</b> Favorable			
		<b>G</b> Unfavorable	only if it disrupts existing srp and magma ranch	<b>AB</b> Unfavorable	neighborhood already exists		
		<b>H</b> Unfavorable	neighborhood already exists	<b>AC</b> Unfavorable	neighborhood already exists	<b>Funding:</b> No: not support/won't use	
		<b>I</b> Favorable	look at land scape if it doesn't disrupt existing neighborhood	<b>AD</b> Favorable			
		<b>J</b> Favorable	if it would reduce congestion	<b>AE</b> Favorable			
		<b>K</b> Favorable	as long as it leaves existing residences intact	<b>AF</b> Favorable			
		<b>L</b> Unfavorable	because it impacts dobson farms and arizona farms developments	<b>AG</b> Favorable			
		<b>M</b> Unfavorable	where is this?	<b>AH</b> Favorable			
		<b>N</b> Unfavorable	Where is this?	<b>AI</b> Favorable			
		<b>O</b> Unfavorable	Neighboorhood already exists for correction officers too much displacement and disruption of travel would	<b>AJ</b> Favorable		<b>Response:</b> N/A	
		<b>P</b> Unfavorable	Neighborhood already exists and ditto above comment	<b>AK</b> Favorable			
		<b>Q</b> Unfavorable	ditti above comment	<b>AL</b> Favorable			
		<b>R</b> Unfavorable	where is this	<b>AM</b> Favorable			
		<b>S</b> Unfavorable	where is this	<b>AN</b> Favorable			
		<b>T</b> Unfavorable	where is this	<b>AO</b> Favorable			

**Additional comments:**  
Please always include affected neighborhoods in planning before decisions are made

**Factors:**  
Best connects to other major routes  
Least impact to existing developmt  
Input rec'd from public

**Funding:**  
No: not support/won't use

**Response:**  
N/A

# North-South Corridor Study Public Workshops December 2011 Public Involvement Summary - Comment Forms

135

Name/ Date	Mtg/Comment Type	Comment	
Brenda McFarland	Public Workshop	<b>Segments:</b>	<b>U</b>
1/7/12	Comment Form	<b>A</b>	<b>V</b>
<b>Additional comments:</b>		<b>B</b>	<b>W</b> Favorable
		<b>C</b>	<b>X</b> Favorable
		<b>D</b>	<b>Y</b>
		<b>E</b>	<b>Z</b>
		<b>F</b>	<b>AA</b>
		<b>G</b>	<b>AB</b>
		<b>H</b>	<b>AC</b>
		<b>I</b> Favorable	<b>AD</b>
		<b>J</b>	<b>AE</b>
		<b>K</b>	<b>AF</b>
		<b>L</b> Unfavorable wildhorse estates is a residential area.	<b>AG</b>
		<b>M</b> Favorable	<b>AH</b>
		<b>N</b>	<b>AI</b>
		<b>O</b>	<b>AJ</b>
		<b>P</b> Unfavorable residential area	<b>AK</b>
		<b>Q</b> Unfavorable unacceptable. Residential area.	<b>AL</b>
		<b>R</b>	<b>AM</b>
		<b>S</b>	<b>AN</b>
		<b>T</b>	<b>AO</b>
			<b>Factors:</b> Best connects to employment ctrs Best connects to other major routes Least impact to existing developmt
			<b>Funding:</b> Yes: use tolled hwy Yes: support tolled hwy
			<b>Response:</b>

## North-South Corridor Study Public Workshops December 2011 Public Involvement Summary - Comment Forms

136

Name/ Date	Mtg/Comment Type	Comment					
Tiffany Sprague	Public Workshop	<b>Segments:</b>			<b>U</b> Unfavorable	This route is completely unacceptable. Not only is it redundant to an existing highway (SR79) and would needlessly destroy the environment and	<b>Factors:</b> Least impact to natural areas/open space Other
1/6/12	Comment Form	<b>A</b> Unfavorable	This route is redundant to an existing highway (SR79) and would needlessly destroy the environment and	<b>V</b> Unfavorable	This route is completely unacceptable. Not only is it redundant to an existing highway (SR79) and other		
		<b>B</b> Unfavorable	This route is redundant to an existing highway (SR79) and would needlessly destroy the environment and	<b>W</b> Unfavorable	This route is completely unacceptable. Not only is it redundant to an existing highway (SR79) and other		
<b>Additional comments:</b> I support a build alternative that includes only mass transit options and does not construct any new or expand any existing roads. We need to be looking toward the future and long-term planning. Roads only provide short-term solutions and are soon very congested. Alternatively, mass transit can provide long-term solutions, carry more people than roads, and are more beneficial to both people and the environment. Roads, on the other hand, are extremely detrimental to the environment and to public health. The North-South Corridor is an environmentally-sensitive area that is very important to people and wildlife alike, as well as for its own intrinsic values. We should minimize disruption of this area as much as possible.		<b>C</b> Unfavorable	This route is redundant to an existing highway (SR79) and would needlessly destroy the environment and	<b>X</b> Unfavorable	This route is completely unacceptable. Not only is it redundant to an existing highway (SR79) and other	If a build alternative is determined to be necessary, improvements should be made to existing highways	
<b>D</b> Unfavorable	This route is redundant to an existing highway (SR79) and would needlessly destroy the environment and	<b>Y</b> Unfavorable	If a build alternative is determined to be necessary, improvements should be made to existing highways				
<b>E</b> Unfavorable	This route is completely unacceptable. Not only is it redundant to an existing highway (SR79) and other	<b>Z</b> Unfavorable	If a build alternative is determined to be necessary, improvements should be made to existing highways				
<b>F</b> Unfavorable	This route is completely unacceptable. Not only is it redundant to an existing highway (SR79) and other	<b>AA</b> Unfavorable	If a build alternative is determined to be necessary, improvements should be made to existing highways	<b>AB</b> Unfavorable	If a build alternative is determined to be necessary, improvements should be made to existing highways	<b>Funding:</b>  No: not support/won't use  Mass transit would be greatly preferred to roadways. I would be willing to pay to use the mass transit rather than the roadway.	
<b>G</b> Unfavorable	This route is completely unacceptable. Not only is it redundant to an existing highway (SR79) and other	<b>AC</b> Unfavorable	If a build alternative is determined to be necessary, improvements should be made to existing highways				
<b>H</b> Unfavorable	This route is completely unacceptable. Not only is it redundant to an existing highway (SR79) and other	<b>AD</b> Unfavorable	If a build alternative is determined to be necessary, improvements should be made to existing highways				
<b>I</b> Unfavorable	This route is completely unacceptable. Not only is it redundant to an existing highway (SR79) and other	<b>AE</b> Unfavorable	If a build alternative is determined to be necessary, improvements should be made to existing highways	<b>AF</b> Unfavorable	If a build alternative is determined to be necessary, improvements should be made to existing highways	<b>Response:</b> N/A	
<b>J</b> Unfavorable	This route is completely unacceptable. Not only is it redundant to an existing highway (SR79) and other	<b>AG</b> Unfavorable	If a build alternative is determined to be necessary, improvements should be made to existing highways				
<b>K</b> Unfavorable	This route is completely unacceptable. Not only is it redundant to an existing highway (SR79) and other	<b>AH</b> Unfavorable	If a build alternative is determined to be necessary, improvements should be made to existing highways				
<b>L</b> Unfavorable	This route is completely unacceptable. Not only is it redundant to an existing highway (SR79) and other	<b>AI</b> Unfavorable	If a build alternative is determined to be necessary, improvements should be made to existing highways	<b>AJ</b> Unfavorable	If a build alternative is determined to be necessary, improvements should be made to existing highways		
<b>M</b> Unfavorable	This route is completely unacceptable. Not only is it redundant to an existing highway (SR79) and other	<b>AK</b> Unfavorable	If a build alternative is determined to be necessary, improvements should be made to existing highways				
<b>N</b> Unfavorable	This route is completely unacceptable. Not only is it redundant to an existing highway (SR79) and other	<b>AL</b> Unfavorable	If a build alternative is determined to be necessary, improvements should be made to existing highways				
<b>O</b> Unfavorable	This route is completely unacceptable. Not only is it redundant to an existing highway (SR79) and other	<b>AM</b> Unfavorable	If a build alternative is determined to be necessary, improvements should be made to existing highways	<b>AN</b> Unfavorable	If a build alternative is determined to be necessary, improvements should be made to existing highways		
<b>P</b> Unfavorable	This route is completely unacceptable. Not only is it redundant to an existing highway (SR79) and other	<b>AO</b> Unfavorable	If a build alternative is determined to be necessary, improvements should be made to existing highways				
<b>Q</b> Unfavorable	This route is completely unacceptable. Not only is it redundant to an existing highway (SR79) and other						
<b>R</b> Unfavorable	This route is completely unacceptable. Not only is it redundant to an existing highway (SR79) and other						
<b>S</b> Unfavorable	This route is completely unacceptable. Not only is it redundant to an existing highway (SR79) and other						
<b>T</b> Unfavorable	This route is completely unacceptable. Not only is it redundant to an existing highway						

**Funding:**  
No: not support/won't use

Mass transit would be greatly preferred to roadways. I would be willing to pay to use the mass transit rather than the roadway.

**Response:**  
N/A

**North-South Corridor Study Public Workshops December 2011  
Public Involvement Summary - Comment Forms**

137

Name/ Date	Mtg/Comment Type	Comment		
Jenna Kahl	Public Workshop	<b>Segments:</b>	<b>U</b> Unfavorable	<b>Factors:</b> Best connects to other destinations Best connects to cities/towns Best connects to other major routes
1/6/12	Comment Form	<b>A</b> Favorable	<b>V</b> Unfavorable	
<b>Additional comments:</b>		<b>B</b> Unfavorable	<b>W</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>C</b> Unfavorable	<b>X</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>D</b> Favorable	<b>Y</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>E</b> Favorable	<b>Z</b> Favorable	
		<b>F</b> Favorable	<b>AA</b> Favorable	
		<b>G</b> Favorable	<b>AB</b> Favorable	
		<b>H</b> Favorable	<b>AC</b> Favorable	<b>Funding:</b> No: not support/won't use
		<b>I</b> Unfavorable	<b>AD</b> Favorable	
		<b>J</b> Unfavorable	<b>AE</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>K</b> Unfavorable	<b>AF</b> Favorable	
		<b>L</b> Unfavorable	<b>AG</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>M</b> Unfavorable	<b>AH</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>N</b> Unfavorable	<b>AI</b> Favorable	
		<b>O</b> Unfavorable	<b>AJ</b> Unfavorable	<b>Response:</b>
		<b>P</b> Unfavorable	<b>AK</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>Q</b> Unfavorable	<b>AL</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>R</b> Unfavorable	<b>AM</b> Favorable	
		<b>S</b> Unfavorable	<b>AN</b> Favorable	
		<b>T</b> Unfavorable	<b>AO</b> Unfavorable	

# North-South Corridor Study Public Workshops December 2011 Public Involvement Summary - Comment Forms

138

Name/ Date	Mtg/Comment Type	Comment		
Colby Kahl	Public Workshop	<b>Segments:</b>	<b>U</b> Favorable	<b>Factors:</b>
1/5/12	Comment Form	<b>A</b> Favorable	<b>V</b> Favorable	Best connects to cities/towns
<b>Additional comments:</b>		<b>B</b> Unfavorable	<b>W</b> Favorable	Best connects to other major routes
		<b>C</b> Unfavorable	<b>X</b> Favorable	Least impact to existing developmt
		<b>D</b> Favorable	<b>Y</b>	
		<b>E</b> Favorable	<b>Z</b>	
		<b>F</b> Favorable	<b>AA</b>	
		<b>G</b> Favorable	<b>AB</b>	
		<b>H</b> Favorable	<b>AC</b>	<b>Funding:</b>
		<b>I</b> Favorable	<b>AD</b>	Yes: support tolled hwy
		<b>J</b> Favorable	<b>AE</b>	Yes: use tolled hwy
		<b>K</b> Favorable	<b>AF</b>	
		<b>L</b> Favorable	<b>AG</b>	
		<b>M</b> Favorable	<b>AH</b>	
		<b>N</b> Favorable	<b>AI</b>	
		<b>O</b> Favorable	<b>AJ</b>	
		<b>P</b> Favorable	<b>AK</b>	<b>Response:</b>
		<b>Q</b> Favorable	<b>AL</b>	
		<b>R</b> Favorable	<b>AM</b>	
		<b>S</b> Favorable	<b>AN</b>	
		<b>T</b> Favorable	<b>AO</b>	

## North-South Corridor Study Public Workshops December 2011 Public Involvement Summary - Comment Forms

139

Name/ Date	Mtg/Comment Type	Comment	
Linda & George Strouse-Brown	Public Workshop	<b>Segments:</b>	<b>U</b>
1/3/12	Comment Form	<b>A</b>	<b>V</b>
		<b>B</b>	<b>W</b>
		<b>C</b>	<b>X</b>
		<b>D</b>	<b>Y</b>
		<b>E</b>	<b>Z</b>
		<b>F</b>	<b>AA</b>
		<b>G</b>	<b>AB</b>
		<b>H</b>	<b>AC</b>
		<b>I</b>	<b>AD</b>
		<b>J</b>	<b>AE</b>
		<b>K</b>	<b>AF</b>
		<b>L</b> Unfavorable Your Maps are wrong. There are current residential home communities alone Felix Road between Arizona	<b>AG</b>
		<b>M</b>	<b>AH</b>
		<b>N</b>	<b>AI</b>
		<b>O</b>	<b>AJ</b>
		<b>P</b> Unfavorable Your Maps are wrong. There are current residential home communities alone Felix Road between Arizona	<b>AK</b>
		<b>Q</b> Unfavorable Your Maps are wrong. There are current residential home communities alone Felix Road between Arizona	<b>AL</b>
		<b>R</b>	<b>AM</b>
		<b>S</b>	<b>AN</b>
		<b>T</b>	<b>AO</b>
<b>Additional comments:</b> You should really look at using Highway 79 as the proposed corridor for the eastern side. Its already there, has no homes directly along until you hit city of Florence. Its already set up as a highway. Please rethink putting a new major corridor down Felix Road where there are real people with children who live directly off of this road. Also, need to reclassify this area as "Existing Residential" because it is and your maps are wrong. Seems the majority of the new corridors don't have nearly the close proximity to residential areas as the one you are proposing putting directly down Felix Road. Again homes are within yards of that road, not miles. You need to eliminate this corridor proposal from your study. Thank you.			
			<b>Factors:</b> Best connects to other major routes Least impact to existing developmt Best use of existing roads/hwys
			<b>Funding:</b> No: not support/won't use  If you can't budget what really is a needed major corridor that you are proposing other than considering to make it a toll road, our state is doing an extremely poor job of taking care of the growing state and need for new major roads that don't affect existing neighborhood and residential homes
			<b>Response:</b> N/A

**North-South Corridor Study Public Workshops December 2011  
Public Involvement Summary - Comment Forms**

140

Name/ Date	Mtg/Comment Type	Comment
Anonymous	Public Workshop	<b>Segments:</b> U
1/2/12	Comment Form	A Favorable V
		B Unfavorable W
		C Unfavorable X
		D Favorable Y
		E Favorable Z
		F Unfavorable AA
		G Favorable AB
		H Favorable AC
		I AD
		J AE
		K AF
		L AG
		M AH
		N AI
		O AJ
		P AK
		Q AL
		R AM
		S AN
		T AO

**Additional comments:**

**Factors:**

**Funding:**

**Response:**

# North-South Corridor Study Public Workshops December 2011 Public Involvement Summary - Comment Forms

141

Name/ Date	Mtg/Comment Type	Comment	
Charlie Witek	Public Workshop	<b>Segments:</b>	
1/2/12	Comment Form	<b>A</b> Favorable    Already Built	<b>U</b>
<b>Additional comments:</b>		<b>B</b> Favorable    Existing Road	<b>V</b>
		<b>C</b> Unfavorable	<b>W</b>
		<b>D</b> Favorable    Business	<b>X</b>
		<b>E</b> Unfavorable	<b>Y</b> Favorable
		<b>F</b> Favorable    Railroad	<b>Z</b> Favorable
		<b>G</b>	<b>AA</b> Favorable
		<b>H</b> Favorable	<b>AB</b>
		<b>I</b> Unfavorable	<b>AC</b>
		<b>J</b>	<b>AD</b>
		<b>K</b>	<b>AE</b>
		<b>L</b>	<b>AF</b>
		<b>M</b>	<b>AG</b>
		<b>N</b>	<b>AH</b>
		<b>O</b>	<b>AI</b>
		<b>P</b>	<b>AJ</b>
		<b>Q</b>	<b>AK</b>
		<b>R</b>	<b>AL</b>
		<b>S</b>	<b>AM</b>
		<b>T</b>	<b>AN</b>
			<b>AO</b>
		<b>Factors:</b> Best connects to cities/towns Lowest cost Least impact to existing developmt	
		<b>Funding:</b> No: not support/won't use	
		<b>Response:</b>	



# North-South Corridor Study Public Workshops December 2011 Public Involvement Summary - Comment Forms

Name/ Date	Mtg/Comment Type	Comment	
Benny Graves	Public Workshop	<b>Segments:</b>	
1/2/12	Comment Form	<b>A</b> Favorable	<b>U</b> Unfavorable Would require freeway to come to close to Felix to get to this section.
		<b>B</b> Favorable We use Ironwood as a freeway now anyway.	<b>V</b> Unfavorable Would require freeway to come to close to Felix to get to this segment.
		<b>C</b> Unfavorable Because we like the route of F and H better. It disturbs less homes.	<b>W</b> Favorable
		<b>D</b> Favorable Easy access for a lot of people.	<b>X</b> Favorable
		<b>E</b> Favorable It is alright because there is seems to go through undeveloped land, but we do like going down Ironwood	<b>Y</b> Favorable
		<b>F</b> Favorable	<b>Z</b> Favorable
		<b>G</b> Favorable As long as it runs into H and not into L and P and Q.	<b>AA</b> Favorable
		<b>H</b> Favorable It goes through undeveloped land.	<b>AB</b> Favorable If it came through from X, but please avoid Q. But We prefer using Highway 87 routes Y,Z,and AA
		<b>I</b> Unable to locate on map	<b>AC</b> Favorable See commenry on AB
		<b>J</b> no comment	<b>AD</b> Favorable See comment on AB
		<b>K</b> no comment	<b>AE</b>
		<b>L</b> Unfavorable To close to Crestfield Manor and Wildhorse Estates. We like our peace and quiet.	<b>AF</b>
		<b>M</b> To close to Crestfield Manor and Wildhorse Estates. We like our peace and quiet.	<b>AG</b>
		<b>N</b> Unfavorable	<b>AH</b>
		<b>O</b> Unfavorable Please stay away from Felix road. There are a few homes there that do not to have freeways in there	<b>AI</b>
		<b>P</b> Unfavorable Traffic already travels down Hunt, it would be better to keep the majority of the traffic where it already flows.	<b>AJ</b>
		<b>Q</b> Unfavorable See above comment.	<b>AK</b>
		<b>R</b> Favorable	<b>AL</b>
		<b>S</b> Favorable	<b>AM</b>
		<b>T</b> Favorable	<b>AN</b>
			<b>AO</b>
<b>Additional comments:</b> Our big concern is we don't want to start adding traffic to areas with homes where there is no traffic to begin with, like our neighborhoods on Felix Road. We suggest putting the traffic in areas where there is already a flow and pattern of traffic or out far where there is no home development at all.		<b>Factors:</b> Best relieves traffic/local streets Least impact to existing developmt Best use of existing roads/hwys	
		<b>Funding:</b> No: not support/won't use	
		<b>Response:</b> N/A	

# North-South Corridor Study Public Workshops December 2011 Public Involvement Summary - Comment Forms

143

Name/ Date	Mtg/Comment Type	Comment			
Dawndi Katich	Public Workshop				
01/02/12	Comment Form				
Additional comments:					
		<b>Segments:</b>	<b>U</b> Unfavorable	MUCH TOO CLOSE to residential areas. There are so many other options that won't impact the property value	<b>Factors:</b>
		<b>A</b> Unfavorable many reasons...	<b>V</b> Unfavorable	MUCH TOO CLOSE to residential areas. There are so many other options that won't impact the property value	Best connects to cities/towns
		<b>B</b> Favorable it's already a main corridor and it makes sense. It's right in the middle of San Tan Valley and would benefit	<b>W</b> Favorable	Impacts the least amount of residential areas and makes sense.	Best connects to other major routes
		<b>C</b>	<b>X</b> Favorable	Impacts the least amount of residential areas and makes sense.	Least impact to existing developmt
		<b>D</b> Favorable again, it's already a main corridor and used by all in this area. Would cause the least amount of impact on	<b>Y</b>		
		<b>E</b> Unfavorable too remote and out of the way. Leave the farm land alone	<b>Z</b>		
		<b>F</b> Unfavorable	<b>AA</b>		
		<b>G</b> Unfavorable no no no no no	<b>AB</b>		
		<b>H</b> Unfavorable no no no no no	<b>AC</b>		<b>Funding:</b>
		<b>I</b> Unfavorable	<b>AD</b>		Yes: support tolled hwy
		<b>J</b>	<b>AE</b>		Yes: use tolled hwy
		<b>K</b>	<b>AF</b>		
		<b>L</b> Unfavorable	<b>AG</b>		
		<b>M</b>	<b>AH</b>		
		<b>N</b>	<b>AI</b>		
		<b>O</b>	<b>AJ</b>		
		<b>P</b> Unfavorable	<b>AK</b>		<b>Response:</b>
		<b>Q</b> Unfavorable	<b>AL</b>		
		<b>R</b>	<b>AM</b>		
		<b>S</b>	<b>AN</b>		
		<b>T</b> Too CLOSE to residential areas. There are so many other options that won't impact the property value and	<b>AO</b>		

# North-South Corridor Study Public Workshops December 2011 Public Involvement Summary - Comment Forms

144

Name/ Date	Mtg/Comment Type	Comment		
Anonymous	Public Workshop			
12/31/11	Comment Form			
Additional comments:				
		<b>Segments:</b>	<b>U</b> Unfavorable	<b>Factors:</b>
		<b>A</b> Unfavorable	<b>V</b> Unfavorable	Best relieves traffic/local streets
		<b>B</b> Unfavorable	<b>W</b> Favorable	Least impact to existing developmt
		<b>C</b> Unfavorable	<b>X</b> Favorable	Input rec'd from public
		<b>D</b> Unfavorable	<b>Y</b>	
		<b>E</b> Unfavorable	<b>Z</b>	
		<b>F</b> Unfavorable	<b>AA</b>	
		<b>G</b> Unfavorable	<b>AB</b>	
		<b>H</b> Unfavorable	<b>AC</b>	<b>Funding:</b>
		<b>I</b> Unfavorable	<b>AD</b>	No: not support/won't use
		<b>J</b> Unfavorable	<b>AE</b>	
		<b>K</b> Unfavorable	<b>AF</b>	
		<b>L</b> Unfavorable	<b>AG</b>	
		<b>M</b> Unfavorable	<b>AH</b>	
		<b>N</b> Unfavorable	<b>AI</b>	
		<b>O</b> Unfavorable	<b>AJ</b>	
		<b>P</b> Unfavorable	<b>AK</b>	<b>Response:</b>
		<b>Q</b> Unfavorable	<b>AL</b>	
		<b>R</b> Favorable	<b>AM</b>	
		<b>S</b> Favorable	<b>AN</b>	
		<b>T</b> Unfavorable	<b>AO</b>	

# North-South Corridor Study Public Workshops December 2011 Public Involvement Summary - Comment Forms

145

Name/ Date	Mtg/Comment Type	Comment		
Anonymous	Public Workshop	<b>Segments:</b>	<b>U</b> Favorable	<b>Factors:</b>
12/30/11	Comment Form	<b>A</b> Unfavorable	<b>V</b> Favorable	Best relieves traffic/local streets
<b>Additional comments:</b>		<b>B</b> Unfavorable	<b>W</b> Favorable	Least impact to existing developmt
		<b>C</b> Unfavorable	<b>X</b> Favorable	Input rec'd from public
		<b>D</b> Unfavorable	<b>Y</b> Favorable	
		<b>E</b> Unfavorable	<b>Z</b> Favorable	
		<b>F</b> Unfavorable	<b>AA</b> Favorable	
		<b>G</b> Unfavorable	<b>AB</b> Favorable	
		<b>H</b> Unfavorable	<b>AC</b> Favorable	<b>Funding:</b>
		<b>I</b> Favorable	<b>AD</b> Favorable	No: not support/won't use
		<b>J</b> Unfavorable	<b>AE</b> Favorable	
		<b>K</b> Unfavorable	<b>AF</b> Favorable	
		<b>L</b> Favorable	<b>AG</b> Favorable	
		<b>M</b> Favorable	<b>AH</b> Favorable	
		<b>N</b> Favorable	<b>AI</b> Favorable	
		<b>O</b> Unfavorable	<b>AJ</b> Favorable	<b>Response:</b>
		<b>P</b> Favorable	<b>AK</b> Favorable	
		<b>Q</b> Favorable	<b>AL</b> Favorable	
		<b>R</b> Favorable	<b>AM</b> Favorable	
		<b>S</b> Unfavorable	<b>AN</b> Favorable	
		<b>T</b> Favorable	<b>AO</b> Favorable	

## 146

Name/ Date	Mtg/Comment Type	Comment
Chuck Buxton	Public Workshop	<b>Segments:</b>
		<b>U</b> Unfavorable Stay away from residential areas. This route causes this project to go much too close to already developed
12/29/11	Comment Form	<b>V</b> Unfavorable Stay away from residential areas. People do not want a 4 to 6 lane highway along residential corridors. Heavy
		<b>W</b> Favorable The least developed area. This route would cause the least harm to current home owners. The noise level
		<b>X</b> Favorable The least developed area. This route would cause the least harm to current home owners. The noise level
		<b>Y</b> Unfavorable Stay away from residential areas. People do not want a 4 to 6 lane highway along residential corridors. Heavy
		<b>Z</b> Unfavorable Stay away from residential areas. People do not want a 4 to 6 lane highway along residential corridors. Heavy
		<b>AA</b> Unfavorable Stay away from residential areas. People do not want a 4 to 6 lane highway along residential corridors. Heavy
		<b>AB</b> Favorable The least developed area. This route would cause the least harm to current home owners. The noise level
		<b>AC</b> Unfavorable Stay away from residential areas. People do not want a 4 to 6 lane highway along residential corridors. Heavy
		<b>AD</b> Favorable The least developed area. This route would cause the least harm to current home owners. The noise level
		<b>AE</b> Unfavorable Stay away from residential areas. This route ends up taking this project much too close to already developed
		<b>AF</b> Unfavorable Stay away from residential areas. This route ends up taking this project much too close to already developed
		<b>AG</b> Unfavorable Stay away from residential areas. This route ends up taking this project much too close to already developed
		<b>AH</b> Favorable The least developed area. This route would cause the least harm to current home owners. The noise level
		<b>AI</b> Unfavorable Stay away from residential areas. This route ends up taking this project much too close to already developed
		<b>AJ</b> Unfavorable Stay away from residential areas. This route ends up taking this project much too close to already developed
		<b>AK</b> Favorable The least developed area. This route would cause the least harm to current home owners. The noise level
		<b>AL</b> Favorable The least developed area. This route would cause the least harm to current home owners. The noise level
		<b>AM</b> Favorable The least developed area. This route would cause the least harm to current home owners. The noise level
		<b>AN</b> Favorable The least developed area. This route would cause the least harm to current home owners. The noise level
		<b>AO</b> Favorable The least developed area. This route would cause the least harm to current home owners. The noise level

**Additional comments:**

The furthest East you can keep this project would be the cheapest in construction. The best route for the majority of people in Pinal County, because it would; cause the least damage to property values, cause the least traffic noise to homeowners that moved to Pinal County to get away from traffic noise and congestion. The farthest east route within twenty years would show wise future planning and probably save money for the taxpayers now and in the future. Also, if your going to build it, build it large enough for the future. It's not going to be nearly as expensive now as a widening project 10 to 15 years from now like you've had to do with US 60.

**Factors:**

Least impact to existing developmnt  
Least impact to planned developmnt  
Input rec'd from public

**Funding:**

Yes: support tolled hwy  
Yes: use tolled hwy

**Response:**

N/A

# North-South Corridor Study Public Workshops December 2011 Public Involvement Summary - Comment Forms

147

Name/ Date	Mtg/Comment Type	Comment		
Monte & Colleen Ferber	Public Workshop		U	
12/28/11		Comment Form		
Additional comments:				
		<b>Segments:</b>		<b>Factors:</b>
		A Favorable a interstate out here would nice	V	Best connects to employment ctrs
		B Favorable	W	Best connects to other destinations
		C	X	Best connects to other major routes
		D	Y	
		E Favorable	Z	
		F Favorable	AA	
		G Favorable	AB	
		H	AC	<b>Funding:</b>
		I	AD	No: not support/won't use
		J	AE	
		K	AF	
		L	AG	
		M	AH	
		N	AI	
		O	AJ	
		P	AK	<b>Response:</b>
		Q	AL	
		R	AM	
		S	AN	
		T	AO	

# North-South Corridor Study Public Workshops December 2011 Public Involvement Summary - Comment Forms

148

Name/ Date	Mtg/Comment Type	Comment			
Mark & Judy Leach	Public Workshop	<b>Segments:</b>	<b>U</b>	Unfavorable	<b>Factors:</b> Least impact to existing developmt Best use of existing roads/hwys Input rec'd from public
12/28/11	Comment Form	<b>A</b> Unfavorable	<b>V</b>	Unfavorable	
		<b>B</b> Unfavorable	<b>W</b>	Favorable LEAST IMPACT TO PRESENT HOMES	
		<b>C</b> Unfavorable	<b>X</b>	Favorable LEAST IMPACT TO PRESENT HOMES	
<b>Additional comments:</b> I WOULD LIKE WILDHORSE ESTATES LOCATED NEAR FELIX & ARIZONA FARMS RD. TO SHOW AS RESIDENTIAL AREA. I DO NOT WANT ANY ROUTE THAT HAS SEGMENTS L, P, Q, NEAR MY PROPERTY. SEGMENTS I, M, S, W, X, WILL HAVE THE LEAST IMPACT TO PRESENT HOMES.		<b>D</b> Unfavorable	<b>Y</b>		
		<b>E</b> Unfavorable	<b>Z</b>		
		<b>F</b> Unfavorable	<b>AA</b>		
		<b>G</b> Unfavorable	<b>AB</b>		
		<b>H</b> Unfavorable	<b>AC</b>		<b>Funding:</b> No: not support/won't use
		<b>I</b> Favorable LEAST IMPACT TO PRESENT HOMES	<b>AD</b>		
		<b>J</b> Unfavorable	<b>AE</b>		
		<b>K</b> Unfavorable	<b>AF</b>		
		<b>L</b> Unfavorable	<b>AG</b>		
		<b>M</b> Favorable LEAST IMPACT TO PRESENT HOMES	<b>AH</b>		
		<b>N</b> Unfavorable	<b>AI</b>		
		<b>O</b> Unfavorable	<b>AJ</b>		
		<b>P</b> Unfavorable	<b>AK</b>		<b>Response:</b> N/A
		<b>Q</b> Unfavorable	<b>AL</b>		
		<b>R</b> Favorable	<b>AM</b>		
		<b>S</b> Favorable LEAST IMPACT TO PRESENT HOMES	<b>AN</b>		
		<b>T</b> Unfavorable	<b>AO</b>		

**North-South Corridor Study Public Workshops December 2011  
Public Involvement Summary - Comment Forms**

149

Name/ Date	Mtg/Comment Type	Comment		
Ann Rankin	Public Workshop	<b>Segments:</b>	U	<b>Factors:</b>
1/9/12	Comment Form	A	V	Least impact to existing developmt
Additional comments:		B	W	Least impact to natural areas/open space
		C	X Unfavorable	Input rec'd from public
		D	Y	It appears that this segment will be directly on our property and would negatively impact a well preserved
		E	Z	
		F	AA	
		G	AB	
		H	AC	<b>Funding:</b>
		I	AD	No: not support/won't use
		J	AE	
		K	AF	
		L	AG	
		M	AH	
		N	AI	
		O	AJ	<b>Response:</b>
		P	AK	
		Q	AL	
		R	AM	
		S	AN	
		T	AO	



# North-South Corridor Study Public Workshops December 2011 Public Involvement Summary - Comment Forms

150

Name/ Date	Mtg/Comment Type	Comment		
Linda Kinsfather	Public Workshop			
12/27/11	Comment Form			
Additional comments:				
		<b>Segments:</b>	<b>U</b> Unfavorable	<b>Factors:</b>
		<b>A</b> Favorable	<b>V</b> Unfavorable	Best connects to employment ctrs
		<b>B</b> Favorable	<b>W</b> Unfavorable	Best connects to cities/towns
		<b>C</b> Unfavorable	<b>X</b> Unfavorable	Best connects to other major routes
		<b>D</b> Unfavorable	<b>Y</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>E</b> Unfavorable	<b>Z</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>F</b> Favorable	<b>AA</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>G</b> Unfavorable	<b>AB</b> Favorable	
		<b>H</b> Unfavorable	<b>AC</b> Unfavorable	<b>Funding:</b>
		<b>I</b> Favorable	<b>AD</b> Favorable	No: not support/won't use
		<b>J</b> Favorable	<b>AE</b> Unfavorable	I pay enough in taxes! Seeing that this probably won't happen for at least 20+ years, I'll probably be dead by then or close to it!!
		<b>K</b> Unfavorable	<b>AF</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>L</b> Favorable	<b>AG</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>M</b> Unfavorable	<b>AH</b> Favorable	
		<b>N</b> Unfavorable	<b>AI</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>O</b> Favorable	<b>AJ</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>P</b> Unfavorable	<b>AK</b> Favorable	<b>Response:</b>
		<b>Q</b> Favorable	<b>AL</b> Favorable	
		<b>R</b> Unfavorable	<b>AM</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>S</b> Unfavorable	<b>AN</b> Favorable	
		<b>T</b> Unfavorable	<b>AO</b> Unfavorable	

**North-South Corridor Study Public Workshops December 2011  
Public Involvement Summary - Comment Forms**

151

Name/ Date	Mtg/Comment Type	Comment			
Sam Sabbara	Public Workshop	<b>Segments:</b>		<b>U</b>	<b>Factors:</b> Best relieves traffic/local streets Least impact to existing developmt Input rec'd from public
12/23/11	Comment Form	<b>A</b> Favorable	Most direct route to the 60 from San Tan Valley.	<b>V</b>	
		<b>B</b> Favorable	Most direct route to the 60 from San Tan Valley.	<b>W</b>	
<b>Additional comments:</b>		<b>C</b> Unfavorable	Seems to cut through my community of copper basin	<b>X</b>	
		<b>D</b> Favorable	Most direct route to the 60 from San Tan Valley.	<b>Y</b>	
		<b>E</b>		<b>Z</b>	
		<b>F</b> Favorable	Most direct route to the 60 from San Tan Valley.	<b>AA</b>	
		<b>G</b>		<b>AB</b>	
		<b>H</b> Favorable	Most direct route to the 60 from San Tan Valley.	<b>AC</b>	<b>Funding:</b> No: not support/won't use
		<b>I</b>		<b>AD</b>	
		<b>J</b>		<b>AE</b>	
		<b>K</b>		<b>AF</b>	
		<b>L</b>		<b>AG</b>	
		<b>M</b>		<b>AH</b>	
		<b>N</b>		<b>AI</b>	
		<b>O</b>		<b>AJ</b>	
		<b>P</b>		<b>AK</b>	<b>Response:</b>
		<b>Q</b>		<b>AL</b>	
		<b>R</b>		<b>AM</b>	
		<b>S</b>		<b>AN</b>	
		<b>T</b>		<b>AO</b>	

**Factors:**  
Best relieves traffic/local  
streets  
Least impact to existing  
developmt  
Input rec'd from public

**Funding:**  
No: not support/won't use

**Response:**

# North-South Corridor Study Public Workshops December 2011 Public Involvement Summary - Comment Forms

152

Name/ Date	Mtg/Comment Type	Comment	
John Wallington	Public Workshop	<b>Segments:</b>	
12/23/11	Comment Form	<b>A</b>	<b>U</b>
<b>Additional comments:</b>		<b>B</b>	<b>V</b>
		<b>C</b>	<b>W</b>
		<b>D</b>	<b>X</b>
		<b>E</b> Unfavorable I live in Laredo Ranch and this particular route is close to out eastern border of our community. We already	<b>Y</b>
		<b>F</b>	<b>Z</b>
		<b>G</b>	<b>AA</b>
		<b>H</b>	<b>AB</b>
		<b>I</b>	<b>AC</b>
		<b>J</b> Favorable Away from communities and a good base for growth	<b>AD</b>
		<b>K</b>	<b>AE</b>
		<b>L</b>	<b>AF</b>
		<b>M</b>	<b>AG</b>
		<b>N</b>	<b>AH</b>
		<b>O</b> Favorable Away from communities and a good base for growth	<b>AI</b>
		<b>P</b>	<b>AJ</b>
		<b>Q</b>	<b>AK</b>
		<b>R</b>	<b>AL</b>
		<b>S</b>	<b>AM</b>
		<b>T</b>	<b>AN</b>
			<b>AO</b>
		<b>Factors:</b>	
		Best connects to other destinations	
		Best connects to other major routes	
		Least impact to existing developmt	
		<b>Funding:</b>	
		Yes: support tolled hwy	
		Yes: use tolled hwy	
		<b>Response:</b>	

**North-South Corridor Study Public Workshops December 2011  
Public Involvement Summary - Comment Forms**

153

Name/ Date	Mtg/Comment Type	Comment
Anonymous	Public Workshop	<b>Segments:</b>
12/22/11	Comment Form	<b>U</b>
<b>Additional comments:</b>		<b>Factors:</b>
		<b>A</b> Favorable
		<b>V</b> Unfavorable
		<b>B</b> Favorable
		<b>W</b> Unfavorable Too close to AZ-79.
		<b>C</b> Favorable
		<b>X</b> Unfavorable Too close to AZ-79.
		<b>D</b> Favorable
		<b>Y</b> Favorable
		<b>E</b> Favorable
		<b>Z</b> Favorable
		<b>F</b> Favorable
		<b>AA</b>
		<b>G</b> Favorable
		<b>AB</b>
		<b>H</b> Favorable
		<b>AC</b>
		<b>I</b> Favorable
		<b>AD</b>
		<b>J</b> Favorable
		<b>AE</b>
		<b>K</b> Favorable
		<b>AF</b>
		<b>L</b> Unfavorable
		<b>AG</b>
		<b>M</b> Unfavorable
		<b>AH</b>
		<b>N</b> Unfavorable
		<b>AI</b>
		<b>O</b> Unfavorable
		<b>AJ</b>
		<b>P</b> Unfavorable
		<b>AK</b>
		<b>Q</b> Unfavorable
		<b>AL</b>
		<b>R</b> Unfavorable SR-24 can handle this area.
		<b>AM</b>
		<b>S</b> Unfavorable
		<b>AN</b>
		<b>T</b> Unfavorable
		<b>AO</b>
		<b>Funding:</b>
		<b>Response:</b>

**North-South Corridor Study Public Workshops December 2011  
Public Involvement Summary - Comment Forms**

154

Name/ Date	Mtg/Comment Type	Comment			
Bryce Hagen	Public Workshop	<b>Segments:</b>		U	<b>Factors:</b>
12/21/11	Comment Form	A Unfavorable	Too close to residential neighborhoods	V	Lowest cost
Additional comments:		B Unfavorable	Too close to residential neighborhoods	W	Least impact to existing developmt
		C Unfavorable	follows segments A and B	X	Least impact to natural areas/open space
		D Unfavorable	follows Segment A, B, and C	Y	
		E Unfavorable	Too close to residential neighborhoods	Z	
		F Unfavorable	follows unfavorable segment A and B	AA	
		G		AB	
		H		AC	<b>Funding:</b>
		I		AD	No: not support/won't use
		J		AE	
		K		AF	
		L		AG	
		M		AH	
		N		AI	
		O		AJ	
		P		AK	<b>Response:</b>
		Q		AL	
		R		AM	
		S		AN	
		T		AO	

# North-South Corridor Study Public Workshops December 2011 Public Involvement Summary - Comment Forms

Name/ Date	Mtg/Comment Type	Comment			
Nelson Chandler	Public Workshop	<b>Segments:</b>			
12/21/11	Comment Form	<b>A</b> Favorable	It supports Segment E.	<b>U</b> Unfavorable	Too indirect. Would not help San Tan Valley commuters.
		<b>B</b> Unfavorable	Too redundant with Ironwood.	<b>V</b> Unfavorable	Too indirect. Would not help San Tan Valley commuters.
		<b>C</b> Favorable	It's not as direct as Segments F/G/H but not bad.	<b>W</b> Unfavorable	This is the worst possible route because it's too far East to help San Tan commuters and on top of that is too far East to help San Tan commuters and on top of that is too indirect.
		<b>D</b> Favorable	Very Direct Route to I-10. Not redundant with 79/77 route.	<b>X</b> Unfavorable	Most direct route.
		<b>E</b> Favorable	This would be the "best" route in my opinion. It cuts the most drive time off, supports the growing San Tan	<b>Y</b> Favorable	Most direct route.
		<b>F</b> Favorable		<b>Z</b> Favorable	Most direct route.
		<b>G</b> Favorable	This is the only Segment that supports Segment E, the best northern segment.	<b>AA</b> Favorable	Most direct route.
		<b>H</b> Favorable	The other routes are too far east.	<b>AB</b> Unfavorable	Not shown on map.
		<b>I</b> Unfavorable	Too far east but would still be acceptable if the J/K/G/H/D segments were chosen.	<b>AC</b> Unfavorable	Too indirect.
		<b>J</b> Favorable	Would prefer something further West but this isn't as bad as M.	<b>AD</b> Unfavorable	Too indirect.
		<b>K</b> Favorable	Would prefer Route E but this isn't as bad as O or S.	<b>AE</b> Unfavorable	No advantage over Y/Z.
		<b>L</b> Unfavorable	Too far east. Would not support San Tan Valley.	<b>AF</b> Unfavorable	No advantage over Y/Z.
		<b>M</b> Unfavorable	Too far east. Would not support San Tan Valley.	<b>AG</b> Unfavorable	Indirect compared to AA.
		<b>N</b> Unfavorable	The route is too inefficient.	<b>AH</b> Unfavorable	No advantage over Y/Z.
		<b>O</b> Unfavorable	This route is too far east for commuters, but would be preferable to segments S/T/W.	<b>AI</b> Unfavorable	No advantage over Y/Z/AA.
		<b>P</b> Unfavorable	The route is too indirect.	<b>AJ</b> Unfavorable	No advantage over AA.
		<b>Q</b> Unfavorable	Too far east for commuters but better than segment X.	<b>AK</b> Unfavorable	No advantage over Y/Z/AA.
		<b>R</b> Unfavorable	Too far east for commuters and too indirect compared to A or I.	<b>AL</b> Unfavorable	No advantage over Y/Z/AA.
		<b>S</b> Unfavorable	Would not support San Tan Valley at all.	<b>AM</b> Unfavorable	Not shown on map.
		<b>T</b> Unfavorable	Would not support San Tan Valley at all.	<b>AN</b> Unfavorable	No advantage over Y.
				<b>AO</b> Unfavorable	Not shown on map.
<b>Additional comments:</b> The North-South corridor is a great idea. Please keep in mind commuters from San Tan Valley to the Phx area when selecting routes.		<b>Factors:</b> Best relieves traffic/local streets Best connects to employment ctrs Other			
		<b>Funding:</b> Yes: support tolled hwy Yes: use tolled hwy If it can get me from San Tan Valley to Mesa easily I'll pay the toll, especially if the speed limit is something like 80+ (if Texas can do it so can we). If it goes to Florence I'll never use it because work is the other direction.			
		<b>Response:</b> N/A			

# North-South Corridor Study Public Workshops December 2011 Public Involvement Summary - Comment Forms

156

Name/ Date	Mtg/Comment Type	Comment				
John Connolly	Public Workshop	<b>Segments:</b>		<b>U</b> Unfavorable	Not familiar with this area.	<b>Factors:</b> Best relieves traffic/hwys & frwys Best connects to cities/towns Best use of existing roads/hwys
12/21/11	Comment Form	<b>A</b> Favorable	Help relieve some of the traffic build up on Ironwood and US 60. Many people live in the Johnson Ranch going to and from Queen Creek. Many people live in	<b>V</b> Unfavorable	Not familiar with this area.	
		<b>B</b> Favorable	Help relieve some of the traffic build up on Ironwood going to and from Queen Creek. Many people live in	<b>W</b> Unfavorable	No additional highway is needed here. All the state needs to do is develop Highway 79 to a four lane	
<b>Additional comments:</b>		<b>C</b> Favorable	This will help relieve Hunt Highway which is currently only a single lane road in both directions. Contractual	<b>X</b> Favorable	This will be needed to connect the proposed highway from Ironwood to I-10. Again though, I would be	
		<b>D</b> Favorable	This will help relieve Hunt Highway which is currently only a single lane road in both directions.	<b>Y</b> Favorable	Current road for State Route 87 and 287 are used heavily. Something needs to be done to relieve the	
		<b>E</b> Favorable	This area is just starting to develop. Therefore, it would be prudent now to buy up and develop out in this area	<b>Z</b> Favorable	Current road for State Route 87 and Selma are used by many. Something needs to be done to relieve the flow	
		<b>F</b> Favorable	This area is just starting to develop. Therefore, it would be prudent now to buy up and develop out in this area	<b>AA</b> Favorable	Current road for State Route 87 and Arica are used by many. Something needs to be done to relieve the flow	
		<b>G</b> Favorable	I am not familiar with this area.	<b>AB</b> Unfavorable	I am unfamiliar with this area, but if it's like the rest of the area, a highway could have a negative impact on	<b>Funding:</b> No: not support/won't use
		<b>H</b> Favorable	This area is just starting to develop. Therefore, it would be prudent now to buy up and develop out in this area	<b>AC</b> Unfavorable	I am unfamiliar with this area, but if it's like the rest of the area, a highway could have a negative impact on	
		<b>I</b> Favorable	As Gold Canyon continues to grow, the current US 60 will be overloaded. Between all the activities (such as	<b>AD</b> Unfavorable	I am unfamiliar with this area, but if it's like the rest of the area, a highway could have a negative impact on	I am against tolls and would avoid them. Many other people I have talked to have said the same thing, therefore a toll road would only be a waste of money for a business and/or the state of Arizona to develop. Please keep in mind also that sometimes foreign companies will win the contracts on these toll
		<b>J</b> Unfavorable	Freeway 202 should be handling this area? I am not 100% familiar with this area though.	<b>AE</b> Unfavorable	I am unfamiliar with this area, but if it's like the rest of the area, a highway could have a negative impact on	
		<b>K</b> Unfavorable	I am unfamiliar with this area therefore I would not know how this would affect traffic.	<b>AF</b> Unfavorable	I am unfamiliar with this area, but if it's like the rest of the area, a highway could have a negative impact on	
		<b>L</b> Unfavorable	How will this affect some of the farmers that are living out in that area now? Arizona Farms Road has lots of	<b>AG</b> Unfavorable	I am unfamiliar with this area, but if it's like the rest of the area, a highway could have a negative impact on	
		<b>M</b> Unfavorable	Not familiar with this area.	<b>AH</b> Unfavorable	I am unfamiliar with this area, but if it's like the rest of the area, a highway could have a negative impact on	
		<b>N</b> Unfavorable	Not familiar with this area.	<b>AI</b> Unfavorable	I am unfamiliar with this area, but if it's like the rest of the area, a highway could have a negative impact on	
		<b>O</b> Unfavorable	Will this development affect the farm lands out in this area? Will this in return have a negative impact on	<b>AJ</b> Unfavorable	I am unfamiliar with this area, but if it's like the rest of the area, a highway could have a negative impact on	<b>Response:</b>
		<b>P</b> Unfavorable	Not familiar with this area.	<b>AK</b> Unfavorable	I am unfamiliar with this area, but if it's like the rest of the area, a highway could have a negative impact on	
		<b>Q</b> Favorable	State Route 287 is heavily used by people living in Coolidge, Casa Grande and the Florence area. As	<b>AL</b> Unfavorable	I am unfamiliar with this area, but if it's like the rest of the area, a highway could have a negative impact on	
		<b>R</b> Unfavorable	Not familiar with this area.	<b>AM</b> Unfavorable	I am unfamiliar with this area, but if it's like the rest of the area, a highway could have a negative impact on	
		<b>S</b> Unfavorable	Not familiar with this area.	<b>AN</b> Favorable	I am not familiar with Wheeler Road, but Attaway road needs to be developed. This area is developing on its'	
		<b>T</b> Unfavorable	Not familiar with this area.	<b>AO</b>	I am not familiar with Martin Rd, but State Route 287 has many areas that are developing now. A new	

# North-South Corridor Study Public Workshops December 2011 Public Involvement Summary - Comment Forms

157

Name/ Date	Mtg/Comment Type	Comment		
Todd Potter	Public Workshop			
12/20/11	Comment Form			
Additional comments:				
		<b>Segments:</b>	<b>U</b> Favorable	<b>Factors:</b>
		<b>A</b> Unfavorable Too much noise in my neighborhood. Too close to existing homes.	<b>V</b> Favorable	Best relieves traffic/local streets
		<b>B</b> Unfavorable Too much noise in my neighborhood. Too close to existing homes.	<b>W</b> Favorable	Best connects to other major routes
		<b>C</b> Unfavorable	<b>X</b> Favorable	Least impact to existing developmt
		<b>D</b> Unfavorable Too much noise in my neighborhood. Too close to existing homes.	<b>Y</b>	
		<b>E</b> Unfavorable Too much noise in my neighborhood. Too close to existing homes.	<b>Z</b>	
		<b>F</b> Unfavorable Too much noise in my neighborhood. Too close to existing homes.	<b>AA</b>	
		<b>G</b> Favorable Far enough away that construction will not interfere with existing Ironwood traffic and not too close to homes.	<b>AB</b>	
		<b>H</b> Favorable Far enough away that construction will not interfere with existing Ironwood traffic and not too close to homes.	<b>AC</b>	<b>Funding:</b>
		<b>I</b> Favorable Far enough away that construction will not interfere with existing Ironwood traffic and not too close to homes.	<b>AD</b>	Yes: support tolled hwy
		<b>J</b> Favorable Far enough away that construction will not interfere with existing Ironwood traffic and not too close to homes.	<b>AE</b>	Yes: use tolled hwy
		<b>K</b> Favorable Far enough away that construction will not interfere with existing Ironwood traffic and not too close to homes.	<b>AF</b>	
		<b>L</b> Unfavorable	<b>AG</b>	
		<b>M</b>	<b>AH</b>	
		<b>N</b>	<b>AI</b>	
		<b>O</b> Favorable	<b>AJ</b>	
		<b>P</b> Favorable	<b>AK</b>	<b>Response:</b>
		<b>Q</b> Favorable	<b>AL</b>	
		<b>R</b> Favorable	<b>AM</b>	
		<b>S</b> Favorable	<b>AN</b>	
		<b>T</b> Favorable	<b>AO</b>	



# North-South Corridor Study Public Workshops December 2011 Public Involvement Summary - Comment Forms

Name/ Date	Mtg/Comment Type	Comment			
Bev Lennen	Public Workshop	<b>Segments:</b>			
12/19/11	Comment Form	<b>A</b> Favorable	Lower impact to existing communities.	<b>U</b> Unfavorable	Cost of two canal crossings.
		<b>V</b> Unfavorable	same		<b>Factors:</b>
		<b>B</b> Favorable	Less impact to established neighborhoods.	<b>W</b>	Best connects to other major routes
		<b>C</b>	unsure	<b>X</b>	Best use of existing roads/hwys
		<b>D</b>	unsure	<b>Y</b>	Least impact to existing developmt
		<b>E</b> Unfavorable	Too close to existing communities and neighborhoods. Pollution, noise, are issues	<b>Z</b>	Other
		<b>F</b>	unsure	<b>AA</b>	
		<b>G</b> Favorable	Property is already impacted by railroad and SRP lines.	<b>AB</b>	
		<b>H</b> Unfavorable	Residential impact.	<b>AC</b>	<b>Funding:</b>
		<b>I</b> Favorable	No impact to existing communities and neighborhoods.	<b>AD</b>	No: not support/won't use
		<b>J</b> Favorable	Supports planned infrastructure and development, as long as it does not impact current communities and	<b>AE</b>	We are too far east and south to be a tolled road.
		<b>K</b> Unfavorable	Too close to existing development.	<b>AF</b>	Save the tolls for the MOST volume areas. We already feel the toll of choosing the far southeast valley.
		<b>L</b> Unfavorable	same	<b>AG</b>	
		<b>M</b>	unsure	<b>AH</b>	
		<b>N</b>	unsure	<b>AI</b>	
		<b>O</b>	unsure	<b>AJ</b>	
		<b>P</b> Unfavorable	Impact on planned communities/development.	<b>AK</b>	<b>Response:</b>
		<b>Q</b>	unsure	<b>AL</b>	N/A
		<b>R</b>	unsure	<b>AM</b>	
		<b>S</b>	unsure	<b>AN</b>	
		<b>T</b> Unfavorable	same	<b>AO</b>	

# North-South Corridor Study Public Workshops December 2011 Public Involvement Summary - Comment Forms

159

Name/ Date	Mtg/Comment Type	Comment				
Joe Ramsey	Public Workshop	<b>Segments:</b>				<b>Factors:</b>
12/18/11	Comment Form	<b>A</b> Unfavorable	Should not be built in any area that would take your personal home	<b>U</b> Unfavorable	See Above	Least impact to existing developmt Input rec'd from public Input rec'd from local gov't Other
		<b>B</b> Unfavorable	Should not be built in any area that would take your personal home	<b>V</b> Unfavorable	See Above	
		<b>C</b> Unfavorable	Should not be built in any area that would take your personal home	<b>W</b> Unfavorable	See Above	
		<b>D</b> Unfavorable	See Above	<b>X</b> Unfavorable	See Above	
		<b>E</b> Unfavorable	See Above	<b>Y</b> Unfavorable		
		<b>F</b> Unfavorable	See Above	<b>Z</b> Unfavorable		
		<b>G</b> Unfavorable	See Above	<b>AA</b> Unfavorable		
		<b>H</b> Unfavorable	See Above	<b>AB</b> Unfavorable		
		<b>I</b> Unfavorable	See Above	<b>AC</b> Unfavorable		<b>Funding:</b>
		<b>J</b> Unfavorable	See Above	<b>AD</b> Unfavorable		No: not support/won't use
		<b>K</b> Unfavorable	See Above	<b>AE</b> Unfavorable		
		<b>L</b> Unfavorable	See Above	<b>AF</b> Unfavorable		
		<b>M</b> Unfavorable	See Above	<b>AG</b> Unfavorable		
		<b>N</b> Unfavorable	See Above	<b>AH</b> Unfavorable		
		<b>O</b> Unfavorable	See Above	<b>AI</b> Unfavorable		
		<b>P</b> Unfavorable	See Above	<b>AJ</b> Unfavorable		<b>Response:</b>
		<b>Q</b> Unfavorable	See Above	<b>AK</b> Unfavorable		
		<b>R</b> Unfavorable	See Above	<b>AL</b> Unfavorable		
		<b>S</b> Unfavorable	See Above	<b>AM</b> Unfavorable		
		<b>T</b> Unfavorable	See Above	<b>AN</b> Unfavorable		
				<b>AO</b> Unfavorable		

## North-South Corridor Study Public Workshops December 2011 Public Involvement Summary - Comment Forms

160

Name/ Date	Mtg/Comment Type	Comment		
Cody Johnston	Public Workshop	<b>Segments:</b>	<b>U</b> Unfavorable	<b>Factors:</b>
12/17/11	Comment Form	<b>A</b> Unfavorable	<b>V</b> Unfavorable	Best connects to employment ctrs Lowest cost Least impact to natural areas/open space
		<b>B</b> Unfavorable	<b>W</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>C</b> Unfavorable There's no other way around that area, it would b a trap!	<b>X</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>D</b> Unfavorable	<b>Y</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>E</b> Unfavorable	<b>Z</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>F</b> Unfavorable	<b>AA</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>G</b> Unfavorable the Srp 500kV transmission line, how often is work performed on said line? How often would there be a	<b>AB</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>H</b> Unfavorable	<b>AC</b> Unfavorable	<b>Funding:</b>
		<b>I</b> Unfavorable	<b>AD</b> Unfavorable	No: not support/won't use
		<b>J</b> Unfavorable	<b>AE</b> Unfavorable	There's nothing wrong with the existing highways other than they need repairs one in awhile. I would not pay to make it to my destination 5 minutes quicker than the existing highways would. The economy is too down in the dumps still for this project. I feel in a way some of the proposed routes would h like
		<b>K</b> Unfavorable	<b>AF</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>L</b> Unfavorable	<b>AG</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>M</b> Unfavorable	<b>AH</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>N</b> Unfavorable	<b>AI</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>O</b> Unfavorable	<b>AJ</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>P</b> Unfavorable	<b>AK</b> Unfavorable	<b>Response:</b>
		<b>Q</b> Unfavorable	<b>AL</b> Unfavorable	N/A
		<b>R</b> Unfavorable	<b>AM</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>S</b> Unfavorable	<b>AN</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>T</b> Unfavorable	<b>AO</b> Unfavorable	

**North-South Corridor Study Public Workshops December 2011  
Public Involvement Summary - Comment Forms**

161

Name/ Date	Mtg/Comment Type	Comment			
Pat Olsen	Public Workshop	<b>Segments:</b>	<b>U</b>	Unfavorable	cost of building 2 bridges and not as direct. Just don't put zig zag waves in it like Maricopa did on the Red
12/16/11	Comment Form	<b>A</b>	<b>V</b>		<b>Factors:</b> Best relieves traffic/hwys & frwys Best connects to employment ctrs Other
<b>Additional comments:</b>		<b>B</b>	<b>W</b>		
		<b>C</b>	<b>X</b>		
		<b>D</b>	<b>Y</b>		
		<b>E</b>	<b>Z</b>		
		<b>F</b>	<b>AA</b>		
		<b>G</b>	<b>AB</b>		
		<b>H</b>	<b>AC</b>	Unfavorable	use middle route crossing the river.
		<b>I</b> Favorable It will have the least impact on existing routes. It will also help populate surrounding areas. Additional	<b>AD</b>		<b>Funding:</b> Yes: support tolled hwy Yes: use tolled hwy I would prefer not to have a toll. The toll cost will be a big factor. If it is too high it will drive people away. Also there is the additional cost of the toll equipment and staff to maintain.
		<b>J</b>	<b>AE</b>		
		<b>K</b>	<b>AF</b>		
		<b>L</b>	<b>AG</b>		
		<b>M</b>	<b>AH</b>		
		<b>N</b>	<b>AI</b>		
		<b>O</b>	<b>AJ</b>		
		<b>P</b>	<b>AK</b>		<b>Response:</b>
		<b>Q</b>	<b>AL</b>		
		<b>R</b>	<b>AM</b>		
		<b>S</b> Favorable See Segment I	<b>AN</b>		
		<b>T</b>	<b>AO</b>		

# North-South Corridor Study Public Workshops December 2011 Public Involvement Summary - Comment Forms

Name/ Date	Mtg/Comment Type	Comment			
Don & Rachel Larsen	Public Workshop				
12/16/11	Comment Form				
<b>Additional comments:</b>					
		<b>Segments:</b>	<b>U</b>	Unfavorable	Too far out to be of much use.
		<b>A</b> Favorable	Close in enough, not too far out.	<b>V</b>	Unfavorable
		<b>B</b> Unfavorable	Too many all ready established residential areas. We do not want a major freeway running through our	<b>W</b>	Unfavorable
		<b>C</b> Unfavorable	Too many all ready established residential areas. We do not want a major freeway running through our	<b>X</b>	Unfavorable
		<b>D</b> Favorable	Close in enough, not too far out.	<b>Y</b>	Unfavorable
		<b>E</b> Unfavorable	Too many all ready established residential areas. We do not want a major freeway running through our	<b>Z</b>	Unfavorable
		<b>F</b> Unfavorable	Too many all ready established residential areas. We do not want a major freeway running through our	<b>AA</b>	
		<b>G</b> Favorable	Close in enough, not too far out.	<b>AB</b>	
		<b>H</b> Favorable	Close in enough, not too far out.	<b>AC</b>	
		<b>I</b> Favorable	Close in enough, not too far out.	<b>AD</b>	
		<b>J</b> Favorable	Close in enough, not too far out.	<b>AE</b>	
		<b>K</b> Favorable	Close in enough, not too far out.	<b>AF</b>	
		<b>L</b> Unfavorable	Too far out to be of much use.	<b>AG</b>	
		<b>M</b> Unfavorable	Too far out to be of much use.	<b>AH</b>	
		<b>N</b> Unfavorable	Too far out to be of much use.	<b>AI</b>	
		<b>O</b> Unfavorable	Too far out to be of much use.	<b>AJ</b>	
		<b>P</b> Unfavorable	Too far out to be of much use.	<b>AK</b>	
		<b>Q</b> Unfavorable	Too far out to be of much use.	<b>AL</b>	
		<b>R</b> Unfavorable	Too far out to be of much use.	<b>AM</b>	
		<b>S</b> Unfavorable	Too far out to be of much use.	<b>AN</b>	
		<b>T</b> Unfavorable	Too far out to be of much use.	<b>AO</b>	
					<b>Factors:</b>
					Best relieves traffic/local streets
					Best connects to other major routes
					Least impact to existing developmt
					<b>Funding:</b>
					No: not support/won't use
					<b>Response:</b>
					NO TOLL ROADS, PLEASE!!!

# North-South Corridor Study Public Workshops December 2011 Public Involvement Summary - Comment Forms

163

Name/ Date	Mtg/Comment Type	Comment		
Riley Smith	Public Workshop		U Unfavorable	<b>Factors:</b>
12/15/11	Comment Form	<b>Segments:</b>		Best connects to cities/towns
		<b>A</b> Favorable easy access from US 60, possible loop with sr 24	V Unfavorable	Best connects to other major routes
		<b>B</b> Unfavorable too close to residential and commerce	W Unfavorable	Least impact to existing developmt
<b>Additional comments:</b>		<b>C</b> Unfavorable too close to communities, closes san tan valley off, disrupts mountain park	X Unfavorable	
		<b>D</b> Favorable easy transition to SR87 to -110	Y	
		<b>E</b> Favorable provides Queen Creek eastern access to the highway and also provides boundaries for community growth	Z	
		<b>F</b> Unfavorable Highway would be too close to Poston Butte High School	AA	
		<b>G</b> Favorable	AB	
		<b>H</b> Favorable access to hospital, connects G to D	AC	<b>Funding:</b>
		<b>I</b> Unfavorable	AD	Yes: use tolled hwy
		<b>J</b> Unfavorable	AE	out of necessity because i am a resident
		<b>K</b> Unfavorable	AF	
		<b>L</b> Favorable	AG	
		<b>M</b> Unfavorable	AH	
		<b>N</b> Unfavorable	AI	
		<b>O</b> Unfavorable	AJ	
		<b>P</b> Unfavorable	AK	<b>Response:</b>
		<b>Q</b> Favorable	AL	
		<b>R</b> Unfavorable	AM	
		<b>S</b> Unfavorable	AN	
		<b>T</b> Unfavorable	AO	

# North-South Corridor Study Public Workshops December 2011 Public Involvement Summary - Comment Forms

Name/ Date	Mtg/Comment Type	Comment			
Dan Didesch	Public Workshop	<b>Segments:</b>			
12/15/11	Comment Form	<b>A</b>	Same as D, E, F, and G	<b>U</b> Unfavorable	unnecessary/See K/too expensive
<b>Additional comments:</b> A straight line is the shortest distance and the least expensive. Also the population clusters are better served by using the shortest distance methodology. I personally do not want to give developers the State Trust Lands if a highway is put through or there won't be any for use anymore.		<b>B</b> Favorable	Same as D, E, F, and G	<b>V</b> Unfavorable	unnecessary/See K/too expensive
		<b>C</b> Favorable	Same as D, E, F, and G	<b>W</b> Unfavorable	unnecessary/See K/too expensive
		<b>D</b> Favorable	They are the ones who need streamlined access	<b>X</b> Unfavorable	unnecessary/See K/too expensive
		<b>E</b> Favorable	Reduced flood control costs, no State Trust land used, CAP Canal is an existing sound barrier for residents on	<b>Y</b> Unfavorable	unnecessary/too expensive
		<b>F</b> Favorable	Better access for residential population and access to more commute alternatives	<b>Z</b> Unfavorable	unnecessary/too expensive
		<b>G</b> Favorable	same as D and E	<b>AA</b>	
		<b>H</b> Favorable	Same as D, E, F, and G	<b>AB</b> Unfavorable	unnecessary/too expensive
		<b>I</b> Unfavorable	Unnecessary expense with SR 24 an bad use of State Trust land/See K	<b>AC</b>	
		<b>J</b> Unfavorable	Unfavorable	<b>AD</b>	
		<b>K</b> Unfavorable	I may be confused but isn't the purpose to move traffic where they need to go at the cheapest cost. Flood	<b>AE</b>	
		<b>L</b> Unfavorable	unnecessary/See K/too expensive	<b>AF</b>	
		<b>M</b> Unfavorable	unnecessary/See K	<b>AG</b>	
		<b>N</b> Unfavorable	unnecessary/See K	<b>AH</b>	
		<b>O</b> Unfavorable	unnecessary/See K	<b>AI</b>	
		<b>P</b> Unfavorable	too expensive	<b>AJ</b>	
		<b>Q</b> Unfavorable	too expensive	<b>AK</b>	
		<b>R</b> Unfavorable	unnecessary/See K	<b>AL</b>	
		<b>S</b> Unfavorable	unnecessary/See K	<b>AM</b>	
		<b>T</b> Unfavorable	unnecessary/See K	<b>AN</b>	
				<b>AO</b>	
				<b>Factors:</b>	
				Best connects to employment ctrs	
				Lowest cost	
				Best use of existing roads/hwys	
				Other	
				<b>Funding:</b>	
				Yes: support tolled hwy	
				<b>Response:</b>	
				N/A	

## North-South Corridor Study Public Workshops December 2011 Public Involvement Summary - Comment Forms

Name/ Date	Mtg/Comment Type	Comment	
Dan Frantz	Public Workshop	<b>Segments:</b>	
12/13/11	Comment Form	<b>A</b> Unfavorable	Far too much impact to surrounding areas. Route I makes more sense for a northern point.
		<b>B</b> Unfavorable	Far too much impact to surrounding areas
		<b>C</b> Unfavorable	Far too much impact to surrounding areas
		<b>D</b> Unfavorable	Far too much impact to surrounding areas
		<b>E</b> Unfavorable	Far too much impact to surrounding areas
		<b>F</b> Unfavorable	Far too much impact to surrounding areas
		<b>G</b> Unfavorable	Far too much impact to surrounding areas
		<b>H</b> Unfavorable	Far too much impact to surrounding areas
		<b>I</b> Favorable	Best northern connection point with minimal impact to surrounding areas
		<b>J</b> Unfavorable	Does not make sense if you can connect segments S to M to I
		<b>K</b> Unfavorable	Far too much impact to surrounding areas
		<b>L</b> Unfavorable	Far too much impact to surrounding areas
		<b>M</b> Favorable	Makes sense when connecting Segments S to I for a shorter route
		<b>N</b> Unfavorable	Does not make sense if you can connect segments S to M to I
		<b>O</b> Unfavorable	Far too much impact to surrounding areas
		<b>P</b> Unfavorable	Far too much impact to surrounding areas
		<b>Q</b> Unfavorable	Far too much impact to surrounding areas
		<b>R</b> Unfavorable	Does not make sense if you can connect segments S to M to I
		<b>S</b> Favorable	minimal impact to surrounding area
		<b>T</b> Unfavorable	Too close to existing communities
		<b>U</b> Unfavorable	Does not make sense when connecting Segments X and W or T
		<b>V</b> Unfavorable	Does not make sense when connecting Segments X and W or T
		<b>W</b> Favorable	minimal impact to surrounding area
		<b>X</b> Favorable	minimal impact to surrounding area
		<b>Y</b> Unfavorable	Far too much impact to surrounding areas
		<b>Z</b> Unfavorable	Far too much impact to surrounding areas
		<b>AA</b> Unfavorable	Far too much impact to surrounding areas
		<b>AB</b> Favorable	Good alt route with minimal impact to established communities
		<b>AC</b> Favorable	Good alt route with minimal impact to established communities
		<b>AD</b> Favorable	Good alt route with minimal impact to established communities
		<b>AE</b> Unfavorable	AH is better route
		<b>AF</b> Unfavorable	AH is better route
		<b>AG</b> Unfavorable	AI or AK is better route
		<b>AH</b> Favorable	Good alt route with minimal impact to established communities
		<b>AI</b> Favorable	Good alt route with minimal impact to established communities
		<b>AJ</b> Favorable	Good alt route with minimal impact to established communities
		<b>AK</b> Favorable	Good alt route with minimal impact to established communities
		<b>AL</b> Favorable	Good alt route with minimal impact to established communities
		<b>AM</b> Favorable	Good alt route with minimal impact to established communities
		<b>AN</b> Favorable	Good alt route with minimal impact to established communities
		<b>AO</b> Favorable	Good alt route with minimal impact to established communities
<b>Additional comments:</b>		There is an incredible amount of unused land in the surrounding populated areas. Everywhere you look there is brown dirt, desolation and land that has nothing on it, or is not planned for any use at all. Running a major corridor right thru populated areas like Coolidge and the San Tan Valley communities does not make sense at all. Property values will be hit even harder and the quality of life will drop dramatically. While a corridor connecting I-10 to Rt 60 would be a benefit that I would take advantage of and support. It must be put in areas that make sense.	
		<b>Factors:</b> Best relieves traffic/local streets Best connects to other major routes Least impact to existing developmt	
		<b>Funding:</b> No: not support/won't use	
		I used to live in a Toll Highway area. I avoided them and did not appreciate having to pay to commute on top of the expense of fuel and wear and tear on the car.	
		<b>Response:</b> N/A	



# North-South Corridor Study Public Workshops December 2011 Public Involvement Summary - Comment Forms

166

Name/ Date	Mtg/Comment Type	Comment	
Peter Hawthorne	Public Workshop	<b>Segments:</b>	
12/13/11	Comment Form	<b>A</b> Favorable no intrusion upon current residents.	<b>U</b>
<b>Additional comments:</b> Main concern is any noise abatement on the proposed route. Road noise and that type of noise pollution can certainly ruin one of the reasons why many have migrated to the southern sub-divisions.		<b>B</b> Unfavorable leads into congested residential, already developed, area	<b>V</b>
		<b>C</b>	<b>W</b>
		<b>D</b> Favorable finished the proposed route with little intrusion.	<b>X</b>
		<b>E</b> Favorable skirts most residential areas where construction will not intrude on daily life. Construction should go much	<b>Y</b> Unfavorable
		<b>F</b>	<b>Z</b>
		<b>G</b> Favorable still skirts most currently developed residential areas.	<b>AA</b>
		<b>H</b> Favorable continues through undeveloped area	<b>AB</b>
		<b>I</b> Favorable Probably the best route, I, J, O, Q as the least intrusive upon existing housing and developed population areas.	<b>AC</b>
		<b>J</b> Favorable through unpopulated area.	<b>AD</b>
		<b>K</b>	<b>AE</b>
		<b>L</b>	<b>AF</b>
		<b>M</b>	<b>AG</b>
		<b>N</b>	<b>AH</b>
		<b>O</b> Favorable through unpopulated area. faster (and hopefully cheaper) construction.	<b>AI</b>
		<b>P</b>	<b>AJ</b>
		<b>Q</b> Favorable finished the route in the most direct path to 287.	<b>AK</b>
		<b>R</b>	<b>AL</b>
		<b>S</b>	<b>AM</b>
		<b>T</b>	<b>AN</b>
			<b>AO</b>
		<b>Factors:</b>	
		Lowest cost	
		Least impact to existing developmt	
		Input rec'd from public	
		<b>Funding:</b>	
		No: not support/won't use	
		This was done in the Denver area with E-470 and the highway was sold to a Mexican company where the tolls no go. They are also very expensive. Tolls will be in the several dollars per trip. That portion of highway, E-470, remains under utilized and all predictions regarding pay-back of construction costs	
		<b>Response:</b>	
		N/A	

# North-South Corridor Study Public Workshops December 2011 Public Involvement Summary - Comment Forms

167

Name/ Date	Mtg/Comment Type	Comment			
Bryan Moore	Public Workshop				
12/16/11	Comment Form				
Additional comments:					
		<b>Segments:</b>	<b>U</b>	Unfavorable	Most of the traffic from Pinal county heads toward phoenix and downtown Mesa. This route is
		<b>A</b> Favorable	<b>V</b>	Unfavorable	Most of the traffic from Pinal county heads toward phoenix and downtown Mesa. This route is
		<b>B</b> Favorable	<b>W</b>	Unfavorable	Most of the traffic from Pinal county heads toward phoenix and downtown Mesa. This route is
		<b>C</b> Favorable	<b>X</b>	Unfavorable	Most of the traffic from Pinal county heads toward phoenix and downtown Mesa. This route is
		<b>D</b> Favorable	<b>Y</b>	Favorable	Most direct route to Tucson and would connect Coolidge,Eloy, and Picacho to San Tan Valley.
		<b>E</b> Unfavorable	<b>Z</b>	Favorable	Most direct route to Tucson and would connect Coolidge,Eloy, and Picacho to San Tan Valley.
		<b>F</b> Unfavorable	<b>AA</b>	Favorable	Most direct route to Tucson and would connect Coolidge,Eloy, and Picacho to San Tan Valley.
		<b>G</b> Unfavorable	<b>AB</b>	Unfavorable	
		<b>H</b> Unfavorable	<b>AC</b>	Unfavorable	
		<b>I</b> Unfavorable	<b>AD</b>	Unfavorable	
		<b>J</b> Unfavorable	<b>AE</b>	Unfavorable	
		<b>K</b> Unfavorable	<b>AF</b>	Unfavorable	
		<b>L</b> Unfavorable	<b>AG</b>	Unfavorable	
		<b>M</b> Unfavorable	<b>AH</b>	Unfavorable	
		<b>N</b> Unfavorable	<b>AI</b>	Unfavorable	
		<b>O</b> Unfavorable	<b>AJ</b>	Unfavorable	
		<b>P</b> Unfavorable	<b>AK</b>	Unfavorable	
		<b>Q</b> Unfavorable	<b>AL</b>	Unfavorable	
		<b>R</b> Unfavorable	<b>AM</b>	Unfavorable	
		<b>S</b> Unfavorable	<b>AN</b>	Unfavorable	
		<b>T</b> Unfavorable	<b>AO</b>	Unfavorable	
					<b>Factors:</b> Best connects to employment ctrs Best connects to cities/towns Best connects to other major routes
					<b>Funding:</b> Yes: support tolled hwy Yes: use tolled hwy
					<b>Response:</b>

# North-South Corridor Study Public Workshops December 2011 Public Involvement Summary - Comment Forms

168

Name/ Date	Mtg/Comment Type	Comment		
Don Stapley	Public Workshop	<b>Segments:</b>	<b>U</b> Favorable	<b>Factors:</b>
12/13/11	Comment Form	<b>A</b> Unfavorable	<b>V</b> Favorable	Best relieves traffic/hwys & frwys
<b>Additional comments:</b>		<b>B</b> Unfavorable	<b>W</b> Unfavorable	Best connects to employment ctrs
		<b>C</b> Unfavorable	<b>X</b> Favorable	Best connects to cities/towns
		<b>D</b> Unfavorable	<b>Y</b>	
		<b>E</b> Unfavorable	<b>Z</b>	
		<b>F</b> Unfavorable	<b>AA</b>	
		<b>G</b> Unfavorable	<b>AB</b>	
		<b>H</b> Unfavorable	<b>AC</b>	<b>Funding:</b>
		<b>I</b> Favorable	<b>AD</b>	Yes: support tolled hwy
		<b>J</b> Favorable	<b>AE</b>	
		<b>K</b> Unfavorable	<b>AF</b>	
		<b>L</b> Unfavorable	<b>AG</b>	
		<b>M</b> Unfavorable	<b>AH</b>	
		<b>N</b> Unfavorable	<b>AI</b>	
		<b>O</b> Favorable	<b>AJ</b>	
		<b>P</b> Favorable	<b>AK</b>	<b>Response:</b>
		<b>Q</b> Unfavorable	<b>AL</b>	
		<b>R</b> Unfavorable	<b>AM</b>	
		<b>S</b>	<b>AN</b>	
		<b>T</b> Unfavorable	<b>AO</b>	

# North-South Corridor Study Public Workshops December 2011 Public Involvement Summary - Comment Forms

169

Name/ Date	Mtg/Comment Type	Comment		
Anonymous	Public Workshop	<b>Segments:</b>	<b>U</b> Unfavorable	<b>Factors:</b>
12/13/11	Comment Form	<b>A</b> Unfavorable Ironwood Road already exists and we need another north south route to relieve traffic.	<b>V</b> Unfavorable	Best relieves traffic/local streets
<b>Additional comments:</b>		<b>B</b> Unfavorable Ironwood Road already exists and we need another north south route to relieve traffic.	<b>W</b> Unfavorable	Best connects to employment ctrs
		<b>C</b> Unfavorable This route is not a good route because you would have to follow along the Ironwood alignment to get to this	<b>X</b> Unfavorable	Best connects to other major routes
		<b>D</b> Unfavorable This is not a good route because again we need to create more routes to relieve traffic and this route	<b>Y</b> Unfavorable	Least impact to existing developmt
		<b>E</b> Unfavorable	<b>Z</b> Unfavorable	Best use of existing roads/hwys
		<b>F</b> Unfavorable	<b>AA</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>G</b> Unfavorable	<b>AB</b> Favorable	
		<b>H</b> Unfavorable	<b>AC</b> Favorable	<b>Funding:</b>
		<b>I</b> Favorable This creates a new route and has good separation from Ironwood and the 79 Highway.	<b>AD</b> Favorable	Yes: support tolled hwy
		<b>J</b> Favorable	<b>AE</b> Favorable	
		<b>K</b> Unfavorable Starting to go west and then it will go east again. Doesn't make sense.	<b>AF</b> Favorable	
		<b>L</b> Unfavorable	<b>AG</b> Favorable	
		<b>M</b> Unfavorable This is not good because it is building a route that is getting too close to the 79 Highway.	<b>AH</b> Favorable	
		<b>N</b> Unfavorable	<b>AI</b> Favorable	
		<b>O</b> Favorable Good spacing and a straight shot.	<b>AJ</b> Favorable	
		<b>P</b> Unfavorable Getting too close to the 79 Highway.	<b>AK</b> Favorable	<b>Response:</b>
		<b>Q</b> Favorable	<b>AL</b> Favorable	
		<b>R</b> Unfavorable	<b>AM</b> Favorable	
		<b>S</b> Unfavorable	<b>AN</b> Favorable	
		<b>T</b> Unfavorable	<b>AO</b> Favorable	

# North-South Corridor Study Public Workshops December 2011 Public Involvement Summary - Comment Forms

170

Name/ Date	Mtg/Comment Type	Comment		
Seth Keeler	Public Workshop			
12/12/11	Comment Form			
Additional comments:				
		<b>Segments:</b>	<b>U</b> Favorable	<b>Factors:</b>
		<b>A</b> Unfavorable	<b>V</b> Favorable	Best connects to cities/towns
		<b>B</b> Unfavorable	<b>W</b> Unfavorable	Best connects to other major routes
		<b>C</b> Unfavorable	<b>X</b> Favorable	Other
		<b>D</b> Unfavorable	<b>Y</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>E</b> Unfavorable	<b>Z</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>F</b> Unfavorable	<b>AA</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>G</b> Unfavorable	<b>AB</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>H</b> Unfavorable	<b>AC</b> Favorable	<b>Funding:</b>
		<b>I</b> Favorable	<b>AD</b> Favorable	No: not support/won't use
		<b>J</b> Favorable	<b>AE</b> Favorable	A toll road may be the right financing mechanism here. It depends on how much it would cost to use. If it was too expensive, I would not use it.
		<b>K</b> Unfavorable	<b>AF</b> Favorable	
		<b>L</b> Unfavorable	<b>AG</b> Favorable	
		<b>M</b> Favorable	<b>AH</b> Favorable	
		<b>N</b> Favorable	<b>AI</b> Favorable	
		<b>O</b> Favorable We own property here and want this corridor to come through our farm.	<b>AJ</b> Favorable	<b>Response:</b>
		<b>P</b> Favorable We own property here and want this corridor to come through our farm.	<b>AK</b> Favorable	
		<b>Q</b> Unfavorable	<b>AL</b> Favorable	
		<b>R</b> Favorable	<b>AM</b> Favorable	
		<b>S</b> Unfavorable	<b>AN</b> Favorable	
		<b>T</b> Unfavorable	<b>AO</b> Favorable	

# North-South Corridor Study Public Workshops December 2011 Public Involvement Summary - Comment Forms

171

Name/ Date	Mtg/Comment Type	Comment		
Matt Duran	Public Workshop			
12/12/11	Comment Form			
Additional comments:				
		<b>Segments:</b>	<b>U</b>	<b>Factors:</b>
		<b>A</b>	<b>V</b>	Best connects to other major routes Least impact to natural areas/open space Input rec'd from public
		<b>B</b>	<b>W</b>	
		<b>C</b>	<b>X</b>	
		<b>D</b>	<b>Y</b>	
		<b>E</b>	<b>Z</b>	
		<b>F</b>	<b>AA</b>	
		<b>G</b>	<b>AB</b>	
		<b>H</b>	<b>AC</b>	<b>Funding:</b>
		<b>I</b>	<b>AD</b>	Yes: support tolled hwy
		<b>J</b>	<b>AE</b>	
		<b>K</b>	<b>AF</b>	
		<b>L</b>	<b>AG</b>	
		<b>M</b>	<b>AH</b>	
		<b>N</b>	<b>AI</b>	
		<b>O</b>	<b>AJ</b>	
		<b>P</b>	<b>AK</b>	<b>Response:</b>
		<b>Q</b>	<b>AL</b>	
		<b>R</b>	<b>AM</b>	
		<b>S</b>	<b>AN</b>	
		<b>T</b>	<b>AO</b>	

## 172

Name/ Date	Mtg/Comment Type	Comment				
Jared Lee	Public Workshop	<b>Segments:</b>		<b>U</b> Unfavorable	Don't pay for two bridges when you can buy the land through merrill ranch for cheap!	<b>Factors:</b> Best connects to employment ctrs Best connects to cities/towns Lowest cost
12/11/11	Comment Form	<b>A</b> Favorable	The best access point to the US 60. Using I, R, N segments are a GIANT waste as NO existing	<b>V</b> Favorable	Future development, the land is worthless now!	
		<b>B</b> Favorable	Yes! That road needs to be a Freeway ASAP!	<b>W</b> Unfavorable	Now we can blow up the freeway while we commute to work! Yippee! No.	
<b>Additional comments:</b>		<b>C</b> Unfavorable	Why move for the Indian community. Too many existing housing developments! In addition the	<b>X</b> Favorable	Keeps Florence, an important town for the ENTIRE valley's security connected. Just ask the Dept. of	<b>Funding:</b>  No: not support/won't use  You realize that this is one of the poorest surbaban areas right? Who would fund this with a toll.
		<b>D</b> Unfavorable	Too far from Florence!	<b>Y</b> Unfavorable	Too far from Florence.	
		<b>E</b> Favorable	Avoids existing congestion, while improving access as a viable alternative. Allows for growth, and the state	<b>Z</b> Favorable	Too far from Florence.	
		<b>F</b> Favorable	Why not, everybody already avoids living next to the train for the same reason, they don't like the noise!	<b>AA</b> Favorable	Save da money!	
		<b>G</b> Favorable	Can't build homes there anyway!	<b>AB</b> Favorable	Connects Florence.	
		<b>H</b> Unfavorable	Misses Florence!	<b>AC</b> Favorable	Connects Florence.	
		<b>I</b> Unfavorable	No, what a waste! Can always be done as an addition to segment E later!	<b>AD</b> Favorable	Connects Florence.	
		<b>J</b> Unfavorable	Who is this for, the coyotes?	<b>AE</b> Favorable	Connects Florence.	
		<b>K</b> Unfavorable	Who is the for, the Quail Hunters?	<b>AF</b> Unfavorable	Use existing highway	
		<b>L</b> Favorable	What developments, these guys are probably already bankrupt. Buy it now while it's cheap!	<b>AG</b> Unfavorable	Use existing highway	
		<b>M</b> Unfavorable	Who is this for, the Jack Rabbits?	<b>AH</b> Unfavorable	Use existing highway	
		<b>N</b> Unfavorable	C'mon, are you seriously putting in this in for the Gophers?	<b>AI</b> Unfavorable	Use existing highway	<b>Response:</b>
		<b>O</b> Unfavorable	No one would pay for this, why should you?	<b>AJ</b> Unfavorable	Use existing highway	
		<b>P</b> Favorable	What developments, these guys are probably already bankrupt. Buy it now while it's cheap!	<b>AK</b> Unfavorable	Use existing highway	
		<b>Q</b> Favorable	What developments, these guys are probably already bankrupt. Buy it now while it's cheap!	<b>AL</b> Unfavorable	Use existing highway	
		<b>R</b> Unfavorable	We don't want freeways just for the birds and bunnies.	<b>AM</b> Favorable	Connects Florence	
		<b>S</b> Unfavorable	More for the Jack Rabbits? You know I bet the cacti thinks cool too? Who heck does this help?	<b>AN</b> Favorable	Connects Florence	
		<b>T</b> Unfavorable	Why go this route? Magma Ranch II has already moved it's dirt, unlike Merrill Farms.	<b>AO</b> Favorable	Connects Florence	

**North-South Corridor Study Public Workshops December 2011**  
**Public Involvement Summary - Comment Forms**

173

Name/ Date	Mtg/Comment Type	Comment	
Jeremy Goldman	Public Workshop	<b>Segments:</b>	
12/12/11	Comment Form	<b>A</b>	<b>U</b>
<b>Additional comments:</b>		<b>B</b>	<b>V</b>
		<b>C</b>	<b>W</b>
		<b>D</b>	<b>X</b>
		<b>E</b> Unfavorable	<b>Y</b>
		This proposed route is too close to the communities of Laredo Ranch, Castlewood, and Pecan Creek. The	<b>Z</b>
		<b>F</b>	<b>AA</b>
		<b>G</b>	<b>AB</b>
		<b>H</b>	<b>AC</b>
		<b>I</b>	<b>AD</b>
		<b>J</b>	<b>AE</b>
		<b>K</b>	<b>AF</b>
		<b>L</b>	<b>AG</b>
		<b>M</b>	<b>AH</b>
		<b>N</b>	<b>AI</b>
		<b>O</b>	<b>AJ</b>
		<b>P</b>	<b>AK</b>
		<b>Q</b>	<b>AL</b>
		<b>R</b>	<b>AM</b>
		<b>S</b>	<b>AN</b>
		<b>T</b>	<b>AO</b>
		<b>Factors:</b>	
		Best connects to other major routes	
		Least impact to existing developmt	
		Input rec'd from public	
		<b>Funding:</b>	
		Yes: use tolled hwy	
		Yes: support tolled hwy	
		<b>Response:</b>	



# North-South Corridor Study Public Workshops December 2011 Public Involvement Summary - Comment Forms

174

Name/ Date	Mtg/Comment Type	Comment			
Rosita Triarchis	Public Workshop				
12/11/11	Comment Form				
Additional comments:					
		<b>Segments:</b>	<b>U</b>	Unfavorable	Not necessary if using segments A, E, G, H, D -or- L, and Q. Too far east for San Tan Valley commuter
		<b>A</b> Favorable	<b>V</b>	Unfavorable	Not necessary if using segments A, E, G, H, D -or- L, and Q. Too far east for San Tan Valley commuter
		<b>B</b> Unfavorable	<b>W</b>	Unfavorable	Not necessary if using segments A, E, G, H, D -or- L, and Q. Too far east for San Tan Valley commuter
		<b>C</b> Unfavorable	<b>X</b>	Unfavorable	Not necessary if using segments A, E, G, H, D -or- L, and Q. Too far east for San Tan Valley commuter
		<b>D</b> Favorable	<b>Y</b>	Favorable	Roads already in, centrally located corridor
		<b>E</b> Favorable	<b>Z</b>	Favorable	Roads already in, centrally located corridor
		<b>F</b> Unfavorable	<b>AA</b>	Favorable	Roads already in, centrally located corridor
		<b>G</b> Favorable	<b>AB</b>	Unfavorable	Sorry, I do not see this on the provided map
		<b>H</b> Favorable	<b>AC</b>	Unfavorable	Only if utilizing segment Q which I prefer more centrally located segment D
		<b>I</b> Unfavorable	<b>AD</b>	Unfavorable	Only as a second route if not using only if not using D, Y, Z, AA. D, Y, Z, AA is my first choice.
		<b>J</b> Unfavorable	<b>AE</b>	Unfavorable	Not necessary.
		<b>K</b> Unfavorable	<b>AF</b>	Unfavorable	Not necessary.
		<b>L</b> Favorable	<b>AG</b>	Unfavorable	Not necessary.
		<b>M</b> Unfavorable	<b>AH</b>	Unfavorable	Only as a 2nd choice if for some reason you cannot do D, Y, Z, AA.
		<b>N</b> Unfavorable	<b>AI</b>	Unfavorable	if local traffic is a challenge then utilize segments Q, AC, AD, AH, AI, AJ, AL for 2nd centrally located,
		<b>O</b> Unfavorable	<b>AJ</b>	Unfavorable	if local traffic is a challenge then utilize segments Q, AC, AD, AH, AI, AJ, AL for 2nd centrally located,
		<b>P</b> Unfavorable	<b>AK</b>	Unfavorable	Not necessary
		<b>Q</b> Favorable	<b>AL</b>	Unfavorable	Not necessary. If local traffic is a challenge on current 87, then utilize segments Q, AC, AD, AH, AI, AJ, AL for
		<b>R</b> Unfavorable	<b>AM</b>	Unfavorable	I don't see this marked on map, but if it's where I think it is, it's not necessary if using segment Y
		<b>S</b> Unfavorable	<b>AN</b>	Unfavorable	Not necessary if using Y, Z, AA
		<b>T</b> Unfavorable	<b>AO</b>	Unfavorable	Sorry I do not see this on map provided
					<b>Factors:</b> Best relieves traffic/local streets Best connects to cities/towns Best connects to other major routes
					<b>Funding:</b> No: not support/won't use
					<b>Response:</b>

# North-South Corridor Study Public Workshops December 2011 Public Involvement Summary - Comment Forms

175

Name/ Date	Mtg/Comment Type	Comment			
Ronald L. Hansen	Public Workshop	<b>Segments:</b>		<b>U</b>	<b>Factors:</b>
12/10/11	Comment Form	<b>A</b> Favorable	Most westerly. An unfavorable aspect would be disruption on existing Ironwood and prevention of same comments as on Segment A	<b>V</b>	Best relieves traffic/local streets
		<b>B</b> Favorable		<b>W</b>	Best connects to other major routes
		<b>C</b> Favorable	I like this option better than alternatives, because it is most westerly.	<b>X</b>	Least impact to existing developmt
		<b>D</b> Favorable	Most westerly.	<b>Y</b>	
		<b>E</b>		<b>Z</b>	
		<b>F</b>		<b>AA</b>	
		<b>G</b> Favorable	This could be advantageous, if continued north and south. But it is easterly of current and probably near favorable, if the alignment includes Segment G.	<b>AB</b>	
		<b>H</b> Favorable		<b>AC</b>	<b>Funding:</b>
		<b>I</b> Unfavorable	too far easterly	<b>AD</b>	Yes: support tolled hwy
		<b>J</b> Unfavorable	Too far easterly	<b>AE</b>	
		<b>K</b> Unfavorable	Too far easterly	<b>AF</b>	
		<b>L</b> Unfavorable	Too far easterly	<b>AG</b>	
		<b>M</b> Unfavorable	Too far easterly	<b>AH</b>	
		<b>N</b> Unfavorable	Too far easterly	<b>AI</b>	
		<b>O</b>		<b>AJ</b>	
		<b>P</b>		<b>AK</b>	<b>Response:</b>
		<b>Q</b>		<b>AL</b>	N/A
		<b>R</b>		<b>AM</b>	
		<b>S</b>		<b>AN</b>	
		<b>T</b>		<b>AO</b>	

# North-South Corridor Study Public Workshops December 2011 Public Involvement Summary - Comment Forms

176

Name/ Date	Mtg/Comment Type	Comment		
Anonymous	Public Workshop			
12/09/11	Comment Form			
Additional comments:				
		<b>Segments:</b>	<b>U</b> Favorable	<b>Factors:</b>
		<b>A</b> Favorable Ironwood is a long stretch of rode that is only 2 lanes going in and out of the Queen Creek/San Tan Valley	<b>V</b> Favorable	Best relieves traffic/hwys & frwys
		<b>B</b> Favorable	<b>W</b> Favorable	Best connects to employment ctrs
		<b>C</b> Favorable	<b>X</b> Favorable	Best connects to cities/towns
		<b>D</b> Favorable	<b>Y</b> Favorable	Best connects to other major routes
		<b>E</b> Favorable	<b>Z</b> Favorable	Least impact to existing developmt
		<b>F</b> Favorable	<b>AA</b> Favorable	Least impact to planned developmt
		<b>G</b> Favorable	<b>AB</b> Favorable	Best use of existing roads/hwys
		<b>H</b> Favorable	<b>AC</b> Favorable	<b>Funding:</b>
		<b>I</b> Favorable	<b>AD</b> Favorable	No: not support/won't use
		<b>J</b> Favorable	<b>AE</b> Favorable	
		<b>K</b> Favorable	<b>AF</b> Favorable	
		<b>L</b> Favorable	<b>AG</b> Favorable	
		<b>M</b> Favorable	<b>AH</b> Favorable	
		<b>N</b> Favorable	<b>AI</b> Favorable	
		<b>O</b> Favorable	<b>AJ</b> Favorable	
		<b>P</b> Favorable	<b>AK</b> Favorable	<b>Response:</b>
		<b>Q</b> Favorable	<b>AL</b> Favorable	
		<b>R</b> Favorable	<b>AM</b> Favorable	
		<b>S</b> Favorable	<b>AN</b> Favorable	
		<b>T</b> Favorable	<b>AO</b> Favorable	

# North-South Corridor Study Public Workshops December 2011 Public Involvement Summary - Comment Forms

177

Name/ Date	Mtg/Comment Type	Comment		
Anonymous	Public Workshop			
12/9/11	Comment Form			
Additional comments:				
		<b>Segments:</b>	<b>U</b>	<b>Factors:</b>
		<b>A</b>	<b>V</b>	Best relieves traffic/hwys & frwys
		<b>B</b>	<b>W</b>	Best connects to other major routes
		<b>C</b>	<b>X</b>	Least impact to existing developmt
		<b>D</b>	<b>Y</b>	
		<b>E</b> Unfavorable Too close to my community	<b>Z</b>	
		<b>F</b>	<b>AA</b>	
		<b>G</b>	<b>AB</b>	
		<b>H</b>	<b>AC</b>	<b>Funding:</b>
		<b>I</b>	<b>AD</b>	No: not support/won't use
		<b>J</b>	<b>AE</b>	
		<b>K</b>	<b>AF</b>	
		<b>L</b>	<b>AG</b>	
		<b>M</b>	<b>AH</b>	
		<b>N</b>	<b>AI</b>	
		<b>O</b>	<b>AJ</b>	<b>Response:</b>
		<b>P</b>	<b>AK</b>	
		<b>Q</b>	<b>AL</b>	
		<b>R</b>	<b>AM</b>	
		<b>S</b>	<b>AN</b>	
		<b>T</b>	<b>AO</b>	

**North-South Corridor Study Public Workshops December 2011  
Public Involvement Summary - Comment Forms**

178

Name/ Date	Mtg/Comment Type	Comment		
Jon Thompson	Public Workshop	<b>Segments:</b>	<b>U</b>	<b>Factors:</b>
12/09/11	Comment Form	<b>A</b> Favorable	<b>V</b>	Best connects to employment ctrs
<b>Additional comments:</b>		<b>B</b>	<b>W</b>	Least impact to existing developmt
		<b>C</b>	<b>X</b>	Other
		<b>D</b>	<b>Y</b> Unfavorable	There are gas lines that run along Christensen road as well as a new bridge that was just redone to help local
		<b>E</b>	<b>Z</b>	
		<b>F</b>	<b>AA</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>G</b>	<b>AB</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>H</b>	<b>AC</b> Favorable	This would be the lesser of some evils but not the perfect route. It would be better to be on Valley Farms
		<b>I</b>	<b>AD</b> Favorable	<b>Funding:</b> Yes: support tolled hwy
		<b>J</b>	<b>AE</b> Favorable	
		<b>K</b>	<b>AF</b>	
		<b>L</b>	<b>AG</b>	
		<b>M</b>	<b>AH</b>	
		<b>N</b>	<b>AI</b>	
		<b>O</b>	<b>AJ</b>	
		<b>P</b>	<b>AK</b>	<b>Response:</b>
		<b>Q</b> Favorable	<b>AL</b>	This is a good route. It keeps the freeway in an established area that is already disrupted due to the
		<b>R</b>	<b>AM</b> Favorable	This route has the least impact and is already damaged financially due to the power line. There is already an
		<b>S</b>	<b>AN</b>	
		<b>T</b>	<b>AO</b>	

# North-South Corridor Study Public Workshops December 2011 Public Involvement Summary - Comment Forms

179

Name/ Date	Mtg/Comment Type	Comment		
Anonymous	Public Workshop	<b>Segments:</b>	<b>U</b> Unfavorable	<b>Factors:</b> Best connects to other major routes Least impact to existing developmt Input rec'd from public
12/09/11	Comment Form	<b>A</b> Unfavorable	<b>V</b> Unfavorable	
<b>Additional comments:</b>		<b>B</b> Unfavorable	<b>W</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>C</b> Unfavorable	<b>X</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>D</b> Unfavorable	<b>Y</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>E</b> Unfavorable	<b>Z</b> Favorable	
		<b>F</b> Unfavorable	<b>AA</b> Favorable	
		<b>G</b> Unfavorable	<b>AB</b> Favorable	
		<b>H</b> Unfavorable	<b>AC</b> Favorable	<b>Funding:</b> No: not support/won't use
		<b>I</b> Favorable	<b>AD</b> Favorable	
		<b>J</b> Favorable	<b>AE</b> Favorable	
		<b>K</b> Unfavorable	<b>AF</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>L</b> Unfavorable	<b>AG</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>M</b> Unfavorable	<b>AH</b> Favorable	
		<b>N</b> Unfavorable	<b>AI</b> Favorable	
		<b>O</b> Favorable	<b>AJ</b> Favorable	<b>Response:</b>
		<b>P</b> Unfavorable	<b>AK</b> Favorable	
		<b>Q</b> Favorable	<b>AL</b> Favorable	
		<b>R</b> Unfavorable	<b>AM</b> Favorable	
		<b>S</b> Unfavorable	<b>AN</b> Favorable	
		<b>T</b> Unfavorable	<b>AO</b> Unfavorable	

## North-South Corridor Study Public Workshops December 2011 Public Involvement Summary - Comment Forms

Name/ Date	Mtg/Comment Type	Comment					
Joseph Abate	Public Workshop	<b>Segments:</b>		<b>U</b>	Favorable	This area is mostly undeveloped and close enough to developed areas to be an asset.	
12/08/11	Comment Form	<b>A</b>	Unfavorable	That area is already developed and would require excessive spending to acquire	<b>V</b>	Favorable	This area is mostly undeveloped and close enough to developed areas to be an asset.
		<b>B</b>	Unfavorable	Does not work without A&C	<b>W</b>	Favorable	This area is mostly undeveloped and close enough to developed areas to be an asset.
<b>Additional comments:</b> This project should have been started years ago. There is only one route for the 100,000's of residence of the south east valley to reach any highway or inter-state. This route is through residential areas which is not efficient or safe. This corridor would save fuel for those that live in the areas and make the residential roads safer for pedestrians. This project should be fast tracked and finished as quickly as possible. With the current state of the economy the cost will be less now then what they would be when the economy rebounds. With the low price of housing in southern parts of the valley the traffic condition have continued to become more and more unbearable. Completion of this project would also relieve congestion on US60, northern I10 and the loop 202. To not build this corridor would be an extreme error in judgement that people of Arizona will pay for, for year to come.		<b>C</b>	Unfavorable	That area is already developed and would require excessive spending to acquire	<b>X</b>	Favorable	This area is mostly undeveloped and close enough to developed areas to be an asset.
		<b>D</b>	Favorable	This area is mostly undeveloped and close enough to developed areas to be an asset.	<b>Y</b>	Favorable	This area is mostly undeveloped and close enough to developed areas to be an asset. This is a future
		<b>E</b>	Unfavorable	This does not work without A	<b>Z</b>	Favorable	This area is mostly undeveloped and close enough to developed areas to be an asset.
		<b>F</b>	Unfavorable	This does not work without A&B.	<b>AA</b>	Favorable	This area is mostly undeveloped and close enough to developed areas to be an asset.
		<b>G</b>	Favorable	This area is mostly undeveloped and close enough to developed areas to be an asset.	<b>AB</b>	Favorable	This area is mostly undeveloped and close enough to developed areas to be an asset.
		<b>H</b>	Favorable	This area is mostly undeveloped and close enough to developed areas to be an asset.	<b>AC</b>	Favorable	This area is mostly undeveloped and close enough to developed areas to be an asset.
		<b>I</b>	Favorable	This area is mostly undeveloped and close enough to developed areas to be an asset.	<b>AD</b>	Favorable	This area is mostly undeveloped and close enough to developed areas to be an asset.
		<b>J</b>	Favorable	This area is mostly undeveloped and close enough to developed areas to be an asset.	<b>AE</b>	Favorable	This area is mostly undeveloped and close enough to developed areas to be an asset.
		<b>K</b>	Favorable	This area is mostly undeveloped and close enough to developed areas to be an asset.	<b>AF</b>	Favorable	This area is mostly undeveloped and close enough to developed areas to be an asset.
		<b>L</b>	Unfavorable	This is not need if western route is not used.	<b>AG</b>	Favorable	This area is mostly undeveloped and close enough to developed areas to be an asset.
		<b>M</b>	Favorable	This area is mostly undeveloped and close enough to developed areas to be an asset.	<b>AH</b>	Favorable	This area is mostly undeveloped and close enough to developed areas to be an asset.
		<b>N</b>	Favorable	This area is mostly undeveloped and close enough to developed areas to be an asset.	<b>AI</b>	Favorable	This area is mostly undeveloped and close enough to developed areas to be an asset.
		<b>O</b>	Favorable	This area is mostly undeveloped and close enough to developed areas to be an asset.	<b>AJ</b>	Favorable	This area is mostly undeveloped and close enough to developed areas to be an asset.
		<b>P</b>	Favorable	This area is mostly undeveloped and close enough to developed areas to be an asset.	<b>AK</b>	Favorable	This area is mostly undeveloped and close enough to developed areas to be an asset.
		<b>Q</b>	Favorable	This area is mostly undeveloped and close enough to developed areas to be an asset.	<b>AL</b>	Favorable	This area is mostly undeveloped and close enough to developed areas to be an asset.
		<b>R</b>	Favorable	This area is mostly undeveloped and close enough to developed areas to be an asset.	<b>AM</b>	Favorable	This area is mostly undeveloped and close enough to developed areas to be an asset.
		<b>S</b>	Favorable	This area is mostly undeveloped and close enough to developed areas to be an asset.	<b>AN</b>	Favorable	This area is mostly undeveloped and close enough to developed areas to be an asset.
		<b>T</b>	Favorable	This area is mostly undeveloped and close enough to developed areas to be an asset.	<b>AO</b>	Favorable	This area is mostly undeveloped and close enough to developed areas to be an asset.
						<b>Funding:</b> No: not support/won't use	
						As a former resident of the state of New Jersey home of the toll road. They only add to corruption and add unneeded cost i.e. toll booths and all the required maintance to operate them. If anything the New Jersev Turnpike and	
						<b>Response:</b> N/A	

**North-South Corridor Study Public Workshops December 2011**  
**Public Involvement Summary - Comment Forms**

181

Name/ Date	Mtg/Comment Type	Comment			
Rob Precht	Public Workshop	<b>Segments:</b>		<b>U</b>	<b>Factors:</b>
12/08/11	Comment Form	<b>A</b> Favorable	It is obvious that Ironwood is the most traveled thorough fare in far east valley. This is road of choice	<b>V</b>	Best connects to other major routes Least impact to existing developmt Input rec'd from public
		<b>B</b> Favorable	For the same reasons as Segment A has. This will pass up and coming area near new Banner hospital,	<b>W</b>	
<b>Additional comments:</b>		<b>C</b>		<b>X</b>	
		<b>D</b>		<b>Y</b>	
		<b>E</b>		<b>Z</b>	
		<b>F</b>		<b>AA</b>	
		<b>G</b>		<b>AB</b>	
		<b>H</b>		<b>AC</b>	<b>Funding:</b>
		<b>I</b>		<b>AD</b>	No: not support/won't use
		<b>J</b>		<b>AE</b>	
		<b>K</b>		<b>AF</b>	
		<b>L</b>		<b>AG</b>	
		<b>M</b>		<b>AH</b>	
		<b>N</b>		<b>AI</b>	
		<b>O</b>		<b>AJ</b>	
		<b>P</b>		<b>AK</b>	<b>Response:</b>
		<b>Q</b>		<b>AL</b>	
		<b>R</b>		<b>AM</b>	
		<b>S</b>		<b>AN</b>	
		<b>T</b>		<b>AO</b>	

**Factors:**  
 Best connects to other major routes  
 Least impact to existing developmt  
 Input rec'd from public

**Funding:**  
 No: not support/won't use

**Response:**



# North-South Corridor Study Public Workshops December 2011 Public Involvement Summary - Comment Forms

182

Name/ Date	Mtg/Comment Type	Comment		
Anonymous	Public Workshop			
12/07/11	Comment Form			
Additional comments:				
		<b>Segments:</b>	<b>U</b> Unfavorable	<b>Factors:</b>
		<b>A</b> Favorable Lots of traffic using this stretch of Ironwood road to access US 60 to head west. Could remove existing	<b>V</b> Favorable	Best relieves traffic/local streets
		<b>B</b> Unfavorable Not enough ROW south of Germann to Skyline Dr, adjacent high voltage power line along Gantzel south of	<b>W</b> Unfavorable	Best connects to cities/towns
		<b>C</b> Unfavorable	<b>X</b> Favorable	
		<b>D</b> Unfavorable	<b>Y</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>E</b> Favorable	<b>Z</b> Favorable	
		<b>F</b> Unfavorable	<b>AA</b> Favorable	
		<b>G</b> Favorable	<b>AB</b> Favorable	
		<b>H</b> Unfavorable	<b>AC</b> Favorable	<b>Funding:</b>
		<b>I</b> Favorable	<b>AD</b> Favorable	Yes: support tolled hwy
		<b>J</b> Favorable	<b>AE</b> Favorable	Yes: use tolled hwy
		<b>K</b> Favorable	<b>AF</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>L</b> Favorable	<b>AG</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>M</b> Unfavorable	<b>AH</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>N</b> Unfavorable	<b>AI</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>O</b> Favorable	<b>AJ</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>P</b> Favorable	<b>AK</b> Favorable	<b>Response:</b>
		<b>Q</b> Unfavorable Need lot of ROW since it parallels existing 500 KV transmission line and a railroad.	<b>AL</b> Favorable	
		<b>R</b> Unfavorable	<b>AM</b> Favorable	
		<b>S</b> Unfavorable	<b>AN</b> Favorable	
		<b>T</b>	<b>AO</b> Unfavorable	

# North-South Corridor Study Public Workshops December 2011 Public Involvement Summary - Comment Forms

183

Name/ Date	Mtg/Comment Type	Comment	
Anonymous	Public Workshop	<b>Segments:</b>	<b>U</b>
12/01/11	Comment Form	<b>A</b> Unfavorable	<b>V</b>
<b>Additional comments:</b>		<b>B</b> Unfavorable	<b>W</b>
		<b>C</b> Favorable	<b>X</b>
		<b>D</b>	<b>Y</b>
		<b>E</b> Unfavorable	<b>Z</b>
		<b>F</b>	<b>AA</b>
		<b>G</b>	<b>AB</b>
		<b>H</b>	<b>AC</b>
		<b>I</b>	<b>AD</b>
		<b>J</b>	<b>AE</b>
		<b>K</b>	<b>AF</b>
		<b>L</b>	<b>AG</b>
		<b>M</b>	<b>AH</b>
		<b>N</b>	<b>AI</b>
		<b>O</b>	<b>AJ</b>
		<b>P</b>	<b>AK</b>
		<b>Q</b>	<b>AL</b>
		<b>R</b>	<b>AM</b>
		<b>S</b>	<b>AN</b>
		<b>T</b>	<b>AO</b>

**Factors:**  
Best relieves traffic/local streets  
Best connects to other destinations  
Input rec'd from local gov't

**Funding:**  
Yes: use tolled hwy

**Response:**

# North-South Corridor Study Public Workshops December 2011 Public Involvement Summary - Comment Forms

184

Name/ Date	Mtg/Comment Type	Comment			
Tom Simpson	Public Workshop				
01/11/12	Comment Form				
Additional comments:					
		<b>Segments:</b>	<b>U</b>	Unfavorable	<b>Factors:</b>
		<b>A</b> Favorable most useful entry point & existing road	<b>V</b>	Unfavorable	
		<b>B</b> Favorable uses an existing road	<b>W</b>	Unfavorable	
		<b>C</b> Unfavorable	<b>X</b>	Unfavorable	
		<b>D</b> Favorable cont south, straight shot to "Y"	<b>Y</b>	Favorable cont south to run with an existing noise source to "Z"	
		<b>E</b> Unfavorable	<b>Z</b>	Favorable cont to "AA"	
		<b>F</b> Favorable keeps road noise next to existing noise source, less disruptive	<b>AA</b>	Favorable cont to "4"	
		<b>G</b> Unfavorable straight shot south to "D"	<b>AB</b>	Unfavorable	
		<b>H</b> Favorable	<b>AC</b>	Unfavorable	<b>Funding:</b>
		<b>I</b> Unfavorable	<b>AD</b>	Unfavorable	It would depend on what the toll would be, how much time it saved, and how convient it would be to use (both to access and to pay the tolls). Coins, tokens, electronically?
		<b>J</b> Unfavorable	<b>AE</b>	Unfavorable	
		<b>K</b> Unfavorable	<b>AF</b>	Unfavorable	
		<b>L</b> Unfavorable	<b>AG</b>	Unfavorable	
		<b>M</b> Unfavorable	<b>AH</b>	Unfavorable	
		<b>N</b> Unfavorable	<b>AI</b>	Unfavorable	
		<b>O</b>	<b>AJ</b>	Unfavorable	
		<b>P</b> Unfavorable	<b>AK</b>	Unfavorable	<b>Response:</b>
		<b>Q</b> Unfavorable	<b>AL</b>	Unfavorable	
		<b>R</b> Unfavorable	<b>AM</b>	Unfavorable	
		<b>S</b> Unfavorable	<b>AN</b>	Unfavorable	
		<b>T</b> Unfavorable	<b>AO</b>	Unfavorable	

# North-South Corridor Study Public Workshops December 2011 Public Involvement Summary - Comment Forms

185

Name/ Date	Mtg/Comment Type	Comment		
Lowell Harris	Public Workshop	<b>Segments:</b>	<b>U</b>	<b>Factors:</b>
1/11/12	Comment Form	<b>A</b> Unfavorable	<b>V</b>	Best relieves traffic/local streets
		<b>B</b> Unfavorable	<b>W</b>	Best connects to other major routes
		<b>C</b> Unfavorable	<b>X</b>	Least impact to existing developmt
		<b>D</b> Unfavorable	<b>Y</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>E</b> Unfavorable too close to residential area	<b>Z</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>F</b> Unfavorable	<b>AA</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>G</b> Unfavorable	<b>AB</b> Favorable	
		<b>H</b> Unfavorable	<b>AC</b> Favorable	<b>Funding:</b>
		<b>I</b> Favorable less residential area affected	<b>AD</b> Favorable after AD either route south is acceptable	Yes: use tolled hwy
		<b>J</b> Favorable same as I	<b>AE</b> Favorable	I would be willing to pay a toll as long as it is reasonable
		<b>K</b> Unfavorable	<b>AF</b> Favorable	
		<b>L</b> Unfavorable	<b>AG</b> Favorable	
		<b>M</b>	<b>AH</b> Favorable	
		<b>N</b>	<b>AI</b>	
		<b>O</b> Favorable	<b>AJ</b> Favorable	
		<b>P</b>	<b>AK</b> Favorable	<b>Response:</b>
		<b>Q</b> Favorable	<b>AL</b> Favorable	N/A
		<b>R</b>	<b>AM</b>	
		<b>S</b>	<b>AN</b>	
		<b>T</b>	<b>AO</b>	

# North-South Corridor Study Public Workshops December 2011 Public Involvement Summary - Comment Forms

Name/ Date	Mtg/Comment Type	Comment			
Anonymous	Public Workshop	<b>Segments:</b>		<b>U</b> Favorable	<b>Factors:</b>
1/11/12	Comment Form	<b>A</b> Unfavorable	area already has Ironwood Dr and Gantzel Rd. Highway would be wasted here	<b>V</b>	Best connects to employment ctrs
		<b>B</b> Unfavorable	same as A	<b>W</b> Unfavorable	Best connects to cities/towns
		<b>C</b> Unfavorable	same issue, has Hunt highway	<b>X</b> Favorable	Other
		<b>D</b> Unfavorable	same as C	<b>Y</b>	
		<b>E</b> Unfavorable		<b>Z</b>	
		<b>F</b> Unfavorable		<b>AA</b>	
		<b>G</b> Unfavorable		<b>AB</b>	
		<b>H</b> Unfavorable	not supported by local government AT ALL!	<b>AC</b>	<b>Funding:</b>
		<b>I</b> Favorable	most sensible local to support future growth	<b>AD</b>	Yes: support tolled hwy
		<b>J</b> Favorable	same as I	<b>AE</b>	Yes: use tolled hwy
		<b>K</b> Unfavorable	impedes future growth	<b>AF</b>	
		<b>L</b> Unfavorable		<b>AG</b>	
		<b>M</b> Unfavorable	feeds into very poor alignment option for future growth	<b>AH</b>	
		<b>N</b>		<b>AI</b>	
		<b>O</b> Favorable	exactly what local government supports	<b>AJ</b>	
		<b>P</b> Favorable		<b>AK</b>	<b>Response:</b>
		<b>Q</b> Unfavorable		<b>AL</b>	N/A
		<b>R</b> Unfavorable	feeds into an option that would destroy planned growth	<b>AM</b>	
		<b>S</b> Unfavorable	same as R	<b>AN</b>	
		<b>T</b> Unfavorable	same issue as S & R	<b>AO</b>	

**Additional comments:**  
The valley's growth corridor will be shaken by this highway. Please support the alignment that the cities & towns have adopted.

THANK YOU!

# North-South Corridor Study Public Workshops December 2011 Public Involvement Summary - Comment Forms

187

Name/ Date	Mtg/Comment Type	Comment		
Anonymous	Public Workshop		U Favorable	<b>Factors:</b>
1/11/12	Comment Form	<b>Segments:</b>		Least impact to existing developmt
		A Unfavorable	V	Least impact to planned developmt
		B Unfavorable	W Unfavorable this would make the highway of no benefit at all to the community	Other
		C Unfavorable Hunt hwy is already here, why spend money on a road that already has transport.	X	
		D Unfavorable also a similar issue as C	Y	
		E Unfavorable	Z	
		F Unfavorable	AA	
		G Unfavorable	AB	
		H Unfavorable again, roads exist here, so do homes	AC	<b>Funding:</b>
		I Favorable	AD	Yes: support tolled hwy
		J Favorable	AE	Yes: use tolled hwy
		K Favorable	AF	
		L Unfavorable this is not what the city adopted	AG	
		M Unfavorable feeds into a alignment unsupported by Florence	AH	
		N Favorable if this helps line up the highway with the supported current alignment	AI	
		O Favorable the city of Florence has adopted this	AJ	
		P Favorable we went threw this with the city go with their support	AK	<b>Response:</b>
		Q Unfavorable this is not the alignment locals support	AL	N/A
		R Unfavorable does not line up with supported alignment	AM	
		S Unfavorable going threw state trust land makes no sence at all, why build it then?	AN	
		T Unfavorable would impact development in area in a negative way!	AO	

# North-South Corridor Study Public Workshops December 2011 Public Involvement Summary - Comment Forms

188

Name/ Date	Mtg/Comment Type	Comment	
Ivan Richardson	Public Workshop	<b>Segments:</b>	<b>U</b>
1/11/12	Comment Form	<b>A</b> Favorable	<b>V</b>
<b>Additional comments:</b>		<b>B</b> Favorable	<b>W</b>
		<b>C</b>	<b>X</b>
		<b>D</b>	<b>Y</b> Favorable
		<b>E</b>	<b>Z</b> Favorable
		<b>F</b> Favorable	<b>AA</b> Favorable
		<b>G</b> Favorable	<b>AB</b>
		<b>H</b> Favorable	<b>AC</b>
		<b>I</b>	<b>AD</b>
		<b>J</b>	<b>AE</b>
		<b>K</b>	<b>AF</b>
		<b>L</b>	<b>AG</b>
		<b>M</b>	<b>AH</b>
		<b>N</b>	<b>AI</b>
		<b>O</b>	<b>AJ</b>
		<b>P</b>	<b>AK</b>
		<b>Q</b>	<b>AL</b>
		<b>R</b>	<b>AM</b>
		<b>S</b>	<b>AN</b>
		<b>T</b>	<b>AO</b>

**Factors:**  
Best connects to other major routes  
Least impact to existing developmt  
Least impact to natural areas/open space  
Best use of existing roads/hwys

**Funding:**

**Response:**

# North-South Corridor Study Public Workshops December 2011 Public Involvement Summary - Comment Forms

Name/ Date	Mtg/Comment Type	Comment		
Carolyn Tompkins	Public Workshop		U	
		<b>Segments:</b>		<b>Factors:</b>
1/12/12	Comment Form	A Unfavorable area too busy already - AJUSTD just N of 60 on Ironwood. Too many kids/buses & cars! Safety issues	V	Best connects to other major routes
		B Unfavorable	W	Lowest cost
		C Unfavorable	X	Least impact to existing developmt
		D	Y	
		E	Z	
		F	AA	
		G	AB	
		H	AC	<b>Funding:</b>
		I Favorable less impact on existing homes, etc.	AD	Yes: use tolled hwy
		J Favorable	AE	
		K Unfavorable	AF	
		L	AG	
		M	AH	
		N	AI	
		O Favorable open area	AJ	
		P	AK	<b>Response:</b>
		Q Favorable	AL	N/A
		R	AM	
		S	AN	
		T	AO	

**Additional comments:**  
If/when there will be the 60 bypass around Gold Canyon area that would be the ideal time to do ALL construction.

My thoughts are to use as much open space undeveloped area as possible. Less impact on citizens-less costs?? faster construction. Enjoyed your presentation. Thank you for allowing our input.



# North-South Corridor Study Public Workshops December 2011 Public Involvement Summary - Comment Forms

Name/ Date	Mtg/Comment Type	Comment		
Anonymous	Public Workshop	<b>Segments:</b>	<b>U</b> Favorable	<b>Factors:</b>
1/12/12	Comment Form	<b>A</b> Unfavorable	<b>V</b>	Least impact to existing developmt
		<b>B</b> Unfavorable	<b>W</b> Unfavorable this alignment would be of no benefit to the local properties	Least impact to planned developmt
		<b>C</b> Unfavorable There is infrastructure already in place - This would be a waste of money	<b>X</b> Favorable	Other
		<b>D</b> Unfavorable same as C	<b>Y</b>	
		<b>E</b> Unfavorable	<b>Z</b>	
		<b>F</b> Unfavorable	<b>AA</b>	
		<b>G</b> Unfavorable	<b>AB</b>	
		<b>H</b> Unfavorable feeds into same issue as C & D	<b>AC</b>	<b>Funding:</b>
		<b>I</b> Favorable	<b>AD</b>	Yes: support tolled hwy
		<b>J</b> Favorable	<b>AE</b>	Yes: use tolled hwy
		<b>K</b> Unfavorable	<b>AF</b>	
		<b>L</b>	<b>AG</b>	
		<b>M</b> Unfavorable this does not support alignment adopted by municipalities	<b>AH</b>	
		<b>N</b>	<b>AI</b>	
		<b>O</b> Favorable this alignment has already been adopted by Florence	<b>AJ</b>	
		<b>P</b> Unfavorable same as O	<b>AK</b>	<b>Response:</b>
		<b>Q</b> Unfavorable not supported by area residence	<b>AL</b>	N/A
		<b>R</b> Unfavorable	<b>AM</b>	
		<b>S</b> Unfavorable	<b>AN</b>	
		<b>T</b> Unfavorable impedes future development of area	<b>AO</b>	

**Additional comments:**  
It is critically important that ADOT  
keep in the fourfront of their minds  
when considering the alignment that  
many of the towns have already  
gone through the public process and  
adopted alignments.

Notably - Florence with unanimous  
council consent.

# North-South Corridor Study Public Workshops December 2011 Public Involvement Summary - Comment Forms

191

Name/ Date	Mtg/Comment Type	Comment			
James Pruter	Public Workshop	<b>Segments:</b>		<b>U</b>	<b>Factors:</b>
1/12/12	Comment Form	<b>A</b> Unfavorable	connects to unfavorable segments "B" and "E"	<b>V</b>	Best relieves traffic/hwys & frwys
<b>Additional comments:</b>		<b>B</b> Unfavorable	dense development already. Would need frontage roads in addition to freeway	<b>W</b>	Best connects to other major routes
		<b>C</b>		<b>X</b>	Least impact to existing developmt
		<b>D</b> Unfavorable	conflicts with Anthem @ Merril Ranch	<b>Y</b>	
		<b>E</b> Unfavorable	too close to Planned communities of Laredo Ranch and Castlegate	<b>Z</b>	
		<b>F</b> Unfavorable	connects to unfavorable segment "B"	<b>AA</b>	
		<b>G</b> Unfavorable	conflicts with current or planned development	<b>AB</b>	
		<b>H</b> Unfavorable	conflicts with current or planned developments	<b>AC</b>	<b>Funding:</b>
		<b>I</b> Favorable	connects to proposed US 60 realignment	<b>AD</b>	Yes: support tolled hwy Yes: use tolled hwy
		<b>J</b> Favorable		<b>AE</b>	I would prefer a freeway, but if a tolled highway is the only way to get the project funded, I would use it.
		<b>K</b> Unfavorable	connects to unfavorable segment "G"	<b>AF</b>	
		<b>L</b>		<b>AG</b>	
		<b>M</b>		<b>AH</b>	
		<b>N</b>		<b>AI</b>	
		<b>O</b> Favorable	least impact to developments	<b>AJ</b>	
		<b>P</b>		<b>AK</b>	<b>Response:</b>
		<b>Q</b> Favorable		<b>AL</b>	
		<b>R</b>		<b>AM</b>	
		<b>S</b>		<b>AN</b>	
		<b>T</b>		<b>AO</b>	

**North-South Corridor Study Public Workshops December 2011  
Public Involvement Summary - Comment Forms**

192

Name/ Date	Mtg/Comment Type	Comment	
Kristine Bets	Public Workshop	<b>Segments:</b>	<b>U</b>
1/12/12	Comment Form	<b>A</b> Unfavorable	<b>V</b>
<b>Additional comments:</b>		<b>B</b> Unfavorable	<b>W</b>
		<b>C</b>	<b>X</b>
		<b>D</b> Unfavorable	<b>Y</b>
		<b>E</b> Unfavorable	<b>Z</b>
		<b>F</b> Unfavorable	<b>AA</b>
		<b>G</b> Unfavorable	<b>AB</b>
		<b>H</b> Unfavorable	<b>AC</b>
		<b>I</b> Favorable	<b>AD</b>
		<b>J</b> Favorable	<b>AE</b>
		<b>K</b> Unfavorable	<b>AF</b>
		<b>L</b>	<b>AG</b>
		<b>M</b>	<b>AH</b>
		<b>N</b>	<b>AI</b>
		<b>O</b> Favorable	<b>AJ</b>
		<b>P</b>	<b>AK</b>
		<b>Q</b> Favorable	<b>AL</b>
		<b>R</b>	<b>AM</b>
		<b>S</b>	<b>AN</b>
		<b>T</b>	<b>AO</b>

**Factors:**  
Best relieves traffic/hwys  
& frwys  
Best connects to other  
major routes  
Least impact to existing  
developmt

**Funding:**  
Yes: use tolled hwy  
Yes: support tolled hwy

**Response:**

# North-South Corridor Study Public Workshops December 2011 Public Involvement Summary - Comment Forms

193

Name/ Date	Mtg/Comment Type	Comment		
Anonymous	Public Workshop	<b>Segments:</b>	<b>U</b> Favorable	<b>Factors:</b>
1/12/12	Comment Form	<b>A</b> Unfavorable	<b>V</b>	Best connects to employment ctrs
<b>Additional comments:</b> Please support what the town do. They are our voice!		<b>B</b> Unfavorable	<b>W</b> Unfavorable same as T	Best connects to cities/towns
		<b>C</b> Unfavorable	<b>X</b> Favorable	Other
Your consideration is appreciated!		<b>D</b> Unfavorable	<b>Y</b>	
		<b>E</b> Unfavorable	<b>Z</b>	
		<b>F</b> Unfavorable	<b>AA</b>	
		<b>G</b> Unfavorable	<b>AB</b>	
		<b>H</b> Unfavorable	<b>AC</b>	<b>Funding:</b>
		<b>I</b> Favorable this one makes the most sense	<b>AD</b>	Yes: support tolled hwy
		<b>J</b> Favorable	<b>AE</b>	Yes: use tolled hwy
		<b>K</b> Unfavorable	<b>AF</b>	
		<b>L</b>	<b>AG</b>	
		<b>M</b> Unfavorable creates an alignment that impeades growth	<b>AH</b>	
		<b>N</b>	<b>AI</b>	
		<b>O</b> Favorable Town of Florence adopted their alignment!	<b>AJ</b>	
		<b>P</b> Favorable	<b>AK</b>	<b>Response:</b>
		<b>Q</b> Unfavorable	<b>AL</b>	N/A
		<b>R</b> Unfavorable opposite of what is supported by locals & towns!	<b>AM</b>	
		<b>S</b> Unfavorable same as S	<b>AN</b>	
		<b>T</b> Unfavorable wouldn't support growth	<b>AO</b>	

# North-South Corridor Study Public Workshops December 2011 Public Involvement Summary - Comment Forms

Name/ Date	Mtg/Comment Type	Comment			
John & Marcia Westmoreland	Public Workshop				
12/12/11	Comment Form				
<b>Additional comments:</b>					
It would be more costly and cause tremendous traffic congestion to change an existing road into a freeway than to start from scratch on open land.					
A freeway placed next to existing housing developments is very unfair to the people who bought homes/property in that area. It would have a major negative impact on the quality of life, noise, traffic, added businesses, crime, and reduced property values.					
		<b>Segments:</b>	<b>U</b>	Favorable	no existing development
		<b>A</b> Unfavorable cost; congestion during construction; negative impact on existing development	<b>V</b>	Favorable	no existing development
		<b>B</b> Unfavorable cost; congestion during construction; neg. impact on existing development	<b>W</b>	Unfavorable	disruptive to Nat'l Guard, etc.
		<b>C</b> Unfavorable cost; congestion during construction; neg. impact on existing development	<b>X</b>	Favorable	no existing development
		<b>D</b> Unfavorable cost; congestion during construction; neg. impact on existing development	<b>Y</b>		
		<b>E</b> Favorable cost effective; less negative impact on existing development. Note my suggested change on map	<b>Z</b>		
		<b>F</b> Unfavorable negative impact on existing development	<b>AA</b>		
		<b>G</b> Favorable less congestion during construction than B, C, & D; less neg. impact on existing development	<b>AB</b>		
		<b>H</b> Unfavorable negative impact on existing development	<b>AC</b>		
		<b>I</b> Favorable cost effective. And no impact on existing development.	<b>AD</b>		
		<b>J</b> Favorable No existing development	<b>AE</b>		
		<b>K</b>	<b>AF</b>		
		<b>L</b> Favorable less congestion during construction than B, C, & D. And no existing development to impact	<b>AG</b>		
		<b>M</b> Favorable no existing development	<b>AH</b>		
		<b>N</b> Favorable no existing development	<b>AI</b>		
		<b>O</b> Favorable cost effective. No impact on existing development.	<b>AJ</b>		
		<b>P</b> Favorable no existing development	<b>AK</b>		
		<b>Q</b> Favorable no existing development	<b>AL</b>		
		<b>R</b> Favorable no existing development	<b>AM</b>		
		<b>S</b> Favorable cost effective. No impact on existing development.	<b>AN</b>		
		<b>T</b> Favorable no existing development	<b>AO</b>		
					<b>Factors:</b>
					Least impact to existing developmt
					Input rec'd from public
					<b>Funding:</b>
					<b>Response:</b>

# North-South Corridor Study Public Workshops December 2011 Public Involvement Summary - Comment Forms

Name/ Date	Mtg/Comment Type	Comment	
John & Marcia Westmoreland	Public Workshop	<b>Segments:</b>	<b>U</b>
01/12/12	Comment Form	<b>A</b> Favorable open land	<b>V</b>
<b>Additional comments:</b> A highway of this size should not be round thru already existing housing developments* It will destroy the quality of life for residents.  *Means homes have already been constructed		<b>B</b> Unfavorable reverse engineering to may existing homes see B	<b>W</b>
		<b>C</b> Unfavorable see B	<b>X</b>
		<b>D</b> Unfavorable see B	<b>Y</b>
		<b>E</b> Favorable open land	<b>Z</b>
		<b>F</b> Unfavorable see B	<b>AA</b>
		<b>G</b> Favorable open land	<b>AB</b>
		<b>H</b> Unfavorable see B	<b>AC</b>
		<b>I</b> Favorable open land	<b>AD</b>
		<b>J</b> Favorable open land	<b>AE</b>
		<b>K</b> Favorable open land	<b>AF</b>
		<b>L</b> Favorable open land	<b>AG</b>
		<b>M</b>	<b>AH</b>
		<b>N</b>	<b>AI</b>
		<b>O</b>	<b>AJ</b>
		<b>P</b>	<b>AK</b>
		<b>Q</b> Favorable open land	<b>AL</b>
		<b>R</b>	<b>AM</b>
		<b>S</b>	<b>AN</b>
		<b>T</b>	<b>AO</b>
			<b>Factors:</b> Best connects to other major routes Least impact to existing developmt
			<b>Funding:</b> No: not support/won't use  Government collects enough of our money already
			<b>Response:</b>

# North-South Corridor Study Public Workshops December 2011 Public Involvement Summary - Comment Forms

Name/ Date	Mtg/Comment Type	Comment			
KATHRYN HAMMOND	Public Workshop				
1/11/12	Comment Form				
<b>Additional comments:</b> Recommended route A-E-G-H-D-Y-Z-AA.					
		<b>Segments:</b>	<b>U</b> Unfavorable	I favor Segment H-- Segment L and beyond (L, P, U, V, Q, X, AB, AM, AO, etc.) require a lot of road to be	<b>Factors:</b> Best relieves traffic/hwys & frwys Best connects to cities/towns Least impact to existing developmt
		<b>A</b> Favorable Segment A is closer to a lot of commercial industry located at Signal Butte Road. Connecting at A would	<b>V</b> Unfavorable	I favor Segment H-- Segment L and beyond (L, P, U, V, Q, X, AB, AM, AO, etc.) require a lot of road to be	
		<b>B</b> Unfavorable Using this segment of road would eliminate another north-south travel option for drivers. If the object behind	<b>W</b> Unfavorable	I favor starting point 1, for reasons stated under Segment A.	
		<b>C</b> Unfavorable Because I don't favor Segment B, I cannot favor Segment C. Segment C also maneuvers around hilly to	<b>X</b> Unfavorable	I favor Segment H-- Segment L and beyond (L, P, U, V, Q, X, AB, AM, AO, etc.) require a lot of road to be	
		<b>D</b> Segment D keeps a lot of the existing north-south travel in tact, while offering improvements to a lesser-	<b>Y</b> Favorable	It would provide another thoroughfare for residents of Coolidge and the farming community, without going	
		<b>E</b> Favorable I favor Segment E over Segment B because it does not impact the existing Ironwood Road traffic. If the object	<b>Z</b> Favorable	I prefer connecting into the major, existing north-south corridor here because I believe that was the intended	
		<b>F</b> Unfavorable I favor Segment E. Please view reasons listed under Segments B and Segment E for more information.	<b>AA</b> Favorable	I prefer connecting into the major, existing north-south corridor here because I believe that was the intended	
		<b>G</b> Favorable Segment G is the only segment which connects to my favored option, Segment E.	<b>AB</b> Unfavorable	I favor Segment H-- Segment L and beyond (L, P, U, V, Q, X, AB, AM, AO, etc.) require a lot of road to be	
		<b>H</b> Favorable There aren't a lot of travel options for residents of Magic Ranch Residential. This segment would add a	<b>AC</b> Unfavorable	I favor Segment H-- Segment L and beyond (L, P, U, V, Q, X, AB, AM, AO, etc.) require a lot of road to be	<b>Funding:</b> Yes: support tolled hwy
		<b>I</b> Unfavorable I favor starting point 1, for reasons stated under Segment A.	<b>AD</b> Unfavorable	I favor Segment H-- Segment L and beyond (L, P, U, V, Q, X, AB, AM, AO, etc.) require a lot of road to be	If I still had family living in Apache Junction, this corridor would be wonderful. I have, frequently, taken SR 79 to Phoenix to avoid traffic on I-10 prior to the I-10 road widening project; but, SR 79 is a little out of the way. I have taken SR 87 through Coolidge and connected to SR 79 before as well. I actually
		<b>J</b> Unfavorable I favor starting point 1, for reasons stated under Segment A.	<b>AE</b> Unfavorable	I favor Segment H-- Segment L and beyond (L, P, U, V, Q, X, AB, AM, AO, etc.) require a lot of road to be	<b>Response:</b>
		<b>K</b> Unfavorable I favor starting point 1, for reasons stated under Segment A.	<b>AF</b> Unfavorable	I favor Segment H-- Segment L and beyond (L, P, U, V, Q, X, AB, AM, AO, etc.) require a lot of road to be	
		<b>L</b> Unfavorable I favor Segment H-- Segment L and beyond (L, P, U, V, Q, X, AB, AM, AO, etc.) require a lot of road to be	<b>AG</b> Unfavorable	I prefer connecting into the major, existing north-south corridor here because I believe that was the intended	
		<b>M</b> Unfavorable I favor starting point 1, for reasons stated under Segment A.	<b>AH</b> Unfavorable	I favor Segment H-- Segment L and beyond (L, P, U, V, Q, X, AB, AM, AO, etc.) require a lot of road to be	
		<b>N</b> Unfavorable I favor starting point 1, for reasons stated under Segment A.	<b>AI</b> Unfavorable	I favor Segment H-- Segment L and beyond (L, P, U, V, Q, X, AB, AM, AO, etc.) require a lot of road to be	
		<b>O</b> Unfavorable I favor starting point 1, for reasons stated under Segment A.	<b>AJ</b> Unfavorable	I prefer connecting into the major, existing north-south corridor here because I believe that was the intended	
		<b>P</b> Unfavorable I favor Segment H-- Segment L and beyond (L, P, U, V, Q, X, AB, AM, AO, etc.) require a lot of road to be	<b>AK</b> Unfavorable	I favor Segment H-- Segment L and beyond (L, P, U, V, Q, X, AB, AM, AO, etc.) require a lot of road to be	
		<b>Q</b> Unfavorable I favor Segment H-- Segment L and beyond (L, P, U, V, Q, X, AB, AM, AO, etc.) require a lot of road to be	<b>AL</b> Unfavorable	I prefer connecting into the major, existing north-south corridor here because I believe that was the intended	
		<b>R</b> Unfavorable I favor starting point 1, for reasons stated under Segment A.	<b>AM</b> Unfavorable	I favor Segment H-- Segment L and beyond (L, P, U, V, Q, X, AB, AM, AO, etc.) require a lot of road to be	
		<b>S</b> Unfavorable I favor starting point 1, for reasons stated under Segment A.	<b>AN</b> Unfavorable	I favor Segment H-- Segment L and beyond (L, P, U, V, Q, X, AB, AM, AO, etc.) require a lot of road to be	
		<b>T</b> Unfavorable I favor starting point 1, for reasons stated under Segment A.	<b>AO</b> Unfavorable	I favor Segment H-- Segment L and beyond (L, P, U, V, Q, X, AB, AM, AO, etc.) require a lot of road to be	

# North-South Corridor Study Public Workshops December 2011 Public Involvement Summary - Comment Forms

197

Name/ Date	Mtg/Comment Type	Comment		
Anonymous	Public Workshop	<b>Segments:</b>	<b>U</b> Unfavorable	<b>Factors:</b>
1/12/12	Comment Form	<b>A</b> Favorable	<b>V</b> Favorable	Best relieves traffic/local streets
<b>Additional comments:</b>		<b>B</b> Unfavorable	<b>W</b> Unfavorable	Best connects to other major routes
		<b>C</b> Unfavorable	<b>X</b> Favorable	Least impact to existing developmt
		<b>D</b> Unfavorable	<b>Y</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>E</b> Favorable	<b>Z</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>F</b> Unfavorable	<b>AA</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>G</b> Favorable	<b>AB</b> Favorable	
		<b>H</b> Unfavorable	<b>AC</b> Unfavorable	<b>Funding:</b>
		<b>I</b> Favorable	<b>AD</b> Favorable	Yes: support tolled hwy
		<b>J</b> Unfavorable	<b>AE</b> Unfavorable	Yes: use tolled hwy
		<b>K</b> Unfavorable	<b>AF</b> Favorable	
		<b>L</b> Favorable	<b>AG</b> Favorable	
		<b>M</b> Unfavorable	<b>AH</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>N</b> Unfavorable	<b>AI</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>O</b> Unfavorable	<b>AJ</b> Favorable	
		<b>P</b> Favorable	<b>AK</b> Favorable	<b>Response:</b>
		<b>Q</b> Favorable	<b>AL</b> Favorable	
		<b>R</b> Unfavorable	<b>AM</b> Favorable	
		<b>S</b> Unfavorable	<b>AN</b> Favorable	
		<b>T</b> Favorable	<b>AO</b> Favorable	



# North-South Corridor Study Public Workshops December 2011 Public Involvement Summary - Comment Forms

198

Name/ Date	Mtg/Comment Type	Comment			
Sherri Ehlert  1/11/12	Public Workshop				
	Comment Form				
Additional comments:					
		<b>Segments:</b>	<b>U</b>	Unfavorable	Less direct path south. Multiple bridges over the CAp canal (Extra cost).
		<b>A</b> Unfavorable Construction has and will cause extreme transit issues. The Road is fairly new anyway.	<b>V</b>	Unfavorable	Less direct path south.
		<b>B</b> Unfavorable Construction has and will cause extreme transit issues. The Road is fairly new anyway.	<b>W</b>	Unfavorable	Less direct path south.
		<b>C</b> Unfavorable Construction has and will cause extreme transit issues. Although the road needs repair, there are no	<b>X</b>	Unfavorable	Less direct path south.
		<b>D</b> Favorable More direct pathway to southern routes, and newly constructed road that could be improved.	<b>Y</b>	Favorable	Most direct path south.
		<b>E</b> Unfavorable Too close to Ironwood Dr.	<b>Z</b>	Favorable	Most direct path south.
		<b>F</b> Unfavorable Ties into the Ironwood/Gantzel Rd route, and eliminates much needed farm and open lands.	<b>AA</b>	Favorable	Most direct path south.
		<b>G</b> Favorable Route is approximately midway between Hunt hwy and SR 79, without interfering with current transit during	<b>AB</b>	Unfavorable	Less direct path south, no advantage seen to having the route farther east.
		<b>H</b> Favorable Most direct route, with few terrain or detour issues.	<b>AC</b>	Unfavorable	Less direct path south, no advantage seen to having the route farther east.
		<b>I</b> Favorable Most direct route, with few terrain or detour issues.	<b>AD</b>	Unfavorable	Less direct path south, no advantage seen to having the route farther east.
		<b>J</b> Favorable Most direct route, with few terrain or detour issues	<b>AE</b>	Unfavorable	Less direct path south, no advantage seen to having the route farther east.
		<b>K</b> Favorable Most direct route, with few terrain or detour issues.	<b>AF</b>	Unfavorable	Less direct path south, no advantage seen to having the route farther east.
		<b>L</b> Unfavorable Less direct path south.	<b>AG</b>	Unfavorable	Less direct path south, no advantage seen to having the route farther east.
		<b>M</b> Unfavorable Less direct path south.	<b>AH</b>	Unfavorable	Less direct path south, no advantage seen to having the route farther east.
		<b>N</b> Unfavorable Less direct path south.	<b>AI</b>	Unfavorable	Less direct path south, no advantage seen to having the route farther east.
		<b>O</b> Unfavorable Less direct path south.	<b>AJ</b>	Unfavorable	Less direct path south, no advantage seen to having the route farther east.
		<b>P</b> Unfavorable Less direct path south.	<b>AK</b>	Unfavorable	Less direct path south, no advantage seen to having the route farther east.
		<b>Q</b> Unfavorable Less direct path south.	<b>AL</b>	Unfavorable	Less direct path south, no advantage seen to having the route farther east.
		<b>R</b> Unfavorable Less direct path south.	<b>AM</b>	Unfavorable	
		<b>S</b> Unfavorable Less direct path south.	<b>AN</b>	Unfavorable	
		<b>T</b> Unfavorable Less direct path south.	<b>AO</b>	Unfavorable	Less direct path south, no advantage seen to having the route farther east.
					<b>Factors:</b> Best relieves traffic/local streets Best connects to other major routes Lowest cost
					<b>Funding:</b> No: not support/won't use
					<b>Response:</b>

# North-South Corridor Study Public Workshops December 2011 Public Involvement Summary - Comment Forms

199

Name/ Date	Mtg/Comment Type	Comment		
Lawrence Hochstatter	Public Workshop	<b>Segments:</b>	<b>U</b>	<b>Factors:</b>
1/18/12	Comment Form	<b>A</b>	<b>V</b>	Best connects to employment ctrs Best connects to other destinations Best connects to other major routes Lowest cost
		<b>B</b>	<b>W</b>	
<b>Additional comments:</b>		<b>C</b>	<b>X</b>	
		D Favorable	Y Favorable	
		<b>E</b>	Z Favorable	
		<b>F</b>	AA Favorable	
		<b>G</b> Favorable	<b>AB</b>	<b>Funding:</b> No: not support/won't use
		<b>H</b> Favorable	<b>AC</b>	
		<b>I</b> Favorable	<b>AD</b>	
		<b>J</b> Favorable	<b>AE</b>	
		<b>K</b> Favorable	<b>AF</b>	
		<b>L</b>	<b>AG</b>	
		<b>M</b>	<b>AH</b>	
		<b>N</b>	<b>AI</b>	
		<b>O</b>	<b>AJ</b>	<b>Response:</b>
		<b>P</b>	<b>AK</b>	
		<b>Q</b>	<b>AL</b>	
		<b>R</b>	<b>AM</b>	
		<b>S</b>	<b>AN</b>	
		<b>T</b>	<b>AO</b>	

# North-South Corridor Study Public Workshops December 2011 Public Involvement Summary - Comment Forms

200

Name/ Date	Mtg/Comment Type	Comment		
Anonymous	Public Workshop			
1/17/12	Comment Form			
<b>Additional comments:</b> Develop a passenger rail system [augmented by BRT (Bus Rapid Transit) if necessary]. Focus on rail. Do NOT build more freeways. Use existing rail lines to develop a workable transit system.				
		<b>Segments:</b>	<b>U</b>	<b>Factors:</b>
		<b>A</b>	<b>V</b>	Best connects to cities/towns
		<b>B</b>	<b>W</b>	Least impact to natural areas/open space
		<b>C</b>	<b>X</b>	Best use of existing roads/hwys
		<b>D</b>	<b>Y</b>	Other
		<b>E</b>	<b>Z</b>	
		<b>F</b>	<b>AA</b>	
		<b>G</b>	<b>AB</b>	
		<b>H</b>	<b>AC</b>	<b>Funding:</b>
		<b>I</b>	<b>AD</b>	No: not support/won't use
		<b>J</b>	<b>AE</b>	Do NOT build a road-develop a rail system instead
		<b>K</b>	<b>AF</b>	
		<b>L</b>	<b>AG</b>	
		<b>M</b>	<b>AH</b>	
		<b>N</b>	<b>AI</b>	
		<b>O</b>	<b>AJ</b>	
		<b>P</b>	<b>AK</b>	<b>Response:</b>
		<b>Q</b> Favorable      good route for a rail line in Florence area	<b>AL</b>	
		<b>R</b>	<b>AM</b>	
		<b>S</b>	<b>AN</b>	
		<b>T</b>	<b>AO</b>	

# North-South Corridor Study Public Workshops December 2011 Public Involvement Summary - Comment Forms

Name/ Date	Mtg/Comment Type	Comment			
Sherman S. Francisco	Public Workshop	<b>Segments:</b>			
1/17/12	Comment Form	<b>A</b> Favorable	give San Tan Valley a boost for growth	<b>U</b>	<b>Factors:</b>
		<b>B</b> Favorable	give San Tan Valley a boost for growth	<b>V</b>	Best relieves traffic/local streets
		<b>C</b> Favorable	San Tan Valley would have growth opportunities help to incorporate some day soon	<b>W</b>	Best connects to employment ctrs
		<b>D</b> Favorable	include Coolidge and help its growth	<b>X</b> Unfavorable	Best use of existing roads/hwys
		<b>E</b> Unfavorable		help keep I-79 free for low traffic. Florence can grow more at Anthem	
		<b>F</b> Favorable	alternate to C would be good	<b>Y</b> Favorable	help Cooldige growth and expansion
		<b>G</b> Unfavorable		<b>Z</b> Favorable	more direct connection to I-10
		<b>H</b> Favorable	connect F to D	<b>AA</b>	
		<b>I</b> Unfavorable		<b>AB</b>	
		<b>J</b> Unfavorable		<b>AC</b>	<b>Funding:</b>
		<b>K</b> Unfavorable		<b>AD</b>	Yes: support tolled hwy
		<b>L</b> Unfavorable		<b>AE</b>	Would depend upon reasonable expense to use it. Say 10 cents per 10 miles would be reasonable.
		<b>M</b>		<b>AF</b>	
		<b>N</b>		<b>AG</b>	
		<b>O</b>		<b>AH</b>	
		<b>P</b>		<b>AI</b>	
		<b>Q</b>		<b>AJ</b>	
		<b>R</b>		<b>AK</b>	<b>Response:</b>
		<b>S</b>		<b>AL</b>	
		<b>T</b>		<b>AM</b>	
				<b>AN</b>	
				<b>AO</b>	

**Additional comments:**  
Great idea as will give better access to gateway airport being further away for downtown Phoenix. Encourage more carrier to use gateway as flyers can get to area with SR 24.

Take some pressure off of I-10 to Tucson.

# North-South Corridor Study Public Workshops December 2011 Public Involvement Summary - Comment Forms

202

Name/ Date	Mtg/Comment Type	Comment		
Linda Myers	Public Workshop	<b>Segments:</b>		
1/17/12	Comment Form	<b>A</b>	<b>U</b>	<b>Factors:</b> Best relieves traffic/hwys & frwys Least impact to existing developmt Least impact to natural areas/open space
		<b>B</b>	<b>V</b>	
		<b>C</b>	<b>W</b>	
		<b>D</b>	<b>X</b>	
		<b>E</b>	<b>Y</b>	<b>Funding:</b> No: not support/won't use  Shouldn't have to pay to use a road we already pay taxes on it.
		<b>F</b>	<b>Z</b>	
		<b>G</b>	<b>AA</b>	
		<b>H</b>	<b>AB</b>	
		<b>I</b>	<b>AC</b>	
		<b>J</b>	<b>AD</b>	
		<b>K</b>	<b>AE</b>	
		<b>L</b>	<b>AF</b>	
		<b>M</b>	<b>AG</b>	
		<b>N</b>	<b>AH</b>	
		<b>O</b>	<b>AI</b>	
		<b>P</b>	<b>AJ</b>	
		<b>Q</b>	<b>AK</b>	<b>Response:</b>
		<b>R</b>	<b>AL</b>	
		<b>S</b>	<b>AM</b> Unfavorable 4 generations lives here	
		<b>T</b>	<b>AN</b>	
			<b>AO</b>	

**Additional comments:**  
They SRP told us power line wasn't going on our property & it did. You think when you live on family homestead & out in country you would be saved from being forced off your land.

**Segments:**

**A**

**B**

**C**

**D** Favorable

follow this straight down should cost much less. I would think.

**E**

**F**

**G**

**H**

**I**

**J**

**K**

**L**

**M**

**N**

**O**

**P**

**Q**

**R**

**S**

**T**

**U**

**V**

**W**

**X**

**Y**

**Z**

**AA**

**AB**

**AC**

**AD**

**AE**

**AF**

**AG**

**AH**

**AI**

**AJ**

**AK**

**AL**

**AM** Unfavorable 4 generations lives here

**AN**

**AO**

# North-South Corridor Study Public Workshops December 2011 Public Involvement Summary - Comment Forms

203

Name/ Date	Mtg/Comment Type	Comment		
Fredrick Schneider	Public Workshop	<b>Segments:</b>	<b>U</b>	<b>Factors:</b>
1/17/12	Comment Form	<b>A</b>	<b>V</b> Favorable	Least impact to existing developmt
		<b>B</b>	<b>W</b>	Least impact to planned developmt
		<b>C</b>	<b>X</b> Favorable	
		<b>D</b>	<b>Y</b>	
		<b>E</b> Unfavorable	<b>Z</b> Favorable	
		<b>F</b>	<b>AA</b> Favorable	
		<b>G</b>	<b>AB</b>	
		<b>H</b>	<b>AC</b>	<b>Funding:</b>
		<b>I</b> Favorable	<b>AD</b> Favorable	
		<b>J</b> Favorable	<b>AE</b> Favorable	
		<b>K</b>	<b>AF</b>	
		<b>L</b>	<b>AG</b>	
		<b>M</b>	<b>AH</b>	
		<b>N</b>	<b>AI</b>	
		<b>O</b> Favorable	<b>AJ</b>	
		<b>P</b> Favorable	<b>AK</b>	<b>Response:</b>
		<b>Q</b>	<b>AL</b>	
		<b>R</b>	<b>AM</b>	
		<b>S</b>	<b>AN</b> Favorable	
		<b>T</b>	<b>AO</b> Favorable	

**Additional comments:**  
Least impact to Arizona Water  
Company's existing and planned  
water facilities including water  
mains, potable water production  
wells, booster stations, storage tanks  
and other utility facilities.

# North-South Corridor Study Public Workshops December 2011 Public Involvement Summary - Comment Forms

Name/ Date	Mtg/Comment Type	Comment			
George Morley	Public Workshop				
01/19/2012	Comment Form				
Additional comments:					
		<b>Segments:</b>	<b>U</b> Unfavorable	Too long - costly	<b>Factors:</b> Best relieves traffic/local streets Best relieves traffic/hwys & frwys
		<b>A</b> Unfavorable Too busy already	<b>V</b> Unfavorable	Costly - too long	
		<b>B</b> Unfavorable Too busy already	<b>W</b> Unfavorable	Too costly - indirect route	
		<b>C</b> Unfavorable Too busy already	<b>X</b> Unfavorable	Too costly - indirect route	
		<b>D</b> Favorable Leads to Union Pacific Railway Line -cheapest way to build thorofare	<b>Y</b> Favorable	Direct route less costly	<b>Funding:</b> No: not support/won't use
		<b>E</b> Unfavorable Ironwood lead in too busy at present	<b>Z</b> Unfavorable	Direct route - shortest distance - less costly	
		<b>F</b> Unfavorable Too busy already	<b>AA</b> Unfavorable	Direct route less costly	
		<b>G</b> Favorable	<b>AB</b> Unfavorable	Indirect route too costly	
		<b>H</b> Favorable Relieves traffic on Ironwood & Gantzel - leads to rail line	<b>AC</b> Unfavorable	Too costly	<b>Response:</b>
		<b>I</b> Favorable Will relieve traffic on Ironwood	<b>AD</b> Unfavorable	Indirect route	
		<b>J</b> Favorable Relieves traffic on Ironwood	<b>AE</b> Unfavorable	Indirect route	
		<b>K</b> Favorable Relieves traffic on Ironwood - direct route to rail line	<b>AF</b> Unfavorable	Rail line more direct	
		<b>L</b> Unfavorable Adds distance & expense	<b>AG</b> Unfavorable	Rail line more direct	
		<b>M</b> Unfavorable Adds distance, too costly	<b>AH</b> Unfavorable	Rail line more direct	
		<b>N</b> Unfavorable Too costly	<b>AI</b> Unfavorable	Rail line more direct	
		<b>O</b> Unfavorable Too costly - rail bed best alternative	<b>AJ</b> Unfavorable	Rail line more direct	
		<b>P</b> Unfavorable Too costly	<b>AK</b> Unfavorable	Rail line more direct	
		<b>Q</b> Unfavorable Too costly	<b>AL</b> Unfavorable	Rail line more direct	
		<b>R</b> Unfavorable Too long - costly	<b>AM</b> Unfavorable	Rail line more direct	
		<b>S</b> Unfavorable Too costly	<b>AN</b> Unfavorable	Rail line more direct	
		<b>T</b> Unfavorable Too costly - longer routes	<b>AO</b> Unfavorable	Rail line more direct	

# North-South Corridor Study Public Workshops December 2011 Public Involvement Summary - Comment Forms

Name/ Date	Mtg/Comment Type	Comment			
Anonymous	Public Workshop	<b>Segments:</b>			
12/12/2011	Comment Form	<b>A</b> Unfavorable	Too many developed areas	<b>U</b> Unfavorable	<b>Factors:</b> Best relieves traffic/hwys & frwys Least impact to existing developmt Least impact to planned developmt
		<b>B</b> Unfavorable	Developments	<b>V</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>C</b> Unfavorable	Developments	<b>W</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>D</b> Unfavorable	Too busy now. Also, too many developments	<b>X</b> Favorable	
		<b>E</b> Unfavorable	Too busy now. Also, too many developments	<b>Y</b> Unfavorable	<b>Funding:</b> Yes: support tolled hwy
		<b>F</b> Unfavorable	Too busy now. Also, too many developments	<b>Z</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>G</b> Unfavorable		<b>AA</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>H</b> Unfavorable		<b>AB</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>I</b> Favorable	Less population, less impact	<b>AC</b> Favorable	<b>Response:</b>
		<b>J</b> Favorable	Less populous	<b>AD</b> Favorable	
		<b>K</b> Unfavorable		<b>AE</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>L</b> Unfavorable		<b>AF</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>M</b> Favorable	Alternate to I-J-O-Q	<b>AG</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>N</b> Unfavorable		<b>AH</b> Favorable	
		<b>O</b> Favorable	Less impact on developed areas	<b>AI</b> Favorable	
		<b>P</b> Unfavorable		<b>AJ</b>	
		<b>Q</b> Favorable	Less impact	<b>AK</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>R</b> Unfavorable		<b>AL</b> Favorable	
		<b>S</b> Favorable	Less impact on developments	<b>AM</b> Unfavorable	
		<b>T</b> Favorable	Less impact on developments	<b>AN</b> Unfavorable	
				<b>AO</b> Favorable	



# North-South Corridor Study Public Workshops December 2011 Public Involvement Summary - Comment Forms

206

Name/ Date	Mtg/Comment Type	Comment		
Robin Drew	Public Workshop			
12/24/11	Comment Form			
Additional comments:				
		<b>Segments:</b>	<b>U</b>	<b>Factors:</b>
		<b>A</b>	<b>V</b>	Best relieves traffic/local streets
		<b>B</b>	<b>W</b>	Best connects to other major routes
		<b>C</b>	<b>X</b>	Least impact to existing developmt
		<b>D</b>	<b>Y</b>	
		<b>E</b> Favorable	<b>Z</b> Favorable Follow existing rd	
		<b>F</b>	<b>AA</b> Favorable Follow existing rd	
		<b>G</b> Favorable	<b>AB</b>	
		<b>H</b> Favorable Too close to existing homes	<b>AC</b> Favorable	<b>Funding:</b>
		<b>I</b>	<b>AD</b> Favorable	No: not support/won't use
		<b>J</b>	<b>AE</b>	
		<b>K</b>	<b>AF</b>	
		<b>L</b> Favorable	<b>AG</b>	
		<b>M</b>	<b>AH</b> Favorable	
		<b>N</b>	<b>AI</b>	
		<b>O</b>	<b>AJ</b>	
		<b>P</b>	<b>AK</b> Favorable	<b>Response:</b>
		<b>Q</b> Favorable	<b>AL</b> Favorable	
		<b>R</b>	<b>AM</b> Favorable	
		<b>S</b>	<b>AN</b> Favorable	
		<b>T</b>	<b>AO</b> Favorable either AO/AM/AB	

## North-South Corridor Study Public Workshops December 2011 Public Involvement Summary - Comment Forms

207

Name/ Date	Mtg/Comment Type	Comment		
Bob Ostrich	Public Workshop		U	
12/12/11	Comment Form			
<b>Additional comments:</b> (On Northern Route map) Why - 2050 population could double! No funding for project could enter with private public partnership - 1.Toll Road?				
(Crossed out 1 and 2, drew line going west and connecting with Route 24.)				
Additional comments: It is apparent to me Route 24 off 202 that heads SE to E solves the exit of 60 south. Take 202 to 24.				
1. Direct to Florence Junction 2. Route to 10 with several options! Most of major traffic trucks go to Florence Junction then east to Globe or Florence south!				
		<b>Segments:</b>		<b>Factors:</b>
		A Unfavorable Major reconstruction on relatively new road	V	Best relieves traffic/local streets
		B Unfavorable Noise and same	W	Best connects to cities/towns
		C	X	Best connects to other major routes
		D Favorable	Y	Lowest cost
		E	Z	Least impact to existing developmt
		F	AA	Input rec'd from public
		G Favorable	AB	
		H Favorable	AC	<b>Funding:</b>
		I Unfavorable	AD	No: not support/won't use
		J	AE	Toll roads are expensive and I believe highways are part of public ownership
		K	AF	
		L	AG	
		M	AH	
		N	AI	
		O	AJ	
		P	AK	<b>Response:</b>
		Q	AL	
		R	AM	
		S	AN	
		T	AO	

## **APPENDIX I**

### **Public Workshop Additional Comments**

## Public Involvement Summary

1

Date	Meeting/Comment Type	Name	Comment Transcription	Response
11/18/2011	Website	J. Roberts	I don't believe there is need of a corridor to be built. Money is tight and construction has almost stopped in this area. Many homes are empty. The present roads can handle the traffic on them. The Ironwood improvement to 4 lane is a huge success, and traffic flows well. The alignment close to Ironwood is the worst choice, but none of them are good. Valley Fever outbreaks have soared from all the building and is finally settling down. The environment already has max pollution and constant dust. Not sure if environmental studies have been done, but the desert creatures that live in the area have already been reduced and do not need to be wiped out for one more unneeded roadway. All of the routes will displace homeowners who will find it difficult to relocate. Creating more pollution and destroying more of the remaining creatures living there is a bad idea. I do not believe a corridor needs to be built at all.	Thank you for your comments; they have been documented as part of the study and forwarded to the study team for consideration. Please let me know if you have any additional questions or comments.
11/22/2011	Phone	Zak Solberg Draskovich	Interested in more project information. Does not have internet. Will plan to attend Dec. 8 meeting.	I explained that he would have access to more information and could ask questions at the upcoming meeting.
11/22/2011	Phone	Susan Waltz	Has no internet access. Requests southern route Mt. View to Attaway. Send her a comment form when available.	Mailed packet of study information.
11/22/2011	Website	Sandy Gotthardt	I recommend the Ironwood route since that road already exists. I do not like the	Thank you for your comments; they have been documented as

## Public Involvement Summary

2

Date	Meeting/Comment Type	Name	Comment Transcription	Response
			possible route near Mountain View Rd. and Hwy 60 because of the impact of more traffic and noise. We live near that intersection and do not want a negative change to our neighborhood. Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this project.	part of the study and forwarded to the study team for consideration. Please let me know if you have any additional questions or comments.
11/22/2011	Website	Richard Horton	Subject: great project that needs to be built You will have a diamond interchange already built in Picacho over the railroad. It only makes economic sense to go up hwy 87 to the Coolidge area. From there you need other suggestions from local people for impact issues. Pinal county will be the next construction boom for the state. Its great to see ADOT planning for this growth.	Thank you for your comments; they have been documented as part of the study and forwarded to the study team for consideration. Please let me know if you have any additional questions or comments.
11/22/2011	Phone	Mary Pierce	She received a meeting notice in the mail. Wanted to know if any of the project connections will connect to Phoenix light rail, either at Superstition Mall or Sycamore. Currently takes the bus to the transit hub. She lives near Ironwood.	Main focus of project is north-south connectivity. There are other current multi-modal studies for Pinal County. Referred to ADOT website for additional information. Some information will also be available at public meetings.
11/22/2011	Email	John Hallett	As per the phone call about your send us your comments link, I am sending this via email. I can't make the current scheduled meetings but I think that it is a great idea for the corridor to begin as soon as possible. Here are a few ideas I would like to present:	Thank you for your comments; they have been documented as part of the study and forwarded to the study team for consideration. Please let me know if you have any additional questions or comments. I've forwarded the information

## Public Involvement Summary

3

Date	Meeting/Comment Type	Name	Comment Transcription	Response
			<p>1. Cost needs to be a factor addressed and keeping it down.</p> <p>2. Use pre existing road structures as the route as much as possible to reduce environmental impact.</p> <p>3. Use pre-existing roads like Hunt Hwy. and 87 to upgrade these road structures that are in need of repairs or widening (personal opinion).</p> <p>4. Keep the roads closer to populated areas and not in the wilderness or out in the middle of cotton fields. This will provide tax revenue for pre-existing businesses. There is no need to build more structures and businesses in the middle of cotton fields nor throw a road out there.</p> <p>5. Coolidge really needs more traffic and business opportunities. Putting the road closer to Florence makes NO Real Gain besides easier transportation for prisoners for the prison systems that are located there.</p>	<p>about the error on to the web team, and it should be fixed shortly.</p>
11/23/2011	Website	Terry Makdad	<p>Subject: Dec meetings - info not on-line</p> <p>Suggestion: The Dec 6, 7, 8 and 12th meetings need to be rescheduled into next year so that this website can provide us advanced info on the route alternatives as shown in the mailing I received today. I want to be able to see where the alternatives are in relationship to my home before I come to the meeting. Why can't us citizens be informed before we come so that we can have questions and comments ready? AZDOT can prepare but don't let the public prepare seems to be the</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments; they have been documented as part of the study and forwarded to the study team for consideration. We hope you will be able to attend one of the upcoming workshops so you can receive more detailed information not included in your invitation.</p> <p>The purpose of the workshop is to have one-on-one interaction with you to discuss your concerns on the more detailed information we</p>

## Public Involvement Summary

4

Date	Meeting/Comment Type	Name	Comment Transcription	Response
			theme. Since the mailing has the alternatives shown why can't they be on an aerial map on the website now that shows existing roads and home?	<p>provide during the presentation and at each table. There will be large table-sized aerial maps showing property and landmarks more closely as a point of reference while you personally give input to staff. You will also have the opportunity to ask questions and talk to engineers and project managers leading the study. You could submit your comment form at the workshop, or mail it in so you have more time to think about the additional information you acquired.</p> <p>More detailed information will also be posted online soon, but it will not include the large aerials that will be used at the workshop nor will you have the opportunity to express concerns or preferences to the ADOT team one-on-one.</p> <p>Additionally, ADOT will be sending an email prior to the first workshop that will include a link to a more detailed comment questionnaire.</p> <p>We thank you for your patience, and please let me know if you have any additional questions or comments.</p>
11/23/2011	Email	Reapers Rapture	I am all for you guys going forward and I hope this works out so a nice road gets built to help everyone. Up until 5 years	Thank you for your comments; they have been documented as part of the study and forwarded to

## Public Involvement Summary

5

Date	Meeting/Comment Type	Name	Comment Transcription	Response
			<p>ago I lived in the area for 20 years. my parents live near the Eloy prisons.</p> <p>So I have been thinking. We had several floods over the years due to the farmers reservoir breakage. the subdivision near the prisons is where my parents still live. It was under water.</p> <p>Also I wanted to let you know that the farmers in that area that use crop dusting air planes also over spray the subdivision and all near by areas. I do not know if the new road may go near this area or closer to the mountains. but if the farmers are aloud to remain they will spray passing cars. they do it now. it has killed much of residents plants and many animals including dogs and horses. a few people have tried to get it taken care of and the over spraying stopped. however it has not worked and therefore continues to this day.</p> <p>like i said i support the idea of the road. I just wanted to bring these items to your attention.</p>	<p>the study team for consideration. Please let me know if you have any additional questions or comments.</p>
11/23/2011	Website	Mel Slocum	<p>Suggestion: I am not in favor of any route that will replace Ironwood Ave. or Hunt Hwy or Hwy 87 south of Coolidge. There is already too much traffic on those roads. I am in favor of any route that keeps the highway East of Attaway Rd, crosses the Cap Canal North of Florence and stays between Hwy 87 and the Cap Canal all the way to I-10.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments; they have been documented as part of the study and forwarded to the study team for consideration. Please let me know if you have any additional questions or comments.</p>



## Public Involvement Summary

6

Date	Meeting/Comment Type	Name	Comment Transcription	Response
11/24/2011	Website	James Stewart	Subject: northsouth corridor Suggestion: The "NOBUILD" option should be taken off the table as a new corridor is critical. Further, the new corridor should be built such as to avoid existing residential street with traffic lights.	Thank you for your comments; they have been documented as part of the study and forwarded to the study team for consideration.
11/26/2011	Email	LaNee Lovelady	<p>Just so you are aware, I tried submitting a form on the website but it kept saying I was entering the wrong security code, which I wasn't. I tried 5 different times and decided to simply send an email.</p> <p>So if I am understanding this correctly, in order for a new route to be developed, some of our houses would be in the way? One route I see goes straight through our community and I am not happy about that (Castlegate). What is wrong with the routes traveled already? Or putting the routes somewhere less disturbance would be necessary? I am not sure how many comments on this have actually been made, nor if mine will even amount to anything; but I have a home in Castlegate and am very happy where I am. I do not want to move any time soon as my family and I love our place! I doubt the state/city could even afford to buy us out. The economy is so bad right now is it truly necessary to spend more money on making another route? If people have to travel for work then so be it, at least he or she has a job during these tough times! I find it having to do with pure laziness and little patience.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments; they have been documented as part of the study and forwarded to the study team for consideration.</p> <p>Route alternatives were developed to minimize impacts on existing and planned development to the extent possible. As the study moves forward into the screening process, the amount of impact each possible route alternative would have on existing and planned developments will be carefully considered and evaluated.</p> <p>The comments the team receives at the public workshops will be posted online in early 2012 after the comment period closes.</p> <p>Please let me know if you have any additional questions or comments.</p>

## Public Involvement Summary

7

Date	Meeting/Comment Type	Name	Comment Transcription	Response
			Why is everyone in such a hurry today? I guess we will see what others say. I would like to hear other opinions on the subject matter as well, although I do not have much time to attend meetings. Thanks for listening and I hope the right decision is made.	
11/26/2011	Website	Jose Diaz	As a resident of San Tan Valley in the Johnson Ranch area I would find it devastating to my daily commute routes if the new corridor were to overlap with either Ironwood or Hunt Hwy. I know many in the Anthem area south of me that would agree. Those routes are already over capacity and could not support construction. In my opinion the North-South corridor should be a highway without lights. Split off the new US 60 alignment around Gold Canyon and then south as directly as possible without affecting the already congested Hunt Hwy and Attaway Rd route. Keep Ironwood, Hunt, AZ 79, AZ 287, and AZ 87 should not overlap with the new corridor allowing for alternate routes in case of major accidents. SR 24 would be excellent if it were also a no traffic light route and connect AZ 202, Ironwood, the new N-S corridor and maybe eventually to the US60/AZ79 interchange.	Thank you for your comments; they have been documented as part of the study and forwarded to the study team for consideration. Please let me know if you have any additional questions or comments.
11/26/2011	Website	Guy Chetcuti	Very important.	
11/29/2011	Email	Robert Flatley	Faxed: Staff recommends that the City Council reaffirm its previous Resolution	Thank you for your comments; they have been documented as

## Public Involvement Summary

8

Date	Meeting/Comment Type	Name	Comment Transcription	Response
			no. 11-12, adopted on May 9, 2011 and attached here, that supports a certain alignment consistent with the City's development goals and forward its comments as "stakeholder input to route alternative screening" as requested. The City Council supports an alignment that advances the public health, safety and welfare in a number of ways including, but not limited to, enhancing the community's infrastructure and transportation, providing opportunities for commercial and residential development, and promoting the City's development goals. The screening document attached, where staff has marked segments AB, AD, AN and AH as favorable, are supported by the Coolidge City Council's Resolution No. 11-12. These comments will be forwarded to HDR Engineering Inc. as requested by ADOT. The general public has also been asked to submit comments. The public meeting has been scheduled for Thursday, Dec. 8, 2011 at the Elk's Lodge on Attaway Road.	part of the study and forwarded to the study team for consideration. Please let me know if you have any additional questions or comments.
11/29/2011	Email	Dave Barney	I think this route is needed, but careful consideration into the largest group of residents along with ensuring we keep current critical roadways is necessary. The alignment along Ironwood road that is one of the possible alignments would cause issues with both of these. As the study shows, the largest population center in Pinal County is San Tan Valley, and a	Thank you for your comments; they have been documented as part of the study and forwarded to the study team for consideration. Please let me know if you have any additional questions or comments. The ADOT web team is looking into the Captcha code issue. Thank you for letting us know.

## Public Involvement Summary

9

Date	Meeting/Comment Type	Name	Comment Transcription	Response
			<p>potential freeway directly down the middle of that would cause issues with both businesses and residents along that route. In addition, the only realistic north south corridor between San Tan Valley (and many of the communities south of it) and Apache Junction today is Ironwood. Replacing it would mean there is still only one way north-south through this area, so any issues, construction, accidents, etc, would result in commuters being forced to take much less efficient paths to get to their destinations. Leaving Ironwood open as is and putting the corridor slightly to the east of San Tan Valley, would mean less impact on residents overall, since the population in those areas is either non-existent or at least significantly less dense, and would keep Ironwood open as an alternate route in the case of issues on the new corridor.</p>	
11/29/2011	Phone	Claire	<p>Concerned that ADA date was 11/22/11, when she received notice on 11/23/11. Has a disabled sister and wants to raise awareness that the incorrect date may discourage disabled interested parties from attending.</p>	<p>Acknowledged concerns and said that notices had gone out at various times, including in the newspapers the week previous. Apologized for the date and asked if any accommodations were needed. Offered to note an ADA date change on the website and at study repositories.</p>
11/29/2011	Phone	Angel Laub	<p>Left a message requesting study information to be sent to her.</p>	<p>Mailed packet of study information.</p>

## Public Involvement Summary

10

Date	Meeting/Comment Type	Name	Comment Transcription	Response
11/30/2011	Website	Raymond Chandler	I have an economical route input on 60 to 10.	N/A
11/30/2011	Website	Ralph Smith	New and Existing Railroads I feel it is important to plan quiet zones for railroads that will pass thru existing neighborhoods. That would mean bringing all existing and future crossings up to code for quiet zones.	Thank you for your comments; they have been documented as part of the study and forwarded to the study team for consideration. Please let me know if you have any additional questions or comments.
11/30/2011	Email	LaNee Lovelady	Thank you for the reply back. It almost seems as the routes going through our neighborhood would be most destructive. I also wanted to quickly add that there is an elementary school in our neighborhood as well. So not only would homes have to be relocated but also a school. Again thank you for listening to my concerns. I truly hope along with a lot of my neighbors that our homes will still be standing once these route alternatives have been decided.	N/A
11/30/2011	Email	James Pruter	I tried to submit my comments on the website, but it keeps saying I have the security code wrong and it won't accept my entry. Im sending you my comments, hoping they will reach the people that read the comments. Below are my comments pasted from website form. Thanks for your time.  Hi. I live in the Laredo Ranch subdivision which is near Combs Rd and Schnepf Rd in San Tan Valley. I noticed that in my area on the map of	Thank you so much for your comments. Rest assured that I will forward them to our ADOT Outreach Team who will ensure that they are posted as part of the official public record for the study.  We are currently working on the North-South Corridor Study Web page, which may have caused a glitch; however, I will look into this because others may have the same problem.

## Public Involvement Summary

11

Date	Meeting/Comment Type	Name	Comment Transcription	Response
			possible routes for the North/South corridor, some of the possible routes are on the West side of the Cap Canal. I'm writing to suggest that these routes should be ruled out. They run too close to the subdivisions of Laredo Ranch, Castle Gate, and numerous others. I suggest that the alternative routes shown on the East side of the CAP canal make a better choice for this area because they put some distance between the freeway and the subdivisions and also because this route makes more sense to meet up with the US 60 at its selected alignment near Gold Canyon. I also suggest that aligning it with Hunt Hwy and Ironwood roads would cause serious disruption to residents daily commutes during construction. In general, the Eastern routes on the map of alternatives look the most logical to me.	Also, look for our electronic email that will have a link to a more detailed survey that you can take which will allow you to comment on the "specific" segments that you find favorable or unfavorable. I will be sending the link before our first public workshop on Dec. 6.  We hope that you will be able to attend one of the workshops so that you can receive more elaborate information, and have the opportunity to ask questions and talk to the engineers and project managers leading the study.  We thank you for your patience. Do not hesitate to contact me for more information in the future.
12/1/2011	Email	James Fugate	I have studied the planned route and think it would be a good project, BUT only when you have the funds to complete it on a cash as you go basis. STOP SPENDING WHAT YOU HAVE NOT GOT ON UNESSENTIAL WORKS!  Thanks for letting me voice my opinion as a taxpayer,	Thank you for your comments; they have been documented as part of the study and forwarded to the study team for consideration. Please let me know if you have any additional questions or comments.
12/2/2011	USPS	William Platt	I favor the most direct route for this North-South Corridor which is the route on Ironwood Road to Hunt Highway,	N/A

## Public Involvement Summary

12

Date	Meeting/Comment Type	Name	Comment Transcription	Response
			then south along Attaway Road to State Highway 87, then south to Interstate Highway 10 near Picacho. This travels over existing right of ways and there is no need to acquire new, expensive right of ways. It would be necessary to improve the existing roads, but that is cheaper than constructing a whole new road if other routes are used. This route does not favor either Coolidge or Florence as the Corridor would be about halfway between the two towns.	
12/2/2011	Email	Alice Bartoo	<p>I am a 6-month resident in the area. I have already noted a dangerous intersection at Gantzel Road and Chandler Heights. Attempting to turn south from Chandler Heights is darned near impossible at times of high traffic. If you consider making Gantzel a part of the route, please include a traffic signal at that intersection.</p> <p>Thank you for the opportunity to comment. I plan to attend your presentation Dec 12th.</p> <p>PS I tried to submit this comment via your website, but the 'security' code that I was to type in was never acceptable. I tried 10 times. Your programmers might want to check that out..... !</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments; they have been documented as part of the study and forwarded to the study team for consideration. Please let me know if you have any additional questions or comments. Thank you for letting us know about the security code. The ADOT web team is looking into the issue; we've received multiple concerns about it.</p>
12/3/2011	Website		<p>This project is long overdue and needs to be done correct to assist the most heavily populated areas.</p> <p>There needs to be an additional</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments; they have been documented as part of the study's official record and forwarded to the study team</p>

## Public Involvement Summary

13

Date	Meeting/Comment Type	Name	Comment Transcription	Response
			connection from some of the heavy eighty thousand plus (80,000+) populated area from Hunts Hwy/Bella Vista Road/across Gentzel Road going over the railroad tracks. The SR 24 selected alignment (202 Fwy) should include additional connections below Ray Rd. possible Germann Rd, Pecos Rd, etc. Are the corridors four (4), six (6) or more lanes without traffic stops?	for consideration. Planning studies conducted by ADOT in recent years in consultation with local, county, state, federal and tribal stakeholders have determined the need for a "high-capacity" transportation corridor in Pinal County. "High-capacity" typically refers to a freeway-type roadway with multiple lanes and limited access, such as SR 202 or I-10; however, various alternatives are currently being studied as part of the North-South Corridor (in coordination with the SR 24 and Intercity Rail teams). A final recommended configuration of the possible North-South roadway in Pinal County will be determined at the conclusion of the study. Please let me know if you have any additional questions or comments.
12/4/2011	Email	George Sealy	Thanks for soliciting comments with regard to the north/south corridor study. I am a Coolidge resident living near the cross-streets of Coolidge and Kenworthy. Here are my comments: 1. I see that there is one alternative that is just east of Arizona Boulevard in Coolidge. I think that is a bit close as it will add a lot of noise with the road traffic. I live on the west side of the city and some mornings I can hear the train going by on the east side. In my opinion, the cross point of the highway over 287 should be closer to midway between	Thank you for your comments; they have been documented as part of the study and forwarded to the study team for consideration. Please let me know if you have any additional questions or comments.



## Public Involvement Summary

14

Date	Meeting/Comment Type	Name	Comment Transcription	Response
			<p>Coolidge and Florence. I see that you have several different alternatives there. It would also serve the Florence citizens better.</p> <p>2. It seems as though widening 87 near Eloy would be the most cost-effective solution. There is not too much residential housing in the I-10/87 area.</p> <p>3. Connecting directly into 202 (as part of the SR 24 alignment) would actually work better for me.</p>	
12/5/2011	Email	Thom Schuett	<p>When it comes time to number the new route, consider that the numbering of the 202 is not only stupid, it is dangerous. If an accident occurs at the 202 and Val Vista, where will emergency response go? Will they go to the north (Red Mountain) or south (San Tan)? Number the route, don't name it, and give it a unique number not some number that already exists.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments; they have been documented as part of the study and forwarded to the study team for consideration. Please let me know if you have any additional questions or comments.</p>
12/5/2011	Website	Nelson Chandler	<p>I'm just writing to say the Ironwood/87 north-south route that meets hunt hwy makes the most sense for commuters because it is the most direct route for people in San Tan Valley, the largest growing community in the study, to get to the phoenix area, plus businesses are already set up along that route. The 2nd best option is the canal route that intersects Arizona Farms. Anything east of the canal route is a waste of time and money. The only good north-south road in the area is Ironwood and commuters are already using it like a freeway</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments; they have been documented as part of the study and forwarded to the study team for consideration. Please let me know if you have any additional questions or comments.</p>

## Public Involvement Summary

15

Date	Meeting/Comment Type	Name	Comment Transcription	Response
			anyway.	
12/5/2011	Email	Kelly Granger	<p>I tried several times to complete the comment form on the <a href="http://www.azdot.gov/northsouthcorridorstudy">www.azdot.gov/northsouthcorridorstudy</a>, but was not able to submit it as the 'captcha' security code would not be accepted. My comments are as follows: Please do not use the "Hunt Hwy route. The San Tan Valley area is already very congested and travel times through that area are high. It would be more convenient for my area (Coolidge) to use the option that follows Rt 87 through and extends Attaway Road directly to Rt 60. I would like to receive updates on this project via email.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments; they have been documented as part of the study and forwarded to the study team for consideration. The ADOT web team is looking into the captcha issue.</p> <p>We'll add you to the email list to received updates, and please let me know if you have any additional questions or comments.</p>
12/7/2011	Email	Roc Arnett	<p>I have been part of the effort to develop a "vision" of future use and economic plan for the area south of Apache Junction and north of Florence now called Superstitions Vistas. As part of the visioning process, we envisioned included roads of regional significance in the area to maximize the development potential of the "Vistas". The purpose of this memo is to present information regarding the North-South Corridor as well as the East-West Corridors of Florence Junction to Combs Road (FJ to Combs) and regarding the SR 24 connection from 3-4 miles north of Florence Junctions to connect to SR 24 at Ironwood. These thoughts reflect the years of my involvement going back to the days I served as a member of the</p>	<p>Thank you for your phone call. I received your email with the maps and project preferences and will share the information. It will also be added to our comment summary for review.</p>

## Public Involvement Summary

16

Date	Meeting/Comment Type	Name	Comment Transcription	Response
			<p>ADOT Board. <b>Pinal County, Regional Significant Routes for Safety and Mobility (RSRSM):</b> As you know, in 2008, Pinal County completed their RSRSM and included in that report was the list of the roads represented by the map I'm attaching to this email. One of those roads is identified as the east/west route from Florence Junction to Combs Road at Queen Creek. This has long been a potential road of regional significance to Pinal County and is recognized on their 2008 map. Attached is a copy of RSRSM and the website where it is available. <b>ADOT Action:</b> When I served on the ADOT Board and as part of planning effort lead by Dale Buskirk, action was taken to develop a route that would run as a continuations from the intersection Florence Junctions west-southwest that would match up to Combs Road on the east side of Queen Creek in Pinal County. For reference, I have attached a map published back at that time from ADOT indicating a future possible corridor. The thought process was then and actually continues to be the corridor would run from Florence Junction on the east, through northern Pinal county and Queen Creek along Combs Road. Combs Road becomes Riggs Road and would continue westerly across the bottom of southeastern Maricopa county reaching I-10 on the west. I recognize that although ADOT took this action there was no funding to match and efforts have been made to use other</p>	

## Public Involvement Summary

17

Date	Meeting/Comment Type	Name	Comment Transcription	Response
			<p>corridors to serve future traffic. I don't believe, however, the State Dept. of Transportation has ever taken Board action that would reverse action taken twelve years ago. ADOT's map is also attached. <b>Superstition Vistas Steering Committee (SVSC)</b> Transportation working maps: The maps that are used and have been produced from our work with our consultants include this same corridor (FJ to Combs). Our maps conceptually list this corridor as an Arizona Parkway, which is a grade higher than a regional road of significance. We have kept this concept in our work program. The thinking of the Superstition Vistas Steering Committee (SVSC) is to space the freeways or Arizona Parkways, about six to seven miles apart. This is the similar distance or relationship of freeways ADOT, MAG and for that matter, Wilbur Smith, used for the space relationship of the Red Mountain 202, the US 60 and the 202 San Tan in the East Valley. These corridors also are about six to seven miles apart. It was felt this is consistent planning criteria that should well be continued in the conceptual plan for SV. SVSC thinks that it makes sense for the FJ to Combs, SR 24 formerly 802 corridors to be included in your conceptual presentation to the county. Note the "draft" working maps attached. As additional information that may give input to the significant regional roads in the SV area, attached is the map form DMB's work showing the corridors that</p>	

## Public Involvement Summary

18

Date	Meeting/Comment Type	Name	Comment Transcription	Response
			<p>will continue into SV, i.e. Elliott, Warner and Ray roads. I also attach the Portales roads conceptual network map. It is a draft also but indicates the connectivity with AJ and SV. Finally:</p> <p><b>Maricopa County Department of Transportation</b> work program: In addition to the information above, we have learned that McDOT is planning to include the Combs/Riggs Road extension from the Meridian county line west to Crismon Road in their 2012 – 2016 work plan, although it has not yet been published. This would complete the corridor from FJ to Combs to Riggs to I -10 helping complete a connection that was the originally conceived concept by people at ADOT and McDOT who had in mind the continuous thoroughfare from Florence Junction to Riggs Road to I -10. We believe that this will eventually become a major east-west thoroughfare that eventually could be some type of modified controlled access with six lanes. Obviously there are some issues, but we think the concept has a great deal of merit and we are trying to move it forward in the big picture. After a review of the history above and my involvement over the years, my recommendation for the North-South (Using your Comment Form Map) is as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Corridor I to</li> <li>· Corridor M to</li> <li>· Corridor S to</li> <li>· Corridors T or W to</li> <li>· Corridor X</li> </ul>	

## Public Involvement Summary

19

Date	Meeting/Comment Type	Name	Comment Transcription	Response
			I would be happy to discuss any of these ideas or issues in greater detail as needed.	
12/8/2011	Website	Leo Guilmette	<p>1. additional obstruction is area 4W on Bella Vista between Quail Run and Attaway: large SRP Solar Panel farm. 2. I favor a route in the western part of 4W and 5W that would service existing developments: In the general San Tan Valley area, especially Johnson Ranch, Copper Basin &amp; Merrill Ranch. 3.Route would start at the East-West connector to 202, south east on eastern side of CAP, cross CAP at Skyline Dr., southwest to Bella Vista &amp; Quail Run, south along west side of Quail Run to railroad, then south-east along RR, then south along eastern side of Oasis dev. into western edge of area 5W. Interchanges at Ocotillo, Skyline Dr., Bella Vista, east side of Copper Mine Road and Arizona Farms Rd, and Merrill Ranch Blvd west of Hunt highway. Routes further east would be redundant to Rt79 and interfere with master planning of Superstition Vista super-parcel. Traffic volume along Hunt Highway, Ganzle and Gary roads is near full volume any time of the day or night. The route I have proposed would mitigate the congestion and provide access to eastern parcels for future developement while avoiding all existing developements. 4.Alternate route would stay east of CAP, cross Judd Rd east of power switching yard and west of existing dev. (This would be outside the</p>	Thank you for your comments; they have been documented as part of the study's official record and forwarded to the study team for consideration. Please let me know if you have any additional questions or comments.

## Public Involvement Summary

20

Date	Meeting/Comment Type	Name	Comment Transcription	Response
			4W area) then cross CAP and take a general south west tract to Hunt highway east of Oasis dev & west of Merrill Ranch. This route would provide less opportunity for interchanges but it also minimizes direction changes.	
12/8/2011	Phone	Edwin Orenberg	Lives in "no man's land". New people coming in. What's going on? Can't afford to move, very disappointed if forced to move. Never, ever give up my house.	Thank you for your comments. We will send you a larger project map and comment form. These will be added to the project comment summary and shared with the team.
12/13/2011	Email		I live in Pinal County and would like to have more information regarding the North-South Corridor project. Can you please email me images and maps to what exactly is being planned?	I've attached two maps of the possible route alternatives, along with the project fact sheet, FAQs and glossary of terms. The website, <a href="http://www.azdot.gov/northsouthcorridorstudy">www.azdot.gov/northsouthcorridorstudy</a> , has additional detailed information about the project, including the presentation given at the public workshops held in the last week.
12/14/2011	Phone	Larry Wolfswinkel	Requesting project information be sent to him, doesn't have a computer.	Packet sent.
12/28/2011	USPS	Barry Jones	Marked desired route on map from invitation.	N/A
12/31/2011	Website	Michael-Monica Vickers	On the website map, there is a proposed route on Felix Road. The map says there is no residential housing in the area. The map is incorrect and needs to be updated. There are many	Thank you for your comments; they have been documented as part of the study's official record and forwarded to the study team for consideration.

## Public Involvement Summary

21

Date	Meeting/Comment Type	Name	Comment Transcription	Response
			residential developments not shown on the map. Please advise.1/3	<p>I have forwarded your concern regarding Wild Horse Estates and Felix Road to the technical team for review.</p> <p>Please let me know if you have any additional questions or comments.</p>
1/1/2012	Website	Raymond Parker	<p>We (my neighbors) want to know who drafted up the proposed route that goes through the neighborhood of Crestview to the North of us (Wild Horse Estates) and runs right next to our houses on Felix Rd.??? You should know without a doubt that we don't want a noisy, dirty freeway against our homes! We figure this is an oversight/ mistake in the layout &amp; would like for you to pull that particular part off the map entirely! This would be the L, P or G parts. Myself, living here for 9yrs, I think the most direct &amp; commonsensical route comes off of Ironwood- A,E,G,H,D- northern, Y, Z, AA- southern.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments; they have been documented as part of the study's official record and forwarded to the study team for consideration.</p> <p>I have forwarded your concern regarding Wild Horse Estates and Felix Road to the technical team for review.</p> <p>Please let me know if you have any additional questions or comments.</p>
1/1/2012	Website	Kenneth Redding	<p>Wild Horse Estates: Many homeowners and myself are very concerned regarding the proposal of building a freeway on Felix Rd. The maps that I looked at seems to be showing this area we live in is a grey area, showing non residential. This is not the case. There are many homes right off of Felix Rd. and a freeway would cause problems with noise, pollution and loss in property</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments; they have been documented as part of the study's official record and forwarded to the study team for consideration. Please let me know if you have any additional questions or comments. I will forward your concern regarding Felix Road and Wild Horse Estates to the technical team for</p>



## Public Involvement Summary

22

Date	Meeting/Comment Type	Name	Comment Transcription	Response
			value. There is plenty of land and roads east of Felix Rd. to pursue the freeway project. Please look into these concerns.	review.
1/1/2012	Website	Donna Tilley	You have Wild horse Estates as a non-residential area. All The lots have a house built on them. I live in 9930 E. Pinto Pony Dr., Florence, AZ 85132, a house in Wild Horse Estates. I do not think the use of Felix Rd. as a 4 to 6 lane high way would be best for our children, noise pollution, or air pollution. The best route without disturbing existing neighborhoods for the North South Corridor would be to use the existing Hwy 79. There are no existing houses to be disturbed and there is already an existing road to follow.	Thank you for your comments; they have been documented as part of the study's official record and forwarded to the study team for consideration. Please let me know if you have any additional questions or comments.
1/2/2012	Website	Benny Graves	It seems to me you are not aware of such housing developments on Felix Road such as Wild Horse Estates and Crestfield Manor. Your map shows them as future construction, these homes have been here for several years now and we would like to be recognized. Sections L, P, and Q look as though they would run right next to our neighborhoods and we do not want our quiet, out of the way neighborhood disturbed in that manner.	Thank you for your comments; they have been documented as part of the study's official record and forwarded to the study team for consideration. The technical team is reviewing the maps regarding Felix Road, Wild Horse Estates and Crestfield Manor. Please let me know if you have any additional questions or comments.
1/4/2012	Email	Raymond Parker	That is exactly what we're talking about! You've got the freeway running right inline with the entrances to our neighborhood! You know full well you wouldn't want a freeway against your	Thank you for your additional feedback and comments. They have been documented as part of the study's official record and forwarded to the study team for

## Public Involvement Summary

23

Date	Meeting/Comment Type	Name	Comment Transcription	Response
			neighborhood! We moved out here to get away from the city & the noise. This isn't going to be the route! No way! The problem is usually people can't attend or forget the date, as I did! It's is definitely not because we're not very concerned!	additional consideration.
1/4/2012	Email	Michael-Monica Vickers	It will be nearly impossible to "avoid" the residences along Felix Road. The neighborhoods are well established. Thank you for keeping us informed.	N/A
1/7/2012	Website	Tony Brown	I would like to see the North-South Corridor alignment follow the most westerly corridor (Ironwood Rd., Hunt Hwy., AZ 87).	Thank you for your comments; they have been documented as part of the study's official record and forwarded to the study team for consideration. Please let me know if you have any additional questions or comments.
1/8/2012	Website	Sandra Walker	My experience with providing input on "proposed" projects is that it has little or no impact (such as the SRP lines that follow the railroad tracks about 1/4 mile from our homes), but I want to comment, in the hope that someone actually checks it out..., that the WILDHORSE ESTATES DEVELOPMENT IS A RESIDENTIAL AREA. It is zoned for horses/large animals and we do not want a multi-lane highway at our back door bringing noise and pollution. We moved out of the city into a county island for exactly that reason. If the highway follows Felix Rd	Thank you for your comments; they have been documented as part of the study's official record and forwarded to the study team for consideration. Please let me know if you have any additional questions or comments.

## Public Involvement Summary

24

Date	Meeting/Comment Type	Name	Comment Transcription	Response
			from Hunt to Arizona Farms Rd it will destroy what we enjoy. WE DO NOT WANT ANY ROUTE THAT HAS SEGMENTS L, P OR Q. Let the road follow Hwy 79 as there are no homes along that route (Segments I, M, S, W or X).	
1/9/2012	Website	Wendy Fuller	I think you should come out in the proposed area door to door and ask all residents in affected area residing already their views on proposed new six-lane interruption and get their views as to where they would like to see road growth. Would be nice to be included in decision making process instead of having it just sprung on without notice to the up-heaval condition.	Thank you for your comments; they have been documented as part of the study's official record and forwarded to the study team for consideration. Stay tuned for more information about another round of public meetings to be held in the next year. Please let me know if you have any additional questions or comments.
1/12/2012	Email	Sandy Bahr	<p>Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments on the possible route alternatives in the North-South Corridor Study. Please accept these comments on behalf of the Sierra Club's Grand Canyon Chapter and our 12,000 members in Arizona. We incorporate our previous comments on this study – submitted November 11, 2010, and August 15, 2011 – by reference.</p> <p>We currently do not support any of the possible route alignments shown on the study maps. Most of these routes include construction of new roads, yet these roads are redundant to others in the area. As we discussed in our previous comments, this corridor is an</p>	Your comments have been documented as part of the study and forwarded to the study team for consideration. Please let me know if you have any additional questions or comments.

## Public Involvement Summary

25

Date	Meeting/Comment Type	Name	Comment Transcription	Response
			<p>environmentally-sensitive area, and construction and disturbance should be kept to a minimum. Additionally, any new roads will only provide short-term congestion relief on existing roadways. The new roads and expansion of existing ones will soon be just as congested as the current roads. As noted in the December 2011 presentation, the northern third of the corridor consists primarily of undeveloped desert landscape, and the remaining two-thirds are mostly agricultural areas. These lands are invaluable for both people and wildlife, providing important habitat, clean air and water, recreation opportunities, and much more. We appreciate that the Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) and other collaborators recognize that the North South Corridor is only part of the solution to travel needs and that any plans must be supplemented by transit as well as enhancements in traffic safety and operations. Emphasis should be given to these needed improvements. Are transportation improvements such as these currently planned? The study frequently references the Intercity Rail Study, but what other transit measures are being considered? How is ADOT working to improve traffic safety and operations through this stretch? Is funding available for these needs? Based on the information provided, it seems as though ADOT is moving forward with the road-building aspect of</p>	

## Public Involvement Summary

26

Date	Meeting/Comment Type	Name	Comment Transcription	Response
			<p>the North South Corridor without ensuring that other needs are met as well. At this point, mass transit options should be the only build alternatives considered for this area. In order to minimize environmental damage and maximize effectiveness, the mass transit route(s) should follow existing roadways whenever possible. Providing alternate transportation choices can not only meet current and future travel demands, but it can also provide a cost-effective solution, benefit the environment by reducing pollution and lessening damage from new or expanded roadways, provide a more pleasurable and useful travel experience for passengers, and benefit public health through a variety of mechanisms, including reduced pollution, less stressful travel, and more. Conversely, vehicle-centered development increases congestion, sprawl, pollution, anxiety, and negative public health impacts. Moreover, property values near transit routes frequently increase, whereas values near heavily used freeways often decrease. Education and enforcement are also key components to solving transportation problems. Driving habits are one of the primary barriers to smoothly flowing traffic (e.g., slower traffic riding in the left lane, tailgating, speeding, and so forth). These conditions will remain the same regardless of whether or not new roads are built or existing ones expanded, and these conditions will continue to cause</p>	

## Public Involvement Summary

27

Date	Meeting/Comment Type	Name	Comment Transcription	Response
			<p>congestion and accidents. ADOT should be reaching out to drivers to inform them of ways to assist the flow of traffic and to ensure public safety. Similarly, additional enforcement in congested or accident-prone areas can help relieve problems.</p> <p>If ADOT decides to move forward with a build alternative that does not focus primarily on transit, we encourage it to utilize existing roadways as much as possible rather than building any new routes. State Route (SR) 79, 287, and 87 appear to provide a suitable travel way in the corridor, yet only portions of some of these roads are discussed or shown as possible routes. If a road-oriented build alternative is selected, we again stress that transit must be included in conjunction with those. We also do not support a tolled roadway as it is a mechanism for pushing forward unwise, unsustainable, and destructive projects with even less accountability to the public. Thank you again for the opportunity to comment on this project. We look forward to learning more about plans for this area.</p>	
1/12/2012	Website	Loree Jegtvig	<p>There are 2 existing housing developments on Felix Rd. south of Arizona Farms road that are not shown on the map. I would not like a highway next to my back yard which is open to Felix. The path down Ironwood looks like the simplest route. We have gone to the Interstate from here several times</p>	<p>I've attached a close-up of the map that gives a clearer indication as to where residences are located along Felix Road. The residential areas are within a yellow part of the map that is designated as an area where development is "Active, Under</p>

## Public Involvement Summary

28

Date	Meeting/Comment Type	Name	Comment Transcription	Response
			and there is very little traffic through Coolidge, so I have a hard time seeing a need for any new route. Please look again at the homes along Felix Road.	Construction, or Start by 2020". The possible route alternatives have been located so as to avoid the residences. We understand that, even if the residences are avoided, there is still a high level of concern about a possible route alternative being located that close to residences. That concern has been documented as part of the study record and forwarded to the technical team for consideration. Please let me know if you have any additional questions or comments.

*This page is intentionally left blank.*



# **North/South Corridor Study**

## **Alternative Selection Report**

### **Public Meeting Summary Report**

**July 2015**

Prepared by  
Arizona Department of Transportation  
206 S. 17th Ave.  
Phoenix, AZ 85007

In cooperation with  
U.S. Department of Transportation  
Federal Highway Administration

Federal-aid No. STP 999-A(365)X ADOT Project No. 999 PN 000 H7454 01L

Abstract: This document summarizes the public outreach meetings conducted by the Arizona Department of Transportation at the completion of the North South Corridor Study Alternatives Selection Report in the fall of 2014. Included in this summary report are the public comments that were received in response to this outreach.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION.....	4
1.0 Overview of Public Involvement Plan.....	4
2.0 Alternatives Selection Report Public Information Meetings.....	5
2.1 News Release.....	5
2.2 Newspaper Display Notices.....	6
3.0 Open House.....	6
3.1 Presentation .....	6
3.2 Website .....	6
4.0 Public Comments.....	6
4.1 Written Comments.....	7
4.2 Web Comments.....	7
4.3 Email Comments.....	7
4.4 Telephone Comments.....	7
5.0 Results.....	7
5.1 Quantified Summary of Participation.....	8
6.0 Title VI – Civil Rights.....	8
Appendix A. Public Meeting Handout .....	9
Appendix B. News Release.....	10
Appendix C. Newspaper Display Notice.....	11
Appendix D. Display Boards.....	12
Appendix E. Presentation.....	18
Appendix F. Comment Form.....	36
Appendix G. Comment Table.....	40
Exhibit 1. Town of Florence Resolution 1490-14.....	90
Exhibit 2. City of Eloy.....	92
Exhibit 3. Rose Law Group.....	94
Exhibit 4. Superstition Vistas.....	97
Exhibit 5. Pinal Land Holdings.....	99
Exhibit 6. Rittenhouse Army Heliport & The North-South Corridor Study.....	103

## Introduction

The Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) and Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) are studying the area between U.S. Route 60 (US 60) in Apache Junction and Interstate 10 (I-10) near Eloy. The purpose of the study is to identify and evaluate a possible route to provide a connection between these two areas.

The study is currently in the alternative selection phase, which means the study team will be looking at a range of possible route alternatives, including the effects of taking no action on any improvements (also known as a no-build option).

The study team started with a 900 square-mile study area, which was refined to the 300 square-mile corridor opportunity area that was presented at the fall 2010 public and agency scoping meetings. After receiving input from the public and various agencies, the team has reduced it even further.

To help the study team evaluate the possible route alternatives, the corridor has been divided into multiple corridor segments, which allows the team to understand the unique opportunities and challenges within each segment to determine whether the selected route alternative could be placed there. The study team is collecting and studying technical information for each segment, including existing and future developments, drainage, soil structure, utilities, travel demand, population growth and the economic development of each community. In addition to the technical information and input from local agencies and communities about their preferences, the team is using the study purpose and need statement as a guide to develop potential route alternatives.

This document summarizes the agency and public outreach and input received on possible route alternatives for the North–South Corridor Study during the fall 2014 Alternatives Selection Report (ARS) public information meetings.

### 1.0 Overview of Public Involvement Plan

For this study, a *Public Outreach Plan* was developed to describe in detail how ADOT, FHWA and the study team would inform, involve, and obtain meaningful input from the public, elected officials, media, and agencies regarding the North/ South Corridor Study, while in compliance with the requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and other related legislation, policy and guidance (this document is available on the project web page, see <http://azdot.gov/projects/south-central/north-south-corridor-study>). The goals of the public outreach program associated with the North/ South Corridor Study included:

- Identify potential study stakeholders such as local officials and community members impacted by the study
- Develop partnering activities that assist with gathering information from stakeholders
- Foster a positive relationship with stakeholders and keep them informed of the study progress
- Adequately evaluate potential levels of controversy to address specific concerns and develop context sensitive plans
- Work together to develop a transportation solution that has broad public support

## **2.0 Alternatives Selection Report Public Information Meetings**

ADOT and FHWA held the following Alternatives Selection Report Public Information Meetings in the evening from 6-8 p.m.:

- Monday, Nov. 17, 2014 at Walker Butte Elementary School, 29697 N Desert Willow Boulevard, Queen Creek, AZ
- Tuesday, Nov. 18, 2014 at Santa Cruz High School, 900 N Main Street, Eloy, AZ
- Wednesday, Nov. 19, 2014 at Apache Junction High School, 2525 S Ironwood Drive, Apache Junction, AZ
- Thursday, Nov. 20 at Coolidge-Florence Elks Lodge, 2241 N. Attaway Road, Coolidge, AZ.

The purpose of the Alternatives Selection Report Public Information Meetings was to provide information about the recently completed Alternative Selection Report as part of the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the North/ South Corridor Study. The ASR has identified the reasonable route alternatives to be carried forward for detailed assessment. The public was invited to attend the meetings and learn more about the study and to give comments.

The Alternatives Selection Report Public Information Meetings began with registration at the door, where attendees were asked to sign in and were provided with a handout. The sign-in sheets were created solely for the purpose of updating the mailing list. An open house then began, where attendees were encouraged to walk around the various stations, view the displays, and ask questions of the study team. A formal presentation was provided by the lead agency, and after the presentation, attendees were given the opportunity to revisit the stations. The public meeting handout can be found in Appendix A.

The ADOT project team met with the following tribal groups and provided an overview of the Alternatives Section Report:

- Monday, Jan. 5, 2015 with Gila River Indian Community District One (six District Council members and 14 attendees in the audience)
- Tuesday, Jan. 6, 2015 with Gila River Indian Community District Three (three Council members and eight attendees in the audience)
- Monday, Feb. 2, 2015 with Gila River Indian Community District Two
- Friday, Feb. 6, 2015 with Tohono O'odham Nation Agriculture and Natural Resources Committee

No written comments were received at these meetings.

## **2.1 News Release**

ADOT issued a news release on November 6, 2014 providing public information meeting details and the methods to provide comments. The copy of the news release is included in Appendix B. The news release was distributed to more than 4,000 news organizations, professional journalists and others subscribed to ADOT's distribution list.

## **2.2 Newspaper Display Notices**

Print advertising was used extensively to provide information about the public information meetings as required by NEPA. Newspaper advertisements (Appendix C) providing the date and location of the Alternatives Selection Report Public Information Meetings were published in the following newspapers:

- Gila River Indian News (Nov. 7, 2014)
- Casa Grande Dispatch (Nov. 4, 2014)
- Coolidge Examiner (Nov. 5, 2014)
- Florence Reminder and Blade- Tribune (Nov. 6, 2014)
- Eloy Enterprise (Nov. 6, 2014)

## **3.0 Open House**

During the Open House portion of the public information meetings, study information, maps, resources, and staff were set up in an open house style. Copies of the Alternatives Selection Report were available for review, staff was available to answer questions and comment forms were provided at tables for written comments.

In addition to information boards that provided general information (welcome, speaker registration, etc.) the following subject areas were displayed in the Open House area which can be found in Appendix D:

- Project Need and Purpose
- Alternative Evaluation Process
- Study Schedule
- Study Area

Representatives from the ADOT Right-of-Way Group and ADOT Environmental Planning Group were also present at the meetings to help answer questions specific to these areas.

## **3.1 Presentation**

Participants heard a formal presentation at 6:30 p.m. presented by the project team (Appendix E).

## **3.2 Website**

The study website was updated and the web address was published on all informational materials. Alternatives Selection Report Public Information Meetings and study details were provided on the website: [azdot.gov/NorthSouthCorridorStudy](http://azdot.gov/NorthSouthCorridorStudy).

## **4.0 Public Comments**

All comments received were reviewed for the specific issues or recommendations raised by the commenter. During the comment period, comments could be submitted in a variety of ways - mail,

telephone and e-mail. A total of 114 comments were received during the official comment period ending January 9, 2015.

#### **4.1 Written Comments**

Written comments via a comment form (Appendix F) consisted of individual comments received via U.S. mail or in person at the public information meetings. Comment forms were available at the public information meetings. Participants could complete the comment forms at the event and place them in a comment box. Participants also had the option of taking the form home and returning it by mail or fax at a later date.

#### **4.2 Web Comments**

An online comment form was developed for the public to utilize on the study website ([azdot.gov/NorthSouthCorridorStudy](http://azdot.gov/NorthSouthCorridorStudy)). This form was linked from both the study website homepage and the meeting page of the website. (64 comments)

#### **4.3 Email Comments**

The email account ([projects@azdot.gov](mailto:projects@azdot.gov)) was utilized for electronic comments. (41 comments)

#### **4.4 Telephone Comments**

Participants could also submit comments through the study telephone line (855.712.8530) (No comments).

### **5.0 Results**

Over 120 comments were received in response to the outreach efforts. Responses ranged from support for the project, to requests for more information and naming suggestions for the proposed facility.

To summarize the comments, responses were grouped into general categories (ex. "Objections to proposed alternative and/or alternative segment"). Categories were not mutually exclusive and commenters may fit into multiple categories (e.g., noting objections to a proposed alternative and/or alternative segment, while also specifying a route preference). Approximately one-third of respondents (37 percent) offered general support for roadway infrastructure improvements to improve transportation for the region. A similar number expressed their interest in a specific route alternative or alternatives (34 percent), while a smaller number of respondents voiced opposition to one or another alternative (26 percent). Nearly a quarter (23 percent) of responses voiced support for the Town of Florence Resolution, which identifies the Town's preference for an alternative. Approximately 15 percent of respondents asked for more information. Nearly five percent expressed opposition to the project in general. All of the comments and the study team's responses may be found in Appendix G.

## 5.1 Quantified Summary of Participation

For each outreach technique, the number of participants was tracked using sign-in-sheets, visual counts, tallies, and computer reports. The table below shows the number of participants in the 30-day comment period, organized by participation method. It should be noted that the cumulative total does not represent “unique” participants; a single person could be counted in multiple categories, for example, some individuals attended the public hearing, provided public testimony and written comments.

Outreach Participants	
Participation method	Participation Numbers
ADOT Email	41
Web Comments	64
Telephone Comments	0
Written Comments	11
Public Meeting Attendance	361
Total Participation	475

## 6.0 Title VI – Civil Rights

Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and related statutes assure that all individuals are not excluded from participation in, denied the benefit of, or subjected to discrimination on the basis of race, color, national origin, sex, age and disability. Executive Order 12898 on Environmental Justice directs that programs, policies, and activities not have a disproportionately high and adverse human health and environmental effect on minority and low-income populations. Outreach efforts were designed and implemented to ensure that these protected populations were provided the opportunity to participate in the public review of the RSA.

ADOT’s goal is to prevent discrimination through the impact of its programs, policies and activities. In accordance with ADOT’s Title VI Policy, the following tasks were undertaken at the public information meetings:


- Title VI brochures were available (in both English and Spanish) to attendees.
- A Title VI Public Notice was displayed.
- Statistical data of meeting attendees was collected via a voluntary Title VI Self Identification Survey card.
- Offered Americans with Disability Act accommodations at the public information meetings.



## Appendix A: Public Meeting Handout

# You're Invited! North-South Corridor Study

The Arizona Department of Transportation, in partnership with the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), is conducting the North-South Corridor Study. Once completed, the study will identify an alignment for the proposed 45-mile transportation corridor in Pinal County that links U.S. 60 near Apache Junction, south to Interstate 10 near Eloy.



## UPCOMING MEETINGS

Come and provide your input on the proposed corridors that were identified in the Alternatives Selection Report (shown in graphic).

All meetings will be held from 6 – 8 p.m. with a formal presentation by ADOT at 6:30 p.m.

- ▶ **Monday, Nov. 17**  
Walker Butte Elementary,  
29697 N. Desert Willow Blvd., Queen Creek
- ▶ **Tuesday, Nov. 18**  
Santa Cruz High School,  
900 N. Main St., Eloy
- ▶ **Wednesday, Nov. 19**  
Apache Junction High School,  
2525 S. Ironwood Drive, Apache Junction
- ▶ **Thursday, Nov. 20**  
Coolidge-Florence Elks Lodge,  
2241 N. Attaway Road, Coolidge

## WHAT'S NEXT?

In accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) will be completed to evaluate potential environmental impacts, such as: cultural and biological resources, socioeconomic and geological conditions, land ownership, air quality, noise impacts and water resources. In coordination with the EIS a preliminary engineering design (Design Concept Report) will also be completed.

## YOUR INPUT IS IMPORTANT

Please submit your written feedback at one of the public meetings, or by one of the following methods:

- ✓ **Online:** [azdot.gov/NorthSouthCorridorStudy](http://azdot.gov/NorthSouthCorridorStudy)
- ✓ **Email:** [projects@azdot.gov](mailto:projects@azdot.gov)
- ✓ **Phone:** 855.712.8530
- ✓ **Mail:** c/o North South Corridor Study,  
1655 W Jackson, #126F, Phoenix, AZ 85007


Submit comments by Jan. 9, 2015, in order to be included in the project record.

## STUDY PROCESS



999 PN 000 H7454 01L, and federal number: 999-A(365)X

14-471



FOR MORE INFORMATION:

855.712.8530

[azdot.gov/NorthSouthCorridorStudy](http://azdot.gov/NorthSouthCorridorStudy)

## Appendix B: News Release

ADOT News Release

### ADOT to hold meetings for North-South Corridor Study in Pinal County

November 06, 2014

For additional information:

**ADOT Media  
Relations**  
[news@azdot.gov](mailto:news@azdot.gov)  
**800.949.8057**

PHOENIX — The Arizona Department of Transportation, in a partnership with the Federal Highway Administration, is hosting a series of public meetings in Pinal County on the North-South Corridor Study, which is a proposed 45-mile transportation corridor that would link US 60 near Apache Junction, south to Interstate 10 near Eloy.

The meetings will provide information about the recently completed Alternatives Selection Report, as part of the Environmental Impact Statement/Design Concept Report for the **North-South Corridor Study**.

The Alternatives Section Report evaluated all the potential locations for the proposed highway and narrowed it down to possible corridors. Once completed, the North-South Corridor Study will identify a preferred alignment for the proposed transportation corridor in Pinal County.

The public is invited to attend the meetings and learn more about the study, possible routes and to provide comments.

**All meetings will be held from 6 – 8 p.m. with a formal presentation at 6:30 p.m. followed by an open house.**

- **Monday, Nov. 17** – Walker Butte Elementary School, 29697 N. Desert Willow Blvd., Queen Creek
- **Tuesday, Nov. 18** – Santa Cruz High School, 900 N. Main St., Eloy
- **Wednesday, Nov. 19** – Apache Junction High School, 2525 S. Ironwood Drive, Apache Junction
- **Thursday, Nov. 20** – Coolidge-Florence Elks Lodge, 2241 N. Attaway Road, Coolidge

In order for potential projects to move forward, they would need to be added to ADOT's Five-Year Transportation Facilities Construction Program. This Five-Year Program serves as a blueprint for future projects and designates how much local, state and federal funding is allocated for those projects. A potential project goes through several levels of review to become part of the Tentative Five-Year Program before the program is presented to the State Transportation Board for consideration and formal approval.

For more information, please visit [azdot.gov/northsouthcorridorstudy](http://azdot.gov/northsouthcorridorstudy).



# Please Join Us for Public Meetings

The Arizona Department of Transportation and Federal Highway Administration will hold public information meetings to provide information about the recently completed Alternatives Selection Report (ASR) as part of the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS)/Design Concept Report for the **North-South Corridor Study**. The ASR has identified the reasonable route alternatives to be carried forward for detailed assessment. The public is invited to attend the meetings and learn more about the study and to give your comments.

All meetings will be held from 6-8 p.m. with a formal presentation at 6:30 p.m. followed by an open house.

## Monday, Nov. 17

Walker Butte Elementary School,  
29697 N. Desert Willow Blvd.,  
Queen Creek

## Tuesday, Nov. 18

Santa Cruz High School,  
900 N. Main St., Eloy

## Wednesday, Nov. 19

Apache Junction High School,  
2525 S. Ironwood Drive,  
Apache Junction

## Thursday, Nov. 20

Coolidge-Florence Elks Lodge,  
2241 N. Attaway Road, Coolidge



Persons that require a reasonable accommodation based on language or a disability should contact ADOT at [projects@azdot.gov](mailto:projects@azdot.gov) or 855.712.8530. Requests should be made as early as possible to ensure the State has an opportunity to address the accommodation.

999 PN 000 H7454 01L, and federal number: 999-A(365)X 14-469

**ADOT**



U.S. Department of Transportation  
**Federal Highway  
Administration**

FOR MORE INFORMATION:  
email [projects@azdot.gov](mailto:projects@azdot.gov) or call 855.712.8530  
[azdot.gov/NorthSouthCorridorStudy](http://azdot.gov/NorthSouthCorridorStudy)

Appendix D: Display Boards

# North-South Corridor Study

# WELCOME





## Public Meeting



November 17–20, 2014

Federal-aid No. STP 999-A(365)X  
ADOT Project No. 999 PN 000 H7454 01L

# North-South Corridor Study

## What is the project?

ADOT is working with affected stakeholder agencies and the public to evaluate reasonable and feasible route alternatives for a proposed 45-mile, north-south transportation corridor in Pinal County and to prepare environmental documents and preliminary design plans for a phased implementation of the project.



## What is the purpose?



There is a demonstrated need for greater north-south roadway connectivity through central Pinal County.

### Population Growth Projections

**1.1 M** Pinal County by 2050



**9.4 M** Maricopa, Pima, and Pinal Counties by 2050

**11.2 M** Arizona by 2050

### The project would:

- Provide a continuous north-south route through central Pinal County
- Relieve traffic on I-10
- Improve access to future activity centers
- Create a more direct connection to the eastern portion of the Phoenix metropolitan area
- Relieve congestion anticipated from projected growth




Federal-aid No. STP 999-A(365)X  
ADOT Project No. 999 PN 000 H7454 01L




# North-South Corridor Study

## How were the alternatives selected?



# North-South Corridor Study

## Route alternatives recommended for study in the EIS



# North-South Corridor Study

## Study Documents



Study is here




Federal-aid No. STP 999-A(365)X  
ADOT Project No. 999 PN 000 H7454 01L



# North-South Corridor Study

## STUDY PROCESS



### Next Steps

Following a recommendation, a record of decision (ROD) would be issued by the FHWA (only after project meets fiscal constraints). If the ROD selects the Build Alternative, design would commence, followed by authorization for property acquisition and construction.



## How to comment

YOUR INPUT IS IMPORTANT

Online:

[azdot.gov/northsouthcorridorstudy](http://azdot.gov/northsouthcorridorstudy)

Email:

[projects@azdot.gov](mailto:projects@azdot.gov)

Phone:


855.712.8530

Mail:

c/o North South Corridor Study  
1655 W Jackson, #126F  
Phoenix, AZ 85007



Federal-aid No. STP 999-A(365)X  
ADOT Project No. 999 PN 000 H7454 01L





A presentation slide with a white background and a dark purple header bar at the top. The title "North-South Corridor Study" is in black, and "Public Meeting" is in purple. The dates "November 17-20, 2014" are in black. The bottom features a dark blue footer bar with the ADOT logo and a navigation icon.

# North-South Corridor Study

## Public Meeting

November 17-20, 2014

**ADOT** 

 1

# Agenda

- ▶ Introductions
- ▶ Study Purpose and Area
- ▶ Study Process
- ▶ Route Alternatives
- ▶ Evaluation Criteria
- ▶ Recommended Corridors
- ▶ Next Steps
- ▶ How to comment

## Title VI Overview

- ▶ Title VI is a federal law that prohibits discrimination on the basis of race, color, or national origin in Federally assisted programs & activities.
- ▶ The law specifically states: “No person in the United States shall on the ground of race, color, or national origin be excluded from participation in, denied the benefits of, or subjected to discrimination under any program or activity receiving Federal financial assistance.” (42 USC 200d)
- ▶ ADOT’s Title VI Policy: Assures that no person shall on the grounds of race, color, national origin, gender, age, or disability be excluded from participation in, be denied benefits of, or be otherwise subjected to discrimination under any ADOT sponsored program or activity.

## Project Team

- ▶ Lead Agencies
  - Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT)
  - Federal Highway Administration (FHWA)
- ▶ Cooperating Agencies
  - Federal agencies with permitting or land transfer authority or special expertise in project-related environmental impact
- ▶ Participating Agencies
  - Federal, state, tribal, regional, and local governmental agencies with an interest in the project
- ▶ Consultant Team
  - HDR, AECOM, Kimley-Horn



## Study Area and Purpose

The project purpose is to:

- ▶ Provide a continuous north-south route through central Pinal County
- ▶ Relieve traffic on I-10
- ▶ Improve access to future activity centers
- ▶ Create a more direct connection to the eastern portion of the Phoenix metropolitan area
- ▶ Relieve congestion anticipated from projected growth




North-South Corridor Study Area

# Study Process

## Study Components

- ▶ Purpose and Need Statement
  - Identifies the problems or issues the project should remedy, and is the basis for development of alternatives
- ▶ Alternatives Selection Report (ASR)
  - Identifies a range of alternatives for further analysis
- ▶ Environmental Impact Statement (EIS)
  - Details the process by which the project was developed, including considering a range of reasonable alternatives and analyzes the potential impacts
- ▶ Location / Design Concept Report (L/DCR)
  - Provides the preliminary design of the project


# Study Process





# Route Alternatives

- ▶ Previous studies
- ▶ Technical analysis
  - Community
  - Built environment
  - Natural environment
- ▶ Stakeholder input
  - Local jurisdictions
  - Regional, state, and federal agencies
- ▶ Public input



## Evaluation Criteria

- ▶ Impact ratings
- ▶ Stakeholder ratings
- ▶ Public ratings



# Evaluation Criteria

## ► Impact Ratings Criteria

- Water resources
- Utility conflicts
- Existing and planned development
- Existing right-of-way
- Threatened and endangered species
- Cultural sites/resources
- Impact of geotechnical features

	Agency rating	Public rating	Impacts rating															
			Local	Regional, state, federal	Public input	Subsurface features	Subsidence	Structures affected	Wildlife corridors	Conservation Priority Areas	Threatened and endangered species	Public parks and trails	Noise	Cultural sites/resources	Existing development	Planned development	Natural drainage features (wetlands/riparian)	Human-made drainage features (canals, flood retaining structures)
Segment																		
P	3	3	2	3	2	5	5	2	3	3	4	5	3	3	5	5	5	5
L2	3	3	2	3	3	4	5	3	3	3	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
AD	4	2	4	2	2	5	5	2	3	3	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
J	3	2	3	3	2	5	5	2	3	3	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
AI	3	3	2	3	2	5	5	3	3	3	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
AIJ	3	3	2	3	2	4	5	2	3	3	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
M	2	3	2	3	2	5	5	2	3	3	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
Z	2	4	3	2	2	4	5	2	3	3	3	4	5	5	5	5	5	5
AL	4	3	3	3	3	5	5	3	3	3	5	5	3	3	5	5	5	5
O2	3	2	3	3	3	5	5	3	2	3	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
V	3	2	2	3	2	5	3	3	3	3	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
AK	4	3	3	3	3	2	5	3	3	3	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
E1	4	3	2	3	2	4	5	2	3	3	5	5	4	5	5	5	5	5
N	2	2	3	3	2	5	5	2	3	3	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
R	2	2	3	3	2	5	5	2	3	3	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
AH	4	2	3	3	3	4	5	2	3	3	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
E4	4	3	2	3	3	4	4	2	3	3	5	3	5	5	5	5	5	5

Step 1 Rating Legend  
 1 = Retain - 15% highest-rated segments  
 2 = Retain (by association)  
 3 = Eliminate (by association)  
 99 = Eliminate - 15% lowest-rated segments

Excerpt from Evaluation Rating Matrix

# Evaluation Criteria

## ► Impact Ratings Criteria (continued)

- Existing open space
- Proposed open space
- Public parks and trails
- Structures affected
- Noise
- Conservation priority areas
- Wildlife corridors

Segment	Local	Agency rating		Public rating		Impacts rating													
		Regional, state, federal	Public input	Subsurface features	Subsidence	Structures affected	Wildlife corridors	Conservation Priority Areas	Threatened and endangered species	Public parks and trails	Noise	Cultural sites/resources	Existing development	Planned development	Natural drainage features (wetlands/rivers)	Human-made drainage features (canals, flood-retarding structures)	Existing open space		
P	3	3	2	3	2	5	5	2	3	5	4	5	5	3	5	5	5		
L2	3	3	2	3	1	4	5	3	1	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5		
AD	4	2	4	2	2	5	5	2	1	1	5	5	5	5	5	5	5		
I	3	2	3	3	2	5	5	2	1	5	5	5	5	5	3	5	5		
AI	3	3	2	3	2	5	5	1	1	1	5	5	5	5	5	3	5		
AI	3	3	2	3	2	4	5	2	1	5	5	5	5	5	5	2	5		
M	2	3	2	3	2	5	5	2	1	5	5	5	5	5	3	5	5		
Z	2	4	3	2	2	4	5	2	1	5	1	3	4	5	5	5	5		
AL	4	3	3	3	1	5	5	1	1	5	5	3	3	5	5	5	5		
Q2	3	2	3	3	1	5	3	2	1	5	5	5	5	3	5	5	5		
V	3	2	2	3	2	5	1	3	3	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5		
AK	4	3	3	1	2	5	5	1	1	1	5	5	5	5	5	3	5		
E1	4	3	2	3	2	4	3	2	3	1	5	5	4	5	1	5	5		
N	2	2	1	3	2	5	5	2	1	5	5	5	5	5	5	1	5		
R	2	2	1	3	2	5	5	2	1	5	5	5	5	5	1	5	5		
AH	4	2	3	3	2	4	5	2	1	1	5	1	5	5	5	1	5		
E4	4	3	2	3	1	4	1	2	1	5	3	5	1	5	5	2	5		

Step 1 Ratings Legend  
 1 = Retain - 15% highest-rated segments  
 2 = Retain (by association)  
 RE = Eliminate (by association)  
 99 = Eliminate - 15% lowest-rated segments

Excerpt from Evaluation Rating Matrix




## Evaluation Criteria

- ▶ Local stakeholder agency ratings
  - Apache Junction
  - Coolidge
  - Eloy
  - Florence
  - Queen Creek
  - Pinal County



## Evaluation Criteria

- Regional, state, and federal agency ratings



# Evaluation Criteria

- Public Ratings
  - December 2011 Workshops



## Recommended Corridors

- ▶ Continuous Route Alternatives to be further evaluated (in addition to a No-Build Option) in the EIS/DCR Phase of the North-South Corridor Study





## Next Steps

- ▶ ASR Public meetings (November 17-20, 2014)
- ▶ Continue coordination with the ongoing ADOT *Passenger Rail Study: Tucson To Phoenix*
- ▶ Continue coordination with the ongoing ADOT *Traffic and Revenue Feasibility Study*
- ▶ Prepare Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) and Location/Design Concept Report
- ▶ Public hearing on the DEIS (anticipated late 2016)

## How to comment

- ▶ Tonight: Fill out a comment form
- ▶ Online: [azdot.gov/northsouthcorridorstudy](http://azdot.gov/northsouthcorridorstudy)
- ▶ Email: [projects@azdot.gov](mailto:projects@azdot.gov)
- ▶ Phone: 855.712.8530
- ▶ Mail:  
c/o North South Corridor Study  
1655 W Jackson, #126F  
Phoenix, AZ 85007

## **Thank You!**

- The open house will continue until 8 p.m.
- Study team members will remain to answer questions and gather comments.

# North-South Corridor Study

**Provide comments on the proposed 45-mile transportation corridor in Pinal County that links U.S. 60 near Apache Junction, south to Interstate 10 near Eloy.**


The Arizona Department of Transportation, in partnership with the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), is conducting the North-South Corridor Study. Once completed, the study will identify an alignment for the proposed 45-mile transportation corridor in Pinal County that links U.S. 60 near Apache Junction, south to Interstate 10 near Eloy.

## UPCOMING MEETINGS

Come and provide your input on the proposed corridors that were identified in the Alternatives Selection Report (shown in graphic).

All meetings will be held from 6–8 p.m. with a formal presentation by ADOT at 6:30 p.m.

- ▶ **Monday, Nov. 17**  
Walker Butte Elementary,  
29697 N. Desert Willow Blvd.,  
Queen Creek
- ▶ **Tuesday, Nov. 18**  
Santa Cruz High School,  
900 N. Main St., Eloy
- ▶ **Wednesday, Nov. 19**  
Apache Junction High School,  
2525 S. Ironwood Drive,  
Apache Junction
- ▶ **Thursday, Nov. 20**  
Coolidge-Florence Elks Lodge,  
2241 N. Attaway Road,  
Coolidge



## WHAT'S NEXT

In accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) will be completed to evaluate potential environmental impacts, such as: cultural and biological resources, socioeconomic and geological conditions, land ownership, air quality, noise impacts and water resources. In coordination with the EIS a preliminary engineering design (Design Concept Report) will also be completed.


## YOUR INPUT IS IMPORTANT

Please submit your written feedback at one of the public meetings, or by one of the following methods:

- ✓ **Online:** [azdot.gov/NorthSouthCorridorStudy](http://azdot.gov/NorthSouthCorridorStudy)
- ✓ **Email:** [projects@azdot.gov](mailto:projects@azdot.gov)
- ✓ **Phone:** 855.712.8530
- ✓ **Mail:** c/o North South Corridor Study,  
1655 W Jackson, #126F, Phoenix, AZ 85007



# **NORTH SOUTH CORRIDOR STUDY AREA**





PERMIT NO. 1716  
PHOENIX, AZ  
U.S. POSTAGE PAID  
STANDARD  
PRESORTED



## North-South Corridor Study

**Provide comments on the proposed 45-mile transportation corridor in Pinal County that links U.S. 60 near Apache Junction, south to Interstate 10 near Eloy.**

### PUBLIC HEARING

- ▶ All meetings are held from 6–8 p.m.
- ▶ Formal presentations at 6:30 p.m.

**Monday, Nov. 17**

Walker Butte Elementary,  
29697 N. Desert Willow Blvd.,  
Queen Creek

**Tuesday, Nov. 18**

Santa Cruz High School,  
900 N. Main St.,  
Eloy

**Wednesday, Nov. 19**

Apache Junction High School,  
2525 S. Ironwood Drive,  
Apache Junction

**Thursday, Nov. 20**

Coolidge-Florence Elks Lodge,  
2241 N. Attaway Road,  
Coolidge

ATTN: Community Relations

ARIZONA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION  
MAIL DROP 126F  
1655 W. Jackson St.  
PHOENIX AZ 85007

## Appendix G: Comment Table



	Comment Type	First Name	Last Name	Comment	Response
1.	Email			<p>re N/S Corridor Study..please send more detailed map = specifically where Germann and Schnepf would be..</p> <p>or is there a link to see the map..thank you</p>	<p>ADOT Communications sent email link to the ASR, which includes study area maps. If information contained within ASR is insufficient, more detailed map may be requested.</p> <p><a href="http://azdot.gov/docs/default-source/projects/alternative-selection-report53efb178c8006c57b531ff0000a35efc.pdf?sfvrsn=2">http://azdot.gov/docs/default-source/projects/alternative-selection-report53efb178c8006c57b531ff0000a35efc.pdf?sfvrsn=2</a></p>
2.	Meeting	Rick	Koerber	<p>Q &amp; A process should be at mic's so everyone can hear other's questions &amp; comments. The U.S. 60 approved alignment is an important project that needs to be done soon. The North South route is needed also, but AZ 60 needs to be widened to accommodate the extra traffic it will bring. Gold Canyon residents are already burdened by the annual renaissance festival traffic. Added business/residential growth would be overwhelming.</p>	<p>Comment noted. The format was chosen to allow participants to come and go (open house format) at their convenience. The only project of note on US 60 is Silver King to Superior streets (east of the N-S Study Area). Gold Canyon Bypass DCR/EA was done, but there is no schedule for next phase.</p>
3.	Meeting	Albert	Dave	<p>Change the name perhaps Panel Express N. South is the Civil War.</p>	<p>Comment noted. If a build alternative is selected, a more formal state route name would be selected – the North South project name relates to the connectivity through Pinal County that the facility would provide.</p>
4.	Email	Louis	Salamone	<p>Dear Sirs and Madams--I am unable to attend tonight's meeting in Apache Junction. But, I wish to make my thoughts known to you.</p> <p>I reside just off Kings Ranch Road in Gold Canyon. Every spring, the residents are made weekend prisoners in their homes because of the heavy traffic generated by the Renaissance Festival south of Gold Canyon on Rt. 60. This, perhaps, overstates the problem some; yet, we are required to resign ourselves to long delays when using Rt. 60 or to try to divine when traffic is lightest in each direction when planning a trip to, say, Apache Junction, Mesa, or points beyond.</p>	<p>Comment noted. The only project of note (along US 60) is Silver King to Superior, which is east of the N-S Study Area. Gold Canyon Bypass DCR/EA was done, but there is no schedule for the next phase.</p>

				<p>Gold Canyon has the very unfortunate, and antiquated, characteristic of having only one road into and out of town. Beside the problems with the Renaissance Festival, from a safety viewpoint if, say, should an evacuation ever be required, the current situation and the planned modifications both put us at risk.</p> <p>Any planning of the re-routing of Route 60 in our area that ignores this problem would be a disservice to the citizens of Gold Canyon.</p> <p>Thank you.</p> <p>Respectfully, Louis Salamone</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p>	
5.	Email	Bob	Mulhair	<p>Recent newspaper articles regarding ADOT's public meetings on a North South Corridor Study prompted me to write on what happen to the By-pass Gold Canyon study from several years ago re-routing traffic around Gold Canyon on US60? I had attended several of those public meetings and recognized that ADOT had put a lot of effort into this study and it would be unfortunate to have that work end up on the "back burner" as a dead issue.</p> <p>Bob Mulhair</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p>	<p>Comment noted. ADOT has reported that the Maricopa Association of Governments (MAG) is considering a study to understand what future network (including the US 60 Bypass, North-South, and SR 24) would best serve the interests of the region.</p> <p>The only project of note (along US 60) is Silver King to Superior, which is east of the N-S Study Area. Gold Canyon Bypass DCR/EA was done, but</p>

					there is no schedule for the next phase.
6.	Mail	Deborah	Bagnall	<p>Please send me the Google Earth file. Please send a more detailed map of area between Cooldige and Florence.</p> <p>I have a farming operation on both sides of the corridor and in order to move equipment I need to know available crossings will be as soon as possible because there is potential to split our farm.</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p>	<p>ADOT Communications sent email link to the ASR, which includes study area maps. If information contained within ASR is insufficient, more detailed map may be requested.</p> <p><a href="http://azdot.gov/docs/default-source/projects/alternative-selection-report53efb178c8006c57b531ff0000a35efc.pdf?sfvrsn=2">http://azdot.gov/docs/default-source/projects/alternative-selection-report53efb178c8006c57b531ff0000a35efc.pdf?sfvrsn=2</a></p>
7.	Mail	Celeste	Carter	<p>My grandparents bought and built their home at the above address in 1934. I am the third generation that has lived there at their home. It is homesteaded and may be historical. I sit on five acres and there is a water well there that supplies water to the surrounding homes new me. We don't own the water company anymore, just sold it in 2013.</p> <p>Would you buy me out?</p> <p>Celeste Adele Carter</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p>	<p>Comment noted. The EIS will evaluate the potential impact to existing development, and consideration of culturally significant and historic properties. Infrastructure, such as wells will also be considered when evaluating the project impacts.</p> <p>Right-of-way acquisition would not commence before a recommended alternative was identified. A recommended alternative may be reported in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement, which is expected to be completed in December, 2016. For additional questions concerning right-of-way, please contact Dave Edwards at ADOT right-of-way (602-712-8803).</p>

8.	Mail	Albert	Dave	<p>I think the best path to serve the people of Florence would be: 1. G 2. P 3. V 4. X 5. AO 6. AC</p> <p>Please keep the ball rolling, we need this. Thank you.</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p>	<p>Comment regarding preferred route noted (Segment G; P; V; X; AO; AC).</p>
9.	Mail	None	None	<p>I believe Wheeler Road will obtain our lawyers to keep ADOT off of Wheeler Road. Too many families will be impacted.</p>	<p>Comment noted. The EIS will evaluate the potential impact to existing development, and consideration of culturally significant and historic properties. Right-of-way acquisition would not commence before a recommended alternative was identified. A recommended alternative will be identified in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement, which is expected to be completed in December, 2016. For additional questions concerning right-of-way, please contact Dave Edwards at ADOT right-of-way (602-712-8803).</p>
10.	Mail	Lonna	Garai	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. First financial priority should be completion of the SR 24 top the US 60 or the SR 79 to alleviate traffic congestion in Gold Canyon and handle the increasing traffic (commercial) to the mines in Superior, Miami and Safford area.</li> <li>2. North South route – I prefer the Green /Brown 1A, 1B route</li> <li>3. I would support either the orange or yellow rail route</li> </ol> <p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p>	<p>Comment noted regarding priorities and passenger rail route. Comment regarding preferred route noted (reference is to earlier project segment notation, which may be found in the ASR).</p>
11.	Email	Chris	Lenz	<p>To Whom It May Concern:</p> <p>I am writing you because I support the Town of Florence Approved General Plan North-South Freeway Alignment. I oppose the “Q” alignment option presented by ADOT as I feel it would have many negative impacts on the existing homes and property owners in the area.</p>	<p>Comment noted. Comment regarding preferred route. (Florence Resolution No. 1490-14 - Segment O3; V; X; and AO (Exhibit 1)). Comment</p>

				<p>Please call me at [REDACTED] if you have any questions or would like to talk with me in further details.</p> <p>Thanks, Chris Lenz</p> <p>[For attachment, reference Exhibit 1 – Town of Florence Resolution 1490-14]</p>	regarding opposition to specific route segments (Segment Q) noted.
12.	Mail	Marvin	Evans	<p>North-South Corridor</p> <p>This route would better serve my area start at G, P, X, AO. The rest is up to you!</p>	Comment regarding preferred route noted (Segment G; P; X; AO).
13.	Mail	Bob	Phillips	<p>Hello</p> <p>My choices for the corridor</p> <p>North-60, <u>E1, E2, E4, G, P, X, AO, AC, AD, AE, AA</u></p> <p>Thank you</p>	Comment regarding preferred route noted (Segment E1, E2, E4, G, P, X, AO, AC, AD, AE, AA)
14.	Mail	Lynn	Stannard	<p>North-South Corridor Please, the path E1, E2, E4, G, P, X, would help so much! We need this badly!</p>	Comment noted. Comment regarding preferred route noted (Segment E1, E2, E4, G, P, X.)
15.	Mail	Albert	Dare	<p>Our new Picacho Peak Parkway</p> <p>North top I, J, K1, K3, G, P, X, AO (Kenlworth Rd), AC, AD, AE, Z, AA, Name</p> <p>1 Picacho Peak or parkway express</p> <p>2 Poston Butte Express</p> <p>3 Lost Dutchman Parkway-not sure of German spelling.</p>	Comment regarding naming ideas noted. Comment regarding preferred route noted (Segment I, J, K1, K3, G, P, X, AO, AC, AD, AE, Z, AA).
16.	Email	James	Carter	<p>this is my input in your determining the best choice of the corridor path. I have lived on the Wheeler rd. on and off since 1975 which is possibly perhaps the chosen path you might take. It would be a DESTRUCTIVE path more than a proper path. Very destructive to peoples lives, property, animals and future dreams and the pursuit of a fruitful life in the outer city life style. I understand motives for choosing a certain path, if it was to be weighed in a balance to make it a quicker determination of the path, the scale seems to easily weigh heavy in the side of people and not money or influence or the deceptive motive of a gain. I would adjust quickly with a relocation of my life if the Wheeler rd. became a memory from the choice of the new path but it would be always in my mind that a "stereo typical government" that is no longer a human but a big machine with no heart that has just pushed forward. I have worked in different levels of government, I speak with experience, nothing personal. It will be interesting to see the outcome and how to justify destruction. Thank you for this moment to express some truth. James Carter</p>	Comment noted. The EIS will evaluate the potential impact to existing development, and consideration of culturally significant and historic properties. Right-of-way acquisition would not commence before a recommended alternative was identified. A recommended alternative will be identified in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement, which is expected to be completed in

					December, 2016. For additional questions concerning right-of-way, please contact Dave Edwards at ADOT right-of-way (602-712-8803).
17.	Email	Mark	Eckhoff	<p>Dear North South Corridor Study Team:</p> <p>The Town of Florence has spent the last several years working with residents, land owners, stakeholders and various other entities through a public process in an effort to help ADOT locate the best alignment for the proposed North-South Freeway Corridor through Florence's Planning Area. The Town's preferences for the Corridor have been officially stated via the Town's General Plan Future Land Use Map, most recently updated in 2014, and per Resolution 1490-14, which affirms the Town's support of the Town's General Plan Future Land Use Map and also states which ADOT Corridor segments the Town can and cannot support. The Town has concurrently acted to support the future alignment of the ADOT Passenger Rail Corridor between the State's two largest metropolitan areas to wisely coincide with the alignment of the ADOT North-South Corridor. The Town's preferred Corridor for the future freeway and rail systems allows these improvements to occur over time in a well-thought out manner that addresses all anticipated impacts of these future transportation enhancements. Any deviations to the Town's preferences for the ADOT North-South Corridor could be extremely detrimental to the Town and the region in both the short and long term. Namely, the Town is very concerned that certain objectionable routes noted in Resolution 1490-14 would have: grave impacts to current and ongoing development north of the Gila River; devastating impacts to the Town's core and central business district by creating a route that would be too far west of downtown Florence; and the highly undesirable impacts of conflicting with years of public and private planning efforts for the Town's Planning Area. The bottom line is that the right Corridor will allow Florence to continue to grow in a sustainable manner, prosper and maintain its position as the heart and seat of Pinal County. Alternatively, the wrong Corridor will most certainly result in Florence being a pass-by community that will have significant challenges adding rooftops, commercial businesses and employment opportunities, thus most certainly resulting in irreversible negative fiscal and other impacts. The Town of Florence sincerely asks that ADOT please continue to work with the Town of Florence in supporting the Town's preferences for the North-South Corridor within the Florence Planning Area.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Mark Eckhoff, AICP, CFM Director Community Development Department Town of Florence [REDACTED]</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p>Comment regarding preferred route noted (Florence Resolution No. 1490-14 - Segment O3; V; X; and AO (Exhibit 1)). Comment regarding opposition to specific route segments noted.</p>

				<div> <div></div> <div></div> <div></div> </div> <p>[For attachment, see Exhibit 1: Town of Florence Resolution 1490-14]</p>	
18.	Mail	Jon	Vlaming	<p>[For attachment, see Exhibit 2: City of Eloy]</p>	Comment noted. Comment regarding preferred route, and described reasoning for same noted (Segment Z; AA).
19.	Email	Steve	Rees	<p>I would like to comment in favor of the route that follows the G-P-V-X-AB-AC segments on the provided maps.</p> <p>This alignment fits best in my view with both existing &amp; planned development through the area.</p> <p>The N/S Freeway will provide an alternative route into the Valley from Tucson and further East that will alleviate congestion on I-10 and reduce miles driven for those traveling to the East Valley growth corridor.</p> <p>This alignment also provides great future planning and development opportunities for Florence, a community that has been at the forefront of the N/S planning efforts.</p>	Comment noted. Comment regarding preferred route noted (Segments G; P; V; X; AB; AC).
20.	Email	Sean	Hamill	<p>Dear Sir or Madam,</p> <p>This letter is to voice my concerns about how ADOT has chosen to not follow the Town of Florence General Plan Alignment of the North/ South Freeway Corridor indicated on their approved 2020 General Plan. ADOT has chosen to further study alignments V/X and Q in the area of concern. I have worked closely with landowners in and around the area of Attaway Rd and Arizona Farms to come up with a solution for the freeway corridor alignment that is both acceptable to the landowners as well as the Town. This alignment was approved by Florence Town council on July 21, 2014 and adopted through Resolution No. 1456-14. By further studying options Q &amp; V/X and not including the Town's preferred alternative, ADOT will not be utilizing the land available in the area to its fullest potential. As ADOT will see when they further study the area, there are many constraints including, existing residents, washes, drainage areas, CAP canal, Railroads, etc. These constraints have already been identified by the Town and local landowners and have been accounted for in choosing the Town's Approved alignment.</p> <p>I strongly urge ADOT to consider including the Town of Florence Approved North-South Freeway alignment moving forward in the study and environmental impact process.</p> <p>Thank you for your time.</p>	Comments noted. Comment regarding preferred route noted (Florence Resolution No. 1490-14 - Segment O3; V; X; and AO (Exhibit 1). The alternatives recommended by the ASR for continued study include the Town of Florence stated preferred alternative (refer to Exhibit 1 – Town of Florence Resolution 1490-14).

				<p>Sean M. Hamill Project Manager I GIS</p> <p>United Engineering Group</p> <p>[For attachment, reference Exhibit 1 – Town of Florence Resolution 1490-14]</p>	
21.	Email	Robert	Williams	<p>1/9/2015 1:155:53 PM</p> <p>To Whom It May Concern:</p> <p>We prefer the corridor route alternative No. 1A or Alternative No. 2A as presented on pages 102 and 103 of the North-South Study. The routes labeled No. 1B and No. 2B place the freeway less than ¼ mile from the long existing association property of Florence Gardens. This will present noise issues as well as pollution issues to the residents who are all elderly and many whom have respiratory problems. We encourage you to select the preferred routes No. 1A or No. 1B.</p> <p>Robert Williams [REDACTED] [REDACTED]</p>	<p>Comment noted. Comment regarding preferred route noted (reference is to earlier project segment notation, which may be found in the ASR). The EIS will evaluate the potential impact to existing development, and consideration of topics such as air quality and noise.</p>
22.	Email	Ashlee	Lewis	<p>To whom it may concern:</p> <p>The Town of Florence has spent the last several years working with residents, land owners, stakeholders and various other entities through a public process in an effort to help ADOT locate the best alignment for the proposed North-South Freeway Corridor through Florence's Planning Area. The Town's preferences for the Corridor have been officially stated via the Town's General Plan Future Land Use Map, most recently updated in 2014, and per Resolution 1490-14, which affirms the Town's support of the Town's General Plan Future Land Use Map and also states which ADOT Corridor segments the Town can and cannot support. The Town has concurrently acted to support the future alignment of the ADOT Passenger Rail Corridor between the State's two largest metropolitan areas to wisely coincide with the alignment of the ADOT North-South Corridor. The Town's preferred Corridor for the future freeway and rail systems allows these improvements to occur over time in a well-thought out manner that addresses all anticipated impacts of these future transportation enhancements. Any deviations to the Town's preferences for the ADOT North-South Corridor could be extremely detrimental to the Town and the region in both the short and long term. Namely, the Town is very concerned that certain objectionable routes noted in Resolution 1490-14 would have: grave impacts to current and ongoing development north of the Gila River; devastating impacts to the Town's core and central business district by creating a route that would be too far west of downtown Florence; and the highly undesirable impacts of conflicting with years of public and private planning efforts for the Town's Planning Area. The bottom line is that the right Corridor will allow Florence to continue to grow in a sustainable manner, prosper and maintain its position as the heart and seat of Pinal County. Alternatively, the wrong Corridor will most certainly result in Florence being a pass by community that will have significant challenges adding rooftops, commercial businesses and employment opportunities, thus most certainly resulting in irreversible negative fiscal and other impacts. The Town of Florence sincerely asks that ADOT please continue to work with the Town of Florence in supporting the Town's preferences for the North-South Corridor within the Florence Planning Area.</p> <p>Thank you, Ashlee Lewis The London Companies</p> <p>[For attachment, reference Exhibit 1 – Town of Florence Resolution 1490-14]</p>	<p>Comment noted. Comment regarding preferred route noted (Florence Resolution No. 1490-14 - Segment O3; V; X; and AO (Exhibit 1)). Comment regarding opposition to specific route segment also noted.</p>
23.	Email	Angela	Massey	<p>I believe Florence should have direct access to the North-South Freeway Corridor. Attached above are my reasons on why.</p> <p>Angela Massey Langley Properties</p>	<p>Comment noted. Comment regarding preferred route noted (Florence Resolution No. 1490-14 - Segment O3; V; X; and AO (Exhibit 1)).</p>



				[For attachment, reference Exhibit 1 – Town of Florence Resolution 1490-14]	
24.	Email	Walker	Butte 700	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>MEMORANDUM</b></p> <p>DATE: January 8, 2015</p> <p>TO: Arizona Dept. of Transportation Via Email: projects@azdot.gov</p> <p>FROM: Walker Butte 700</p> <p>RE: ADOT North-South Corridor – Florence Area Route Alternative</p> <hr/> <p>We have visited <a href="http://www.azdot.gov/northsouthcorridorstudy">www.azdot.gov/northsouthcorridorstudy</a> and <b><u>strongly support</u></b> Resolution No. 1490-14 (attached) by the Town of Florence which reflects Option O3, V, X and OA (Preferred Options) in their General Plan.</p> <p>We <b><u>adamantly oppose</u></b> Options G, Q and AB</p> <p>Property Owner: <b>Walker Butte 700, L.L.C.</b></p> <p>Property Location: Just west of Hunt Highway and south of Magic Ranch, Pinal County, AZ</p> <p>Acreage: 700 Acres</p> <p>APN: 200-24-11; 200-28-003; 209-04-005</p> <p>[For attachment, reference Exhibit 1 – Town of Florence Resolution 1490-14]</p>	Comment noted. Comment regarding preferred route noted (Florence Resolution No. 1490-14 - Segment O3; V; X; and AO (Exhibit 1).

25.	Email	Walker	Butte 500	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>MEMORANDUM</b></p> <p>DATE: January 8, 2015</p> <p>TO: Arizona Dept. of Transportation Via Email: <a href="mailto:projects@azdot.gov">projects@azdot.gov</a></p> <p>FROM: Walker Butte 500</p> <p>RE: ADOT North-South Corridor – Florence Area Route Alternative</p> <hr/> <p>We have visited <a href="http://www.azdot.gov/northsouthcorridorstudy">www.azdot.gov/northsouthcorridorstudy</a> and <b>strongly support</b> Resolution No. 1490-14 (attached) by the Town of Florence which reflects Option O3, V, X and OA (Preferred Options) in their General Plan.</p> <p>We <b><u>adamantly oppose</u></b> Options G, Q and AB</p> <p>Property Owner: <b>Walker Butte 500, L.L.C.</b></p> <p>Property Location: Just east of Hunt Highway and south of Magic Ranch, Pinal County, AZ</p> <p>Acreage: 500 Acres</p> <p>APN: 200-28-002; 200-24-005; 200-24-006; 200-24-010</p> <p>[For attachment, reference Exhibit 1 – Town of Florence Resolution 1490-14]</p>	<p>Comment noted. Comment regarding preferred route noted (Florence Resolution No. 1490-14 - Segment O3; V; X; and AO (Exhibit 1)). Comment regarding opposition to specific route segment noted (G; Q; AB).</p>
-----	-------	--------	--------------	---	--

26.	Email	Walker	Butte 300	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>MEMORANDUM</b></p> <p>DATE: January 8, 2015</p> <p>TO: Arizona Dept. of Transportation Via Email: <a href="mailto:projects@azdot.gov">projects@azdot.gov</a></p> <p>FROM: Walker Butte 300</p> <p>RE: ADOT North-South Corridor – Florence Area Route Alternative</p> <hr/> <p>We have visited <a href="http://www.azdot.gov/northsouthcorridorstudy">www.azdot.gov/northsouthcorridorstudy</a> and <b>strongly support</b> Resolution No. 1490-14 (attached) by the Town of Florence which reflects Option O3, V, X and OA (Preferred Options) in their General Plan.</p> <p>We <b>adamantly oppose</b> Options G, Q and AB</p> <p>Property Owner: <b>Walker Butte 300, L.L.C.</b></p> <p>Property Location: West of Hunt Highway &amp; Merrill Ranch Parkway contiguous to Anthem at Merrill Ranch, Town of Florence, Pinal County, AZ</p> <p>Acreage: 300 Acres</p> <p>APN: 200-24-012; 200-24-00504; 200-24-006A; 200-24-010B; 200-24-01103; 200-24-01202; 200-28-002B; 200-28-00304</p> <p>[For attachment, reference Exhibit 1 – Town of Florence Resolution 1490-14]</p>	<p>Comment noted. Comment regarding preferred route noted (Florence Resolution No. 1490-14 - Segment O3; V; X; and AO (Exhibit 1)). Comment regarding opposition to specific route segment noted (G; Q; AB).</p>
-----	-------	--------	--------------	---	--

27.	Email	Skyline	& Quail	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>MEMORANDUM</b></p> <p>DATE: January 8, 2015</p> <p>TO: Arizona Dept. of Transportation Via Email: <a href="mailto:projects@azdot.gov">projects@azdot.gov</a></p> <p>FROM: Skyline &amp; Quail</p> <p>RE: ADOT North-South Corridor – Florence Area Route Alternative</p> <hr/> <p>We have visited <a href="http://www.azdot.gov/northsouthcorridorstudy">www.azdot.gov/northsouthcorridorstudy</a> and <b>strongly support</b> Resolution No. 1490-14 (attached) by the Town of Florence which reflects Option O3, V, X and OA (Preferred Options) in their General Plan.</p> <p>We <b>adamantly oppose</b> Options G, Q and AB</p> <p>Property Owner: Skyline &amp; Quail, L.L.C.</p> <p>Property Location: SWC Skyline Road &amp; Quail Run Lane</p> <p>Acreage: 284 Acres</p> <p>APN: 210-11-00101</p> <p>[For attachment, reference Exhibit 1 – Town of Florence Resolution 1490-14]</p>	<p>Comment noted. Comment regarding preferred route noted (Florence Resolution No. 1490-14 - Segment O3; V; X; and AO (Exhibit 1). Comment regarding opposition to specific route segment noted (G; Q; AB).</p>
-----	-------	---------	---------	--	---

28.	Email	San Tan	Heights 85	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>MEMORANDUM</b></p> <p>DATE: January 8, 2015</p> <p>TO: Arizona Dept. of Transportation Via Email: <a href="mailto:projects@azdot.gov">projects@azdot.gov</a></p> <p>FROM: San Tan Heights 85</p> <p>RE: ADOT North-South Corridor – Florence Area Route Alternative</p> <hr/> <p>We have visited <a href="http://www.azdot.gov/northsouthcorridorstudy">www.azdot.gov/northsouthcorridorstudy</a> and <b>strongly support</b> Resolution No. 1490-14 (attached) by the Town of Florence which reflects Option O3, V, X and OA (Preferred Options) in their General Plan.</p> <p>We <b><u>adamantly oppose</u></b> Options G, Q and AB</p> <p>Property Owner: <b>RMG San Tan Heights 85, LLC</b></p> <p>Property Location: Northeast of Thompson Rd &amp; Skyline</p> <p>Acreage: 85 Acres</p> <p>APN: 324 Lots</p> <p>[For attachment, reference Exhibit 1 – Town of Florence Resolution 1490-14]</p>	<p>Comment noted. Comment regarding preferred route noted (Florence Resolution No. 1490-14 - Segment O3; V; X; and AO (Exhibit 1). Comment regarding opposition to specific route segment noted (G; Q; AB).</p>
-----	-------	---------	---------------	---	---

29.	Email	CVE	Crestfield Manor 10	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>MEMORANDUM</b></p> <p>DATE: January 8, 2015</p> <p>TO: Arizona Dept. of Transportation Via Email: <a href="mailto:projects@azdot.gov">projects@azdot.gov</a></p> <p>FROM: CVE-Crestfield</p> <p>RE: ADOT North-South Corridor – Florence Area Route Alternative</p> <hr/> <p>We have visited <a href="http://www.azdot.gov/northsouthcorridorstudy">www.azdot.gov/northsouthcorridorstudy</a> and <b>strongly support</b> Resolution No. 1490-14 (attached) by the Town of Florence which reflects Option O3, V, X and OA (Preferred Options) in their General Plan.</p> <p>We <b>adamantly oppose</b> Options G, Q and AB</p> <p>Property Owner: <b>CVE-Crestfield, LLC</b></p> <p>Property Location: SWC of Felix Rd &amp; Heritage Rd, Florence, AZ</p> <p>Acreage: 10 Lots</p> <p>APN: 200-13-194 thru 200-13-196, 200-13-198, 199, 211 thru 214, and 216</p> <p>[For attachment, reference Exhibit 1 – Town of Florence Resolution 1490-14]</p>	Comment noted. Comment regarding preferred route noted (Florence Resolution No. 1490-14 - Segment O3; V; X; and AO (Exhibit 1)). Comment regarding opposition to specific route segment noted (G; Q; AB).
-----	-------	-----	---------------------	--	---

30.	Email	Mulberry	And Butte	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>MEMORANDUM</b></p> <p>DATE: January 8, 2015</p> <p>TO: Arizona Dept. of Transportation Via Email: <a href="mailto:projects@azdot.gov">projects@azdot.gov</a></p> <p>FROM: Mulberry &amp; Butte</p> <p>RE: ADOT North-South Corridor – Florence Area Route Alternative</p> <hr/> <p>We have visited <a href="http://www.azdot.gov/northsouthcorridorstudy">www.azdot.gov/northsouthcorridorstudy</a> and <b>strongly support</b> Resolution No. 1490-14 (attached) by the Town of Florence which reflects Option O3, V, X and OA (Preferred Options) in their General Plan.</p> <p>We <b><u>adamantly oppose</u></b> Options G, Q and AB</p> <p>Property Owner: <b>Mulberry &amp; Butte, LLC</b></p> <p>Property Location: NWC Mulberry St. &amp; Butte Ave., Florence, AZ</p> <p>Acreage: 4 Acres</p> <p>APN: 200-43-071; 200-43-072; 200-43-082 through 200-43-090; 200-43-140 through 200-43-161</p> <p>[For attachment, reference Exhibit 1 – Town of Florence Resolution 1490-14]</p>	<p>Comment noted. Comment regarding preferred route noted (Florence Resolution No. 1490-14 - Segment O3; V; X; and AO (Exhibit 1)). Comment regarding opposition to specific route segment noted (G; Q; AB).</p>
-----	-------	----------	--------------	---	--

31.	Email	Monterra	South	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>MEMORANDUM</b></p> <p>DATE: January 8, 2015</p> <p>TO: Arizona Dept. of Transportation Via Email: <a href="mailto:projects@azdot.gov">projects@azdot.gov</a></p> <p>FROM: Monterra South</p> <p>RE: ADOT North-South Corridor – Florence Area Route Alternative</p> <hr/> <p>We have visited <a href="http://www.azdot.gov/northsouthcorridorstudy">www.azdot.gov/northsouthcorridorstudy</a> and <b>strongly support</b> Resolution No. 1490-14 (attached) by the Town of Florence which reflects Option O3, V, X and OA (Preferred Options) in their General Plan.</p> <p>We <b>adamantly oppose</b> Options G, Q and AB</p> <p>Property Owner: <b>RMG Monterra South, L.L.C.</b></p> <p>Property Location: SEC of Attaway Road &amp; Hunt Highway South of Anthem at Merrill Ranch.</p> <p>Acreage: 262 Acres</p> <p>APN: 1,130 Lots</p> <p>[For attachment, reference Exhibit 1 – Town of Florence Resolution 1490-14]</p>	<p>Comment noted. Comment regarding preferred route noted (Florence Resolution No. 1490-14 - Segment O3; V; X; and AO (Exhibit 1)). Comment regarding opposition to specific route segment noted (G; Q; AB).</p>
-----	-------	----------	-------	--	--



32.	Email	Mesquite	Trails	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>MEMORANDUM</b></p> <p>DATE: January 8, 2015</p> <p>TO: Arizona Dept. of Transportation Via Email: <a href="mailto:projects@azdot.gov">projects@azdot.gov</a></p> <p>FROM: Mesquite Trails</p> <p>RE: ADOT North-South Corridor – Florence Area Route Alternative</p> <hr/> <p>We have visited <a href="http://www.azdot.gov/northsouthcorridorstudy">www.azdot.gov/northsouthcorridorstudy</a> and <b>strongly support</b> Resolution No. 1490-14 (attached) by the Town of Florence which reflects Option O3, V, X and OA (Preferred Options) in their General Plan.</p> <p>We <b>adamantly oppose</b> Options G, Q and AB</p> <p>Property Owner: <b>Mesquite Trails, LLC</b></p> <p>Property Location: SEC of Heritage &amp; Felix Roads North of Anthem at Merrill Ranch, Town of Florence.</p> <p>Acreage: 638 Acres</p> <p>APN: 2,489 lots</p> <p>[For attachment, reference Exhibit 1 – Town of Florence Resolution 1490-14]</p>	<p>Comment noted. Comment regarding preferred route noted (Florence Resolution No. 1490-14 - Segment O3; V; X; and AO (Exhibit 1)). Comment regarding opposition to specific route segment noted (G; Q; AB).</p>
-----	-------	----------	--------	--	--

33.	Email	Magic	Ranch 80	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>MEMORANDUM</b></p> <p>DATE: January 8, 2015</p> <p>TO: Arizona Dept. of Transportation Via Email: <a href="mailto:projects@azdot.gov">projects@azdot.gov</a></p> <p>FROM: Magic Ranch 80</p> <p>RE: ADOT North-South Corridor – Florence Area Route Alternative</p> <hr/> <p>We have visited <a href="http://www.azdot.gov/northsouthcorridorstudy">www.azdot.gov/northsouthcorridorstudy</a> and <b>strongly support</b> Resolution No. 1490-14 (attached) by the Town of Florence which reflects Option O3, V, X and OA (Preferred Options) in their General Plan.</p> <p>We <b>adamantly oppose</b> Options G, Q and AB</p> <p>Property Owner: <b>Palms- Magic Ranch 80, LLC</b></p> <p>Property Location: Arizona Farms Road &amp; Hunt Highway</p> <p>Acreage: 80 Acres</p> <p>APN: 200-58-007, 200-58-011</p> <p>[For attachment, reference Exhibit 1 – Town of Florence Resolution 1490-14]</p>	<p>Comment noted. Comment regarding preferred route noted (Florence Resolution No. 1490-14 - Segment O3; V; X; and AO (Exhibit 1)). Comment regarding opposition to specific route segment noted (G; Q; AB).</p>
-----	-------	-------	----------	--	--

34.	Email	Magic	Lake 80	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>MEMORANDUM</b></p> <p>DATE: January 8, 2015</p> <p>TO: Arizona Dept. of Transportation Via Email: <a href="mailto:projects@azdot.gov">projects@azdot.gov</a></p> <p>FROM: Magic Lake 80</p> <p>RE: ADOT North-South Corridor – Florence Area Route Alternative</p> <hr/> <p>We have visited <a href="http://www.azdot.gov/northsouthcorridorstudy">www.azdot.gov/northsouthcorridorstudy</a> and <b>strongly support</b> Resolution No. 1490-14 (attached) by the Town of Florence which reflects Option O3, V, X and OA (Preferred Options) in their General Plan.</p> <p>We <b>adamantly oppose</b> Options G, Q and AB</p> <p>Property Owner: <b>Magic Lake 80, L.L.C.</b></p> <p>Property Location: West side of Hunt Highway, Pinal County</p> <p>Acreage: 51 Acres</p> <p>APN: 200-25-00201A, 200-25-00201B &amp; 200-25-00201C</p> <p>[For attachment, reference Exhibit 1 – Town of Florence Resolution 1490-14]</p>	<p>Comment noted. Comment regarding preferred route noted (Florence Resolution No. 1490-14 - Segment O3; V; X; and AO (Exhibit 1)). Comment regarding opposition to specific route segment noted (G; Q; AB).</p>
-----	-------	-------	---------	--	--

35.	Email	Lucky	Hunt 65	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>MEMORANDUM</b></p> <p>DATE: January 8, 2015</p> <p>TO: Arizona Dept. of Transportation Via Email: <a href="mailto:projects@azdot.gov">projects@azdot.gov</a></p> <p>FROM: Lucky Hunt 65</p> <p>RE: ADOT North-South Corridor – Florence Area Route Alternative</p> <hr/> <p>We have visited <a href="http://www.azdot.gov/northsouthcorridorstudy">www.azdot.gov/northsouthcorridorstudy</a> and <b>strongly support</b> Resolution No. 1490-14 (attached) by the Town of Florence which reflects Option O3, V, X and OA (Preferred Options) in their General Plan.</p> <p>We <b>adamantly oppose</b> Options G, Q and AB</p> <p>Property Owner: <b>Lucky Hunt 65, LLC</b></p> <p>Property Location: S of SWC Hunt Highway and Arizona Farms Road, Pinal County</p> <p>Acreage: 65 Acres</p> <p>APN: 200-25-001C, E and F</p> <p>[For attachment, reference Exhibit 1 – Town of Florence Resolution 1490-14]</p>	<p>Comment noted. Comment regarding preferred route noted (Florence Resolution No. 1490-14 - Segment O3; V; X; and AO (Exhibit 1)). Comment regarding opposition to specific route segment noted (G; Q; AB).</p>
-----	-------	-------	---------	--	--

36.	Email	Hunt	And Perry	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>MEMORANDUM</b></p> <p>DATE: January 8, 2015</p> <p>TO: Arizona Dept. of Transportation Via Email: projects@azdot.gov</p> <p>FROM: Hunt &amp; Perry</p> <p>RE: ADOT North-South Corridor – Florence Area Route Alternative</p> <hr/> <p>We have visited <a href="http://www.azdot.gov/northsouthcorridorstudy">www.azdot.gov/northsouthcorridorstudy</a> and <b>strongly support</b> Resolution No. 1490-14 (attached) by the Town of Florence which reflects Option O3, V, X and OA (Preferred Options) in their General Plan.</p> <p>We <b><u>adamantly oppose</u></b> Options G, Q and AB</p> <p>Property Owner: <b>Hunt &amp; Hooper, L.L.C.</b></p> <p>Property Location: South of Magic Ranch golf course</p> <p>Acreage: 80 Acres</p> <p>APN: 200-28-001B2</p> <p>[For attachment, reference Exhibit 1 – Town of Florence Resolution 1490-14]</p>	<p>Comment noted. Comment regarding preferred route noted (Florence Resolution No. 1490-14 - Segment O3; V; X; and AO (Exhibit 1)). Comment regarding opposition to specific route segment noted (G; Q; AB).</p>
-----	-------	------	--------------	---	--

37.	Email	Hunt	And Hooper	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>MEMORANDUM</b></p> <p>DATE: January 8, 2015</p> <p>TO: Arizona Dept. of Transportation Via Email: <a href="mailto:projects@azdot.gov">projects@azdot.gov</a></p> <p>FROM: Hunt &amp; Hooper, L.L.C.</p> <p>RE: ADOT North-South Corridor – Florence Area Route Alternative</p> <hr/> <p>We have visited <a href="http://www.azdot.gov/northsouthcorridorstudy">www.azdot.gov/northsouthcorridorstudy</a> and <b>strongly support</b> Resolution No. 1490-14 (attached) by the Town of Florence which reflects Option O3, V, X and OA (Preferred Options) in their General Plan.</p> <p>We <b>adamantly oppose</b> Options G, Q and AB</p> <p>Property Owner: <b>Hunt &amp; Hooper, L.L.C.</b></p> <p>Property Location: West of Hunt Highway contiguous to Magic Ranch, Town of Florence, Pinal County</p> <p>Acreage: 77 Acres</p> <p>APN: 200-28-001A4</p> <p>[For attachment, reference Exhibit 1 – Town of Florence Resolution 1490-14]</p>	<p>Comment noted. Comment regarding preferred route noted (Florence Resolution No. 1490-14 - Segment O3; V; X; and AO (Exhibit 1)). Comment regarding opposition to specific route segment noted (G; Q; AB).</p>
-----	-------	------	---------------	---	--

38.	Email	Heritage	At Magic Ranch	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>MEMORANDUM</b></p> <p>DATE: January 8, 2015</p> <p>TO: Arizona Dept. of Transportation Via Email: <a href="mailto:projects@azdot.gov">projects@azdot.gov</a></p> <p>FROM: Heritage at Magic Ranch</p> <p>RE: ADOT North-South Corridor – Florence Area Route Alternative</p> <hr/> <p>We have visited <a href="http://www.azdot.gov/northsouthcorridorstudy">www.azdot.gov/northsouthcorridorstudy</a> and <b>strongly support</b> Resolution No. 1490-14 (attached) by the Town of Florence which reflects Option O3, V, X and OA (Preferred Options) in their General Plan.</p> <p>We <b>adamantly oppose</b> Options G, Q and AB</p> <p>Property Owner: <b>RMG Arizona Properties Holding XVII,LLC</b></p> <p>Property Location: NEC Sierra Vista Drive &amp; Heritage Road, Pinal County</p> <p>Acreage: 28.61 Acres</p> <p>APN: 200-58-013A7</p> <p>[For attachment, reference Exhibit 1 – Town of Florence Resolution 1490-14]</p>	<p>Comment noted. Comment regarding preferred route noted (Florence Resolution No. 1490-14 - Segment O3; V; X; and AO (Exhibit 1)). Comment regarding opposition to specific route segment noted (G; Q; AB).</p>
-----	-------	----------	----------------	--	--

39.	Email	Florence	Majestic Ranch, LLC	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>MEMORANDUM</b></p> <p>DATE: January 8, 2015</p> <p>TO: Arizona Dept. of Transportation Via Email: <a href="mailto:projects@azdot.gov">projects@azdot.gov</a></p> <p>FROM: Florence/Majestic Ranch, L.L.C.</p> <p>RE: ADOT North-South Corridor – Florence Area Route Alternative</p> <hr/> <p>We have visited <a href="http://www.azdot.gov/northsouthcorridorstudy">www.azdot.gov/northsouthcorridorstudy</a> and <b>strongly support</b> Resolution No. 1490-14 (attached) by the Town of Florence which reflects Option O3, V, X and OA (Preferred Options) in their General Plan.</p> <p>We <b>adamantly oppose</b> Options G, Q and AB</p> <p>Property Owner: <b>Florence/Majestic Ranch, L.L.C.</b></p> <p>Property Location: South of downtown Florence and bound on the east side by Hwy 79</p> <p>Acreage: 160 Acres</p> <p>APN: 206-01-012A5</p> <p>[For attachment, reference Exhibit 1 – Town of Florence Resolution 1490-14]</p>	Comment noted. Comment regarding preferred route noted (Florence Resolution No. 1490-14 - Segment O3; V; X; and AO (Exhibit 1)). Comment regarding opposition to specific route segment noted (G; Q; AB).
-----	-------	----------	---------------------	---	---





40.	Email	Crestfield	Manor 57, LLC	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>MEMORANDUM</b></p> <p>DATE: January 8, 2015</p> <p>TO: Arizona Dept. of Transportation Via Email: <a href="mailto:projects@azdot.gov">projects@azdot.gov</a></p> <p>FROM: Crestfield 57, LLC</p> <p>RE: ADOT North-South Corridor – Florence Area Route Alternative</p> <hr/> <p>We have visited <a href="http://www.azdot.gov/northsouthcorridorstudy">www.azdot.gov/northsouthcorridorstudy</a> and <b>strongly support</b> Resolution No. 1490-14 (attached) by the Town of Florence which reflects Option O3, V, X and OA (Preferred Options) in their General Plan.</p> <p>We <b>adamantly oppose</b> Options G, Q and AB</p> <p>Property Owner: <b>Crestfield 57, LLC</b></p> <p>Property Location: SWC of Felix Road and Heritage Road, Florence, AZ.</p> <p>Acreage: 11 Acres</p> <p>APN: 57 Lots</p> <p>[For attachment, reference Exhibit 1 – Town of Florence Resolution 1490-14]</p>	<p>Comment noted. Comment regarding preferred route noted (Florence Resolution No. 1490-14 - Segment O3; V; X; and AO (Exhibit 1)). Comment regarding opposition to specific route segment noted (G; Q; AB).</p>
-----	-------	------------	---------------	--	--

41.	Email	Rose Law Group	Wolfcor Wolfkin	[For attachment, reference Exhibit 3 – Rose Law Group]	Comment noted. Comment regarding preferred route noted (O3). Comment regarding opposition to specific route segments (Segments G; E4; K3) noted.
42.	Email	Gilbert	Olgin	<p>Dear North-South Corridor Study Team:</p> <p>The Town of Florence has spent the last several years working with residents, land owners, stakeholders and various other entities through a public process in an effort to help ADOT locate the best alignment for the proposed North-South Freeway Corridor through Florence's Planning Area. The Town's preferences for the Corridor have been officially stated via the Town's General Plan Future Land Use Map, most recently updated in 2014, and per Resolution 1490-14, which affirms the Town's support of the Town's General Plan Future Land Use Map and also states which ADOT Corridor segments the Town can and cannot support. The Town has concurrently acted to support the future alignment of the ADOT Passenger Rail Corridor between the State's two largest metropolitan areas to wisely coincide with the alignment of the ADOT North-South Corridor. The Town's preferred Corridor for the future freeway and rail systems allows these improvements to occur over time in a well-thought out manner that addresses all anticipated impacts of these future transportation enhancements. Any deviations to the Town's preferences for the ADOT North-South Corridor could be extremely detrimental to the Town and the region in both the short and long term. Namely, the Town is very concerned that certain objectionable routes noted in Resolution 1490-14 would have: grave impacts to current and ongoing development north of the Gila River; devastating impacts to the Town's core and central business district by creating a route that would be too far west of downtown Florence; and the highly undesirable impacts of conflicting with years of public and private planning efforts for the Town's Planning Area. The bottom line is that the right Corridor will allow Florence to continue to grow in a sustainable manner, prosper and maintain its position as the heart and seat of Pinal County. Alternatively, the wrong Corridor will most certainly result in Florence being a pass-by community that will have significant challenges adding rooftops, commercial businesses and employment opportunities, thus most certainly resulting in irreversible negative fiscal and other impacts. The Town of Florence sincerely asks that ADOT please continue to work with the Town of Florence in supporting the Town's preferences for the North-South Corridor within the Florence Planning Area.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Gilbert Olgin Senior Planner Town of Florence</p> <p>[For attachment, reference Exhibit 1 – Town of Florence Resolution 1490-14]</p>	Comment noted. Comment regarding preferred route noted (Florence Resolution No. 1490-14 - Segment O3; V; X; and AO (Exhibit 1)).

43.	Email	Heath	Reed	<p>Good afternoon North South Corridor Study Team:</p> <p>The Town of Florence has spent the last several years working with residents, land owners, stakeholders and various other entities through a public process in an effort to help ADOT locate the best alignment for the proposed North-South Freeway Corridor through the Town of Florence. The Town's preferences for the Corridor has been officially stated via the Town's General Plan Future Land Use Map, most recently updated in 2014, and per Resolution 1490-14, which affirms the Town's support of the Town's General Plan Future Land Use Map and also states which ADOT Corridor segments the Town can and cannot support. The Town has concurrently acted to support the future alignment of the ADOT Passenger Rail Corridor between the State's two largest metropolitan areas to wisely coincide with the alignment of the ADOT North-South Corridor. The Town's preferred Corridor for the future Freeway and rail systems allows these improvements to occur over time in a well-thought out manner that addresses all anticipated impacts of these future transportation enhancements.</p> <p>Any abnormalities to the Town's preferences for the ADOT North-South Corridor could be extremely detrimental to the Town, land owners and the region in both the short and long term. Namely, the Town is very concerned that certain objectionable routes noted in Resolution 1490-14 would have grave impacts to current and ongoing development north of the Gila River; devastating impacts to the Town's core and central business district by creating a route that would be too far west of downtown Florence; and the highly undesirable impacts of conflicting with years of public and private planning efforts for the Town's Planning Area. The bottom line is that the right Corridor will allow Florence to continue to grow in a sustainable manner, prosper and maintain its position as the heart and seat of Pinal County. Alternatively, the wrong Corridor will most certainly result in Florence being a pass-by community that will have significant challenges adding rooftops, commercial businesses and employment opportunities, thus most certainly resulting in irreversible negative fiscal and other impacts. The Town of Florence sincerely asks that ADOT please continue to work with the Town of Florence in supporting the Town's preferences for the North-South Corridor within the Florence Planning Area.</p> <p>Thanks</p> <p><b>Heath Reed</b> Town Planner Community Development Department Town of Florence</p> <p>[For attachment, reference Exhibit 1 – Town of Florence Resolution 1490-14]</p>	Comment noted. Comment regarding preferred route noted (Florence Resolution No. 1490-14 - Segment O3; V; X; and AO (Exhibit 1)).
44.	Email	John	Anderson	<p><b>12/23/2014 1:07:16 PM</b></p> <p>I support the Town of Florence Resolution No. 1490-14 plan for routes for the North-South Corridor.</p> <p>John Anderson Councilmember, Town of Florence</p> <p>[For attachment, reference Exhibit 1 – Town of Florence Resolution 1490-14]</p>	Comment noted. Comment regarding preferred route noted (Florence Resolution No. 1490-14 - Segment O3; V; X; and AO (Exhibit 1)).
45.	Email	Gerald	Steven	<p>Dear Project Manager</p> <p>Would you please add my comments to your study record. Thank you for your consideration to this input.</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p>	Comment noted. The only project of note on US 60 is Silver King to Superior streets (east of the N-S Study Area). Gold Canyon Bypass DCR/EA was done, but there is no schedule for the next phase. Comment regarding preferred route noted (reference is to earlier project segment

			<p>December 26, 2014</p> <p>AZ Department of Transportation</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b><u>North/South Corridor Study</u></b></p> <p>Dear Project Manager,</p> <p>Thank you for the opportunity to contribute to your study. My perspective is from a Gold Canyon resident who would appreciate some prioritization to immediate congestion opportunities as you deliberate the long term solutions.</p> <p>1. Highway 60 is dangerous and very congested from Signal Butte to Ironwood. I recommend you immediately add lanes in this accident prone section. This expansion to three lanes is critical no matter what long term N/S corridor is chosen. In the same vein, changing the interchange at 60/Ironwood to a full highway overpass system is critical to stop the bottlenecks at that critical intersection and provide highway speed inter-connections.</p> <p>I see you have a similar point of view and adding Hwy 60 access/egress at Meridian is a step in the right direction. Hopefully adding more lanes East from Signal Butte are not far behind.</p> <p>2. Highway 60 from Ironwood to Gold Canyon and Peralta is also very problematic. Although this is a priority 2 compared to item (1), this needs to be triple-lanes as well. The enormous crush of traffic during the Renaissance Fair makes access to and from our neighborhood a nightmare on weekends every February and March. Not only is this a road safety issue, it also poses a safety risk to anyone needing emergency Hospital services.</p> <p>3. There is no alternate East-West access from Gold Canyon except Highway 60 to Apache Junction or going down to Arizona Farms Road. This is a long term issue and any accident or congestion on Hwy 60 between Gold Canyon and Apache Junction completely isolates thousands of us. Perhaps a connection from Ironwood to Peralta or Kings Ranch Road is in your plan? This would give us an escape-route and also streamline access to the Gateway Airport, Queen Creek and Highway 202.</p> <p>4. The new mine that is proposed for Superior will see an increase of traffic along Highway 60. Probably more important is the additional tax revenue this project will generate. I am not clear on your funding plans, but I suggest a direct contribution from the mine operator to help fund items 2 &amp; 3 is very reasonable.</p> <p>5. Ironwood needs to be beefed up south of Highway 60 no matter what corridor is chosen. I suggest additional lanes in each direction. As this area continues to develop, exits instead of stop</p>	<p>notation, which may be found in the ASR).</p>
--	--	--	---	--


				<p>lights at major intersections will become crucial.</p> <p>6. From a macro point of view, <u>my recommendation would be to do all 5 items above and make the major investment in the N/S corridor along the option which shows the corridor on the East side of Highway 60 curve between Apache Junction and Gold Canyon. It looks like this is Alternative 1A according to your documentation.</u></p> <p>This provides a "ring road" concept for through traffic heading north/south from the East Valley. It complements the Hwy 202 connector concept and surrounds the high growth area between the Superstitions and the development all along the Queen Valley down to Hwy 10.</p> <p>Beefing up the Hunt Highway and other feeder roads is also necessary to meet residential and commercial growth needs. However, I assume this is outside your scope.</p> <p>In conclusion, this eastern "super connector" including Alternative 1A between Hwy 60 and Hwy 10 provides the biggest bang for the buck from a long term point of view. It can be built with little interruption to the existing roadways since it is primarily over non-populated land along its total distance. It satisfies long term growth and short term safety and congestion issues.</p> <p>Please feel free to contact me if there are any questions.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Gerald Stevenson</p> 	
46.	Email	Gerald and Sharon	Lee	<p><b>From:</b> Rusty Orerand  <b>Sent:</b> Monday, January 12, 2015 8:46 AM  <b>To:</b> Projects  <b>Subject:</b> North/South Corridor Comments #1500957527</p> <p>From Envoy:</p> <p>1/9/2015 3:45:41 PM  As residents of Florence Gardens in Florence AZ, we object to alternate route 1B/2B. Please select alternate route 1A/2A. Thank you!</p> <p>Gerald and Sharon Lee</p> 	<p>Comment noted. Comment regarding preferred route noted (reference is to earlier project segment notation, which may be found in the ASR). Comment regarding opposition to specific route segment also noted.</p>

47.	Email	Loreto	Gonzales	<p><b>From:</b> Rusty Crensd  <b>Sent:</b> Thursday, January 08, 2015 12:57 PM  <b>To:</b> Projects  <b>Subject:</b> North-South Corridor Study #1500842133</p> <p>From Envoy:</p> <p>1/8/2015 11:30:55 AM  As of now we are not interested until more specific information is provided. Last meeting here in the coolidge area they were still unsure how far east of wheeler rd the study had planned on making the highway. As for west of wheeler rd we are not interested at all unless it is west of hwy 87. We need more details.</p> <p>Loreto Gonzales  </p>	Comment noted. Comment regarding opposition to specific route segment along Wheeler Road noted.
48.	Email	Mike	Hutchinson	[For attachment, reference Exhibit 4 – Superstition Vistas]	Comment noted. Comment regarding preferred route noted (Segment I; J; O3; V; X; AO. ADOT has reported that the Maricopa Association of Governments (MAG) is considering a study to understand what future network (including the US 60 Bypass, North-South, and SR 24) would best serve the interests of the region.
49.	Email	Matthew	McCormick	[For attachment, reference Exhibit 5 – Pinal Land Holdings]	Comment noted. The study team will be meeting with City of Coolidge staff and will request their current adopted land use plan as well as information on any planned developments for consideration in the EIS.

50.	Online	Johnre411	<p>Hello, A few comments. As you all know, this freeway is desperately needed, especially what I assume would be the first few phases to be built between Apache Junction/East Mesa and Florence, as well as the SR24 connector, where well over 100K people live and are stuck using a couple roads with many red lights and traffic congestion, turning what should be a 15 minute ride into a 30-40 minute negative daily experience. Additionally, when this North-South freeway is built, the economic benefits to the entire region and state would be enormous. I suspect it could lead to nothing short of an economic boom as the land area between Superstition Mountains/Apache Junction and Florence/Casa Grande/etc. is huge, I've head it referred to as potentially the "Orange County" of Phoenix should a major freeway make the region accessible. The lack of a freeway in the area is essentially holding up the economic growth of the state in addition to inconveniencing all the people who live in the region already. Funding is the issue but I strongly oppose toll roads; from my time in Dallas they are terrible... Toll roads promote cynicism &amp; division as they provide people with daily opportunity to feel extorted when they consciously have to make the choice to pay for a "first class" ticket or end up frustrated by taking frontage roads with red lights every mile or so. The cynicism develops as a result of resentment/frustration for being nickel and dimed over something as basic and necessary as transportation. My friends in Dallas can't stand them and rightly feel that toll roads are, for lack of a better term, un-American and a violation of the sense of freedom we so much appreciate. Even the most recently elected Conservative Governor of Texas isn't favorable to toll roads after experiencing the reality of them vs. the theory. In short, they are the perfect example of a failed experiment. But that still leaves us with the issue of funding in which I have a suggestion here. The benefits of the North-South freeway are so enormous that AZDOT out to make this a priority and lobby both of our Senators heavily, especially considering that one of them is among the most prominent, influential &amp; respected politicians in the country. As I understand it, both major political parties agree upon the need for a huge investment in the national infrastructure of our roads; this issue is talked about as something that the new congress could actually get done over the next couple of years. As such, it seems that if AZDOT makes this project a priority they could then work hard to successfully lobby our Senators to put this project on a fast track as a condition of their supporting any potential infrastructure bill over the next several years. Considering the gridlock of the last few years this may seem to be a long shot but I'm not so sure about that, change is in the air. An infrastructure investment in this country is inevitable because its so badly needed. As such, AZDOT should position itself on the ground floor so that whenever this infrastructure bill becomes realty, our Senators can use their influence to make sure that it at least finances the first few phases of the North-South corridor as well as SR24 to connect it to the 202. Hopefully, this freeway can be built sooner than any of us currently believe is possible! Thank You, John Re</p>	<p>Comment noted. Reference to tolling was made in the presentation as a possible funding option; no specific funding source has been identified for the project at this time, and it will likely take a combination of funding sources to develop the project. As the project advances through the EIS and preliminary design phase, a cost estimate will be prepared, and additional information will be shared with the public when the draft EIS is prepared for review.</p>
51.	Online		<p>Studies have shown a decline in all highway miles traveled in the state, as well as, a decline in the miles traveled within the Pinal County. Additionally, the low revenues generated through gas tax because of the decline is causing a drop in funding for any additional roadways; this should be strongly scrutinized against the funding need to maintain our current ones. I would rather have current roads maintained rather than building new "shortcuts" that only save people minutes on their commute. For this reason, I support the No Build option for the North South Corridor. As for the effect through my area within the study, around the Coolidge/Florence area. The AO route</p>	<p>Comment noted. Comment regarding preference for no-build alternative also noted.</p>

				is the least detrimental to uprooting any existing community development, as well as, any culturally protected historic areas. Thank you for your time.	
52.	Online	Doug	Benson	On the 3 attached ADOT reports, They all show a decline in highway miles traveled in the state of AZ as well as a decline in the miles traveled in Pinal County. Miles traveled since 2006 have declined both for the State and Pinal County. Correspondingly, there is a drop in gas tax revenue for future projects and tax revenue should be best put to use maintaining our existing roads and bridges that need work, not building new roads. The No Build option is the best option for the North South Corridor. Of existing study routes Section "AO" is much more preferable than "AB" as it avoids housing at Valley Farms, custom homes along Clemans Road and avoids the sensitive Pima Indian cultural sites that are protected by the state. Section "AO" is drawn thru farmland areas and is much less intrusive to existing development. Doug Benson [REDACTED]	Comment noted. Comment regarding preference for no-build alternative noted. Comment regarding preferred route noted (Segments AL; AH; AN; AO; X; V; O3; J; I).
53.		Anonymous		1. Prefer the following route (South to North): AL-->AH-->AN-->AO-->X-->V-->O3-->J & I. This will help support the town of Florence, while developing a more direct route to the prisons (for staff and inmate transportation.) 2. Would like to see this as a limited-entry type of highway (e.g., I-10) rather than a multi-lane type of surface street (i.e., Hunt Highway). This will improve traffic flow & speed. It should also decrease accidents since there will be limited places for slow-downs and stops (limited business access, intersections, stop lights, residential traffic, etc.)	Comment regarding preferred route noted (Segments AL; AH; AN; AO; X; V; O3; J; and I)
54.	Online	[REDACTED]		I believe this freeway is a great idea and due for the Southeast Valley/Florence area. I grew up in the Queen Creek area and saw the tremendous transportation congestion rapid growth placed upon the community. This project would alleviate congestion for current & future populations in the Queen Creek and Florence areas. This project would assist the development already planned in Pinal County and would enhance the current population's transportation system. It would also allow for rapid commercial & residential growth throughout Pinal County creating more jobs in the area. It would provide a more practical entry to the I-10 South which would expedite trade between Tucson and Phoenix (especially the Southeast Phoenix valley area). Since the completion of the San Tan Freeway, southern growth and momentum through Gilbert is progressing and this freeway would greatly benefit the area. Pinal County is the fastest growing County in Arizona and to provide direct access to the Florence area would be a huge benefit. I believe the ideal location of the project would be along the points on the corridor map from G to P to V to X to AB then to AC. Thank you for allowing me to put in my 2 cents!!	Comment noted. Comment regarding preferred route noted (Segments G; P; V; X; AB; AC).
55.	Online	[REDACTED]		I live down one of the corridors you are looking at right off of Clemens between ViKi Inn and Kennilworh road. I believe this is a bad route to take. Section AB south of Highway 287 runs through Pima Indian artifacts, known as pottery hill. As a Native Pima, I believe that the land is sacred, not to mention that is fenced and protected by the state. Plus this route would take out many high dollar homes. I believe that section AO would be a better selection running east of the high tension power lines on Valley Farms Road and in a farming fields with no residential homes in that area.	Comment noted. Comment regarding preferred route noted (Segment AO). The EIS will evaluate the potential impact to culturally significant sites and traditional cultural properties, while also



					expanding the understanding of these sites throughout the project area for future reference and use.
56.	Online	None	None	I support the freeway to go G to P to V to X to AB to AC....thx	Comment regarding preferred route noted (Segment G; P; V; X; AB; AC).
57.	Online			I am VP of the HOA Board for the Castlegate community located at the Southeast corner of Schnepf Road and Ocotillo Road (this development is not shown on your map). I am not commenting as a representative of the HOA but I do know that there is a lot of concern about the effect of this project on property values and noise in our community. Personally, though I am concerned about noise, I feel this project is absolutely necessary to release the congestion that is now on Ironwood which is only going to get worse as more homes are built in our area. I feel that property values will only go up as I am sure Ocotillo will be used as one of the accesses to this new highway. Because of the noise I would prefer that the roadway be as far East as possible but that may not be the best location as I feel the rout starting on Ironwood is preferable but I am sure people in Apache Junction would want you to use the option further East. So despite my concern for noise I think (using the numbers and letters on your map) starting in Apache Junction on A then E1 and E2 with no opinion on the roadway further South as I am just not acquainted with that area. I would be happy to answer any questions you might have of me and would be pleased to have you come and talk to our HOA about your plans, could get other HOAs in the area to come too.	Comment noted. Comment regarding preferred route noted (Segment A; E1; E2). Invitation to speak at HOA referred to project team.
58.	Online	Tom	Krukow	My comments address the Northern starting points proposed for the Corridor, specifically the starting point of Ironwood Drive Southward; and some incidental issues related to existing conditions.. That alignment would have to devastate either the Palmas Del Sol East Manufactured Home Park on the SW corner US60 & Ironwood Drive; or, Apache Creek Golf Course on the South East Corner of US60 & Ironwood Drive; or, Both. How it even arrived on the table is a complete mystery. If the corridor began at Idaho Road to the East of the Apache Creek Golf Course, it would have to travel through the newly reconfigured flood control collection/diversion project, starting just South of Baseline Road. It would have to be an elevated roadway for at least a mile and one half and; would have to bridge the project dam as well as the CAP Canal. Also, it would not afford the people of Gold Canyon any easier or shorter travel distance & times to points South. Since the previously proposed US60 by-pass of Gold Canyon seemed to have legs, I suggest that the take-off point for N-S Corridor be made from there. Much of the current traffic between US60 at the Loop 202 interchange & Ironwood Drive would be reduced if the Route 24 was continued to Ironwood Drive on a speed-ed up basis, instead pushing the North South Corridor from US60 at this time. Traffic from the Queen Creek area is always bogged down and backed up considerably as it hits the Cap Canal bridge going Northbound. Accidents are considerable in the 1 mile from the bridge to US60. A temporary relief could be easily accomplished by utilizing the both lanes of the Westbound on-ramp from Ironwood Drive onto US60. Merely changing the signaling to allow for two Northbound lanes passing under the bridge to turn left, The right hand of the two left lanes	Comment noted. The only project of note on US 60 is Silver King to Superior streets (east of the N-S Study Area). Gold Canyon Bypass DCR/EA was done, but there is no schedule for the next phase.

				could have the option to proceed straight ahead. This would almost double the amount of traffic handled in a given amount of time. Currently, Northbound drivers try to pass the line of traffic in the left turn lane, and to cut in at the last minute as they get close to passing under the bridge. This has caused numerous accidents as well. The soon to be finished Half-Diamond interchange at Meridian Road and US60 will not expedite the Northbound Ironwood traffic at Baseline Road. It will have to contend with left turn lane backups that exist now to go Westbound. Further, with no traffic control light at Baseline and Meridian; and, soon to be 1-new traffic lights on each side of Meridian Road US60 bridge. which will have to be negotiated to access the US60 Westbound ramp, it doesn't appear that the route will be too inviting in the long term. Tom Krukow	
59.	Online	Anonym ous		Section AB south of Highway 287 runs through Pima Indian artifacts known as pottery hill which is fenced and protected by the state. Continuing down it would take out many homes on the top west side of the town of Valley Farms. South on Clemens Road it would ruin many high dollar residential homes & ranchettes on land that was sold as residential subdivisions. On the west side of Clemens Rd is a "unique" canal system which has kept the county from paving the road for many years due to the cost of materials and labor. Section AO would be a better selection running east of the high tension power lines on Valley Farms Road and in farm fields with no residential homes.	Comment noted. Comment regarding preferred route noted (Segment AO). The EIS will evaluate the potential impact to existing and planned development. Infrastructure, such as canals will also be considered when evaluating the project impacts.
60.	Online	None	None	I hope that the chosen route is west of Poston Butte. (A freeway close to Florence Gardens and the downtown Florence area would be a bad idea.) Folks say that a freeway often follows existing high-tension electric lines. That might be a good idea in this case. The idea for rail transportation is great! In fact, people - especially young people - are driving less and less. And lots of places all over the country are not planning new freeways at all. So maybe you can drop the whole idea of a new freeway and just go with the rail transport idea. Whatever you decide, I hope it's a great decision with which we can all live happily.	Comment noted. Comment regarding preferred route noted (Segment Q). Even with consideration of a passenger rail line, there is a recognized need for a transportation route through the area to provide connectivity for the region and the anticipated growth.
61.	Online	Anonym ous		NO on Alternative 2A and 2B! These routes will cause additional noise, congestion, and traffic near established communities. These routes will also cause increased traffic/delays on Ironwood during the construction. This road is already congested and dangerous enough.	Comment noted. Comment regarding opposition to specific route segments noted (reference is to earlier project segment notation, which may be found in the ASR).
62.	Online	None	None	An updated map is needed for questions and comments to be relevant. I live east of Schnepf and south of Ocotillo and do not see my neighborhood on the current map. Where can an updated map with a more accurate picture of the proposed routes be found?	Comment noted; no contact information was provided.
63.	Online	Tim	Skilern	My vision of this north south corridor will be a highway that will move traffic away from Ironwood Drive, provide a more direct route for traffic from Apache Junction to the I-10 corridor for those going to Tucson. Probably the most efficient and less costly route would be locating the highway to the east of the Castlegate community and the old Rittenhouse AirForce base where there is open	Comment noted. Comment regarding preferred route noted.

				land causing less impact to those already settled in the community. The new I-24 route should align with Germann Blvd going east to the new highway to better move the flow of traffic from the West. Just maybe the new I-24 should have an East West Axis connecting to the I-60 towards Globe, Arizona. Thank you for listening to my input. Tim Skillern	
64.	Online			Please push the freeway further East away from Castlegate community.	Comment noted. Comment regarding preferred route be located as far east of the Castlegate community as possible.
65.	Online			"NO" on Alternative 2A and 2B! a major highway in the backyard of Castlegate homes, will impact our property values due to traffic noise, pollution, and unsightliness.	Comment noted. Comment regarding opposition to specific route (Segment E2) noted.
66.	Online			What are the proposed exits for the highway? What is the anticipated groundbreaking date?	Potential interchange locations (i.e., "exits") would be identified in the EIS. While not identified at this time, interchanges would likely be consistent with the Routes of Regional Significance identified in the Pinal County Regionally Significant Routes for Safety & Mobility - (RSRSM).
67.	Online			please select options 1a or 1b to route this highway	Comment regarding preferred route noted (reference is to earlier project segment notation, which may be found in the ASR).
68.	Online			As much as I want a highway close to me I don't want it in my back yard. Option 1a and 1b would be a better choice and not disrupt any established neighborhood	Comment noted. Comment regarding preferred route noted (reference is to earlier project segment notation, which may be found in the ASR).
69.	Online			(There are better options, like Alternative 1A and 1B.) Please use this. We cannot have a highway coming through our neighborhood like 2A and 2B. It will bring down our house values and ruin why we moved here to the natural quiet and beauty! Please do not build a road through our area. Thank you..	Comment noted. Comment regarding preferred route noted (reference is to earlier project segment notation, which may be found in the ASR). Comment regarding

					opposition to specific route segments noted.
70.	Online			I vote no on the proposed 2a and 2b this would almost be in my backyard	Comment regarding opposition to specific route segments noted.
71.	Online			While I support the North South Corridor project (it will alleviate congestion on Ironwood and improve my daily commute and the commute of thousands of others), you CANNOT go with Alternative No. 2A, 2B (the section of road marked in pink as "E2" on your map. What your map doesn't show is how this stretch of road will run adjacent to the backyards of hundreds of homes in the Castlegate Community. The noise from highway traffic, the pollution, and unsightliness will ruin our property values that we so work hard to preserve. I am all in favor of this project, but you need to adopt Alternative No. "1A, 1B" (the brown stretch of road labeled K1) as this moves the highway far enough east as to still provide beneficial access, but will not inhibit quiet, comfortable living of hundreds of Castlegate Community residents. NO on 2A & 2B. YES on 1A, 1B. I am deeply concerned that since your map does not show any of the streets in the Castlegate Community, most residents will not realize how close Alternative 2A & 2B will come to our homes, and will not speak up. Your map omits crucial decision making roads. Please go with Alternative 1A, 1B - do not ruin our large community with 2A, 2B.	Comment noted. Comment regarding preference/opposition to specific route segments noted (reference is to earlier project segment notation, which may be found in the ASR).
72.	Online	None	None	The Town of Florence has spent the last several years working with residents, land owners, stakeholders and various other entities through a public process in an effort to help ADOT locate the best alignment for the proposed North-South Freeway Corridor through Florence's Planning Area. The Town's preferences for the Corridor have been officially stated via the Town's General Plan Future Land Use Map, most recently updated in 2014, and per Resolution 1490-14, which affirms the Town's support of the Town's General Plan Future Land Use Map and also states which ADOT Corridor segments the Town can and cannot support. The Town has concurrently acted to support the future alignment of the ADOT Passenger Rail Corridor between the State's two largest metropolitan areas to wisely coincide with the alignment of the ADOT North-South Corridor. The Town's preferred Corridor for the future freeway and rail systems allows these improvements to occur over time in a well-thought out manner that addresses all anticipated impacts of these future transportation enhancements. Any deviations to the Town's preferences for the ADOT North-South Corridor could be extremely detrimental to the Town and the region in both the short and long term. Namely, the Town is very concerned that certain objectionable routes noted in Resolution 1490-14 would have: grave impacts to current and ongoing development north of the Gila River; devastating impacts to the Town's core and central business district by creating a route that would be too far west of downtown Florence; and the highly undesirable impacts of conflicting with years of public and private planning efforts for the Town's Planning Area. The bottom line is that the right Corridor will allow Florence to continue to grow in a sustainable manner, prosper and maintain its position as the heart and seat of Pinal County. Alternatively, the wrong Corridor will most certainly result in Florence being a pass-by community that will have significant challenges adding rooftops, commercial businesses and employment opportunities, thus most certainly resulting in irreversible negative fiscal and other impacts. The Town of Florence sincerely asks that ADOT please continue to	Comment noted. Comment regarding preferred route noted.

				work with the Town of Florence in supporting the Town's preferences for the North-South Corridor within the Florence Planning Area.	
73.	Online			Please do not locate this near our homes. We are off Felix Road and Cobblestone, in Crestfield Manor. Use vacant land far from homes. We bought out here to get away from freeways. We do not want the noise, traffic or dirt from a freeway corridor.	Comment noted. Comment regarding opposition to specific route segments noted (Segment Q is in proximity to Crestfield Manor).
74.	Online			i would like the most direct route coming south from the 60: Red from the 60, going to purple, then blue, going further south. commuting 100 miles a day to north central phoenix. this would significantly reduce travel time :- ) It would not make sense to move it further east, most people live around queen creek and san tan valley that would use the route .	Comment noted. Comment regarding preferred route noted.
75.	Online	Sharon	Gallagher	I am co-owner of the home my husband and I purchased in 2013. We are year round residents of Apache Junction. I use Ironwood (and Gantzel Rd) regularly both north and south of the 60. Ironwood is very congested south of the 60 most of the time when I drive it. I would prefer Ironwood to be a freeway and the northern end of the North-South Freeway. I would prefer westernmost routing options selected as much as possible all the way south to Eloy and I-10. Thank you. Sharon Gallagher	Comment noted. Comment regarding preferred route noted.
76.	Online	Steve	Gallagher	My wife and I live very near Ironwood on 12th Ave in Apache Junction. We are permanent year round residents. We use Ironwood regularly both north and south of the 60. Ironwood to the south of the 60 needs to be made into a freeway. Ironwood should be selected as the northern end of the freeway. Ironwood is very heavily traveled and congested now south of the 60. An Ironwood Freeway would solve that. An Ironwood Freeway location would likely be preferred for commuters that live in the vicinity of both Ironwood and Gantzel Rd due to closer proximity to their homes. We would like to drive from 12th Ave on Ironwood then remain on Ironwood (now a freeway) as we travel south from the 60. That would be cool and awesome and safe and fun and quick and convenient. I would prefer selection of Ironwood as the northern end and then select routing options that generally remain westernmost as the freeway travels south. I would NOT prefer selection of a freeway entrance east of Ironwood or eastern routing options. Steve Gallagher	Comment noted. Comment regarding preferred route noted.
77.	Online			No where near the Castlegate neighborhood as it would certainly have an adverse effect on my property value and quality of life. I purchased a house in a rural area for a variety of reasons, not least of which is the quiet and lack of ambient light in the evening hours. The increased traffic would outweigh any advantage in egress to the freeway.	Comment noted. Comment regarding opposition to specific route segment (E2) noted.
78.	Online			I would prefer it NOT to be right behind my subdivision, Castlegate.	Comment noted. Comment regarding opposition to specific route segment (E2) noted.
79.	Online			Should absolutely NOT destroy the point of living out here. Turn Ironwood into a freeway. DO not destroy hunting, shooting, peaceful state land with beautiful night skies. Stay away from castlegate. Or buy my house for 5 times value.	Comment noted. Comment regarding opposition to specific route segment (E2) noted.

80.	Online	[REDACTED]		Will there be plans to extend ocotillo further east to connect to the U.S.60? How will each of the options affect my property value? When will there be a final decision?	Extension of Ocotillo Rd east to US60 would be under the jurisdiction of Pinal County. The impacts of both the build alternatives and no-build alternative will be evaluated in the EIS. It is anticipated that a draft EIS will be complete by the end of 2016, at which time there will be another opportunity to comment on the study findings, in addition, at any time during the study process the public may contact ADOT to provide comments on the project.
81.	Online	[REDACTED]		We do not want this so close to Castlegate. Ironwood is the best option.	Comment noted. Comment regarding opposition to specific route segment (E2) noted.
82.	Online	[REDACTED]		I know we need another north-south corridor, so I am not sure it make sense to turn an already heavily used corridor (Ironwood) into a freeway. The traffic it would cause while being built would be tremendous. How wide would you have to go if the Ironwood choice was decided on? There are several housing developments along that street. Since I live in the NE corner of Castlegate community, the option just east of us does not make me happy either - too close. My preference would be to go further east and to keep the freeway as low as possible as to not block all the nice views of the mountains we have. Thanks	Comment noted. Comment regarding preferred route noted, as well as preference to minimize visual impact (to homeowners) of the east route alternative.
83.	Online	[REDACTED]		What will it look like?	Preliminary design of the proposed facility would be described in the EIS (and accompanying Design Concept Report), a draft of which is anticipated at the end of 2016.
84.	Online	[REDACTED]		I do NOT want a freeway in my backyard or an offramp off of Ocotillo Road. A short connector freeway on the already existing Ironwood would be better. People already drive freeway speeds on this road as it is. Make it safer than a two lane highway and people may drive safer. Putting a freeway to east of Castlegate community along the canal is to close to home. I moved out to this area to be away from the noise and traffic. I do not want my value of my home to decrease not do I want the noise. Place it off of Ironwood or not at all.	Comment noted. Comment regarding opposition to specific route segment (E2) and preference for Ironwood alternative noted.
85.	Online	[REDACTED]		Just got a note from a neighbor, I assume, stating that if adot put this hwy on wheeler rd we would only get pennies on the dollar for our property and a figure of \$10k was mentioned. Can you give us	Additional information on ADOT's right-of-way

				facts about how adot will place values to our properties and the process? Thanks.	acquisition process may be found at <a href="http://azdot.gov/business/RightofWay_Properties/contact-us">http://azdot.gov/business/RightofWay_Properties/contact-us</a> . For additional questions concerning right-of-way, please contact Dave Edwards at ADOT right-of-way (602-712-8803).
86.	Online			I am a resident and homeowner in the Castlegate subdivision and am very concerned about potentially have a freeway and on ramp right next to my neighborhood. I have lived in area that had close freeway access in the past and it seemed to have a higher crime rate (theft, auto and home break ins). I'm also not keen on having to listen to traffic or smell it. Clearly, a freeway connection is needed in this area but I feel it would be best if it went as far east as possible where there are fewer existing homes at this point.	Comment noted. Comment regarding preferred route noted.
87.	Online			I represent a group of business owners and leaders in Apache Junction (Superstition Business Owners Group). Our mission is to encourage and assist where possible with economic development within the City of Apache Junction. A concern we have relates to the westbound exit off of Rte. 60 leading to the Old West Highway. In a conversation several of our group members had with a member of ADOT in the recent past, it was mentioned that ADOT was considering the possibility of closing that exit. That certainly would have a devastating effect on the businesses in Apache Junction in that it reduces the number of exits onto the Main business corridor for the city. One of the alternatives for the corridor appears to tie into that exit. Could you provide some insight on this matter. Would this alternative utilize that exit so that it would permit the exit to remain viable for business traffic into Apache Junction? This would be very important to the business community in this city. Thank you.	Comment noted. Preliminary design of the proposed facility, and interchange with US 60 would be described in the EIS (and accompanying Design Concept Report), a draft of which is anticipated at the end of 2016.
88.	Online			I am hoping that with all the "open" land here, the intersection of Felix and Arizona Farms is near 2 subdivisions. One of which I reside. Do you take into consideration proximity of existing housing? It may be more feasible to follow and connect to Hunt Highway and eventually to the I-10. If you used Ironwood and ran through Gantzel and flowed south, you would intersect Hunt Highway and could head towards Attaway Rd between subdivisions. What is the timeline for funding and eventually a building start?	Comment noted. A version of the route recommended was considered in the evaluation of alternatives, but eliminated due to unfavorable ratings (refer to the ASR). Funding has not been identified and there is no current timeline for construction. The EIS, which will identify a preferred alternative, is anticipated at the end of 2016.
89.	Online			After attending the 11/20/14 Public meeting for which there were no notices sent by ADOT to the property owners of record, I have the following comments: 1. My first choice is for a NO BUILD option due to the close proximity to existing homes in Crestfield Manor, Wildhorse Estates and	Comment noted. Comment regarding preferred route noted (preferred being "no-

			<p>Merrill Ranch Anthem which will negatively impact our property rights and values by bringing noise and air pollution to our residences. 2. On January 29, 2012 the Arizona Republic did an eight day special report on "The Air We Breathe" which shows the negative impact to health and quality of life due to pollution generated by uncontrolled growth. If the N-S corridor is built, then the entire area around the highway will be filled with homes and strip malls which will add millions of additional travel miles by people living along the highway and commuting north, south and west to jobs. The evidence is clear that this will happen, all one has to do is look at the E-470 road around the East side of Denver, CO. When E-470 was built there was nothing near it but farms and ranches, now it is completely surrounded by homes and strip malls as far as the eye can see. That is future of Pinal County if this project is allowed to proceed. If the EPA is really concerned with the health of people in this area it would stop this project before Pinal County becomes another Maricopa County with the violations of EPA air quality standards. 3. From the 11/20/14 meeting I see that the comments by property owners in Crestfield Manor and Wildhorse Estates have been totally ignored, a fact that doesn't surprise me since ADOT has already selected the N-S Corridor route but continues the sham of having public meetings and pretending that our comments matter. The first homes in Wildhorse Estates were built in 2002 with the entire community being built out by 2006, yet Wildhorse Estates has been shown on your maps as "future development" vs "residential" which I pointed out in my comments in 2011. Crestfield Manor is not totally built out but does have a significant number of residences and is also shown at "future development. Both Wildhorse Estates and Crestfield Manor are on the west side of Felix Rd about one mile south of Arizona Farms Rd (I thought you need the directions since it appears no one from ADOT has been able to see the residences that are just west of the "P" on the EIS study map). 4. I will once again try to get ADOT to respect my property rights by moving the N-S Corridor to the east where there are presently open fields and open desert which are true "future development" areas. I recommend that the N-S Corridor follow segments I &amp; J to O3, but where O3 crosses the Magma AZ railroad, keep O3 east of the CAP canal where it should cross the CAP canal at "V" on the EIS study map. This eliminates segments E4, G, P &amp; O. An alternative would be to use segments A, E1, E2 but keep them on the east side of the CAP canal and then connect E2 to O3 and keep O3 on the east side of the CAP canal until a crossing of the canal at "V" on the EIS study map. This eliminates segments E4, G, P &amp; O. The two alternatives above would remove the negative impacts of the N-S corridor to Crestfield Manor, Wildhorse Estates and Merrill Ranch Anthem residences. 5. I am also concerned with the impact to the residents in Crestfield Manor and Wildhorse Estates due to the water runoff from the N-S corridor. All water runoff from any N-S Corridor must be kept on the east side of Felix Rd and not be allowed to flow onto the private properties in Wildhorse Estates. State law forbids allowing water runoff to impact other properties and ADOT must be held accountable for controlling any N-S corridor water runoff. 6. Why didn't ADOT mail out notices of the November 2014 public meetings to the affected property owners of record?</p>	<p>build", or Segments I, J, and O3), and opposition to specific route segments noted. Air quality, drainage, and neighborhood impacts are all factors to be evaluated in the EIS. Congestion in the region with the anticipated development without an alternative (i.e., no-build) would also be evaluated. The project team will include your contact information in project list for future notices concerning the project.</p>
90.	Online		<p>I prefer the "ironwood " freeway option because that road already has freeway like driving and would be centrally located to enter into Queen Creek as well. It would create development outside of the ironwood main road for San Tan Valley. Being centrally located as ironwood is would increase values all around for the community. If it is too far outside of San Tan then it is still out of the way for some to use.</p>	<p>Comment noted. Comment regarding preferred route noted (Segment A).</p>



91.	Online	None	None	I would like to see the freeway run down ironwood. Its already the busy road in san tan valley. I live in castlegate and do not want a freeway behind my house.	Comment noted. Comment regarding opposition to specific route segment (E2) noted.
92.	Online			East of the CAP canal, where it is uninhabited, seems to make much more sense than destroying homes and displacing families.	Comment noted. Comment regarding preferred route noted.
93.	Online			Please DO NOT run the freeway just east of castlegate... I did not move here to have a freeway in my backyard :)	Comment noted. Comment regarding opposition to specific route segment (E2) noted.
94.	Online			It would be ideal if the project would be located in the Far East projected site away from current residential areas. I am a homeowner in the Castlegate development and my home is in the northeast side. Many residents live this far to avoid the noise and traffic and this would bring much of that to us. I'm sure many residents who might actually use this corridor would not mind a slightly further drive to keep the peace that we enjoy in our neighborhood. Plus I can believe that the primary use if this project will not be for those close to this residential area and more for those traveling long distance between the 60 and the 10. The need to be so close to our neighborhood does not outweigh the overall need of the corridor to begin with. I hope you can respect the wishes of those who live in this area when making decisions of where to build. I don't always respond to these surveys, but my house is so close the potentially affected area. I lived in the city my whole life. I don't live there anymore and would like to keep the sounds of traffic off my back porch. Thank you for considering my opinion in this matter.	Comment noted. Comment regarding preferred route noted.
95.	Online			At the ADOT meeting they proposed 3 routes. One turns ironwood into a freeway. Another runs between the canal and Castlegate neighborhood. And the other is about 3 miles east of the canal. I personally am stating my voice that I am against the route that goes between the canal and Castlegate. It needs to be on ironwood or 3 miles east of the canal.	Comment noted. Comment regarding preference for Ironwood Alternative (Segment A) and opposition to specific route segment (E2) noted .
96.	Online			I would like for the freeway to be located off of Ironwood. I would NOT want it located near Schnepf Rd or near Castlegate. We moved here because we enjoy the horse property, and open desert behind us. My back yard is adjacent to the far East wall and I do NOT want to see or hear a FWY from my yard. I also do nit think this corner can handle traffic from a fwy and off ramp. It will bring traffic that would not otherwise be here. Where, ironwood is a main road connecting many communities. Makes sense to make that a fwy.	Comment noted. Comment regarding preference for Ironwood Alternative (Segment A) and opposition to specific route segment (E2) noted.
97.	Online			I live in Apache Jct and have commuted to Florence for work for 15 years. I would welcome an alternative route that doesnt go through Gold Canyon. Especially in the winter time! Thanks	Comment noted. Comment regarding preferred route noted.
98.	Online			My comment to ADOT. At the meeting you told us that the state did not have money as of yet to pay for the proposed highway and that you were considering a toll booth to raise the money. How are you going to raise the money to compensate people for their land and homes? Many of the	Comment noted. A toll is being considered as one of many potential funding sources for

				<p>people on Wheeler road spent more than half their lives paying off land, wells and homes. Not to mention all the labor they invested in their property. Several individuals are recently retired; husbands have died and were expecting to take ease for the remainder of their existence. Now you are considering stripping families of everything. If this were happening to your parents would you sit by silently, I think not. Do you plan on opening up your homes to let all these families you are putting out on the streets to live with you while they reconfigure their lives? Is your conscience so seared that none of this affects you? If you can't set people up with the standard of living they have grown accustomed to why would you even consider what you are proposing? If it comes down to people losing their homes and land in comparison to farm land you need to consider the people first. Our voices will be heard regarding this matter.</p>	<p>the project. Additional information on ADOT's right-of-way acquisition process may be found at <a href="http://azdot.gov/business/RightofWay_Properties/contact-us">http://azdot.gov/business/RightofWay_Properties/contact-us</a>, for additional questions concerning right-of-way, please contact Dave Edwards at ADOT right-of-way (602-712-8803).</p>
99.	Online			<p>I have gone to your website <a href="http://azdot.gov/NorthSouthCorridorStudy">azdot.gov/NorthSouthCorridorStudy</a> to complete the online survey. Cannot find the survey online? Please send me the link.</p>	<p>ADOT Communications sent comment form via email</p>
100.	Online			<p>I thought for sure that you were going to plan on coming down further and convert most of Ironwood into a freeway - I mean, it's pretty much driven like one anyways. If anything it would be for safety reasons. The speed limit is 50 mph and most everyone travels 65+ from Pecos to Guadalupe Rd. Coming down to Pecos with the Ironwood Freeway and then connecting the 24 to run East/West at the Pecos interchange and then East down to Florence would have made more sense to me with a branch off to the Eastern portion of STV just north of Florence. I don't agree that said freeway should continue through Gantzel to STV directly though as many people have stated. Traffic flow through that portion of Gantzel is heavy at times, but the main issue through there is lack of traffic control, not lack of lanes or restricted access. There also does need to be consideration for a freeway conversion project in the Hunt Highway to Riggs Road corridor between Empire &amp; Village Lane where it's squeezed to one lane each way. I myself travel Riggs every day to my office in Chandler, and from Power Rd to I-10 I've never had enough traffic in the morning or the afternoon to warrant making Riggs wider or converting it into a freeway as others have mentioned. I actually enjoy the drive through there. The only major slowdown along that route is the section from Ellsworth to Power, which is mainly horse properties, so unless you're willing to shell out mega bucks to the owners - we're never going to get any widening through that section.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>
101.	Online			<p>CAP canal.</p>	<p>Intent of comment unclear.</p>
102.	Online			<p>It would be ideal if the project were to begin by the Ironwood exit from I-60, and go along the copper basin railroad. It would greatly help in the growth of the San Tan Valley area if this corridor project could be expedited instead of taking another 4 - 8 years before even beginning construction. We are a first world nation, and it's inexcusable that something like this should be dragged out for over 10 years already!</p>	<p>Comment noted. Comment regarding preferred route noted.</p>
103.	Online			<p>I am a new resident to Arizona but can appreciate the proposed route to intersect Interstate 10 at a point where the traffic is less. Any travel to the south from this area cuts the time and anxiety. The route selected will also benefit the Ironwood traffic with more safety by having more lanes. The</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>

				eventual tie-in with the route from 202 will be another benefit for the Ironwood traffic. I can also see where areas of future development would be an increase to the local economy. From my point of view, the project is a go.	
104.	Online	None	None	I am mainly concerned with choosing the option (except for the no-build option) that would provide me the fastest drive time to Tucson. Hopefully that would also be the most economical choice while still observing environmental concerns. The I-10 East out of Phoenix is truly congested and out of our way to reach.	Comment noted.
105.	Online			Will there be meetings held in Eloy or for the residents along Highway 87 towards Eloy? I live in Villa Grande Rancheros and it appears the highway will be right next to that community?? How will it look and how will it affect the level of traffic versus what we already deal with.	A meeting was held in Eloy on Tuesday, November 18, 2014 (Santa Cruz High School, 900 N. Main St., Eloy). The questions raised will be addressed in the EIS evaluation.
106.	Online			It would be great if the highway could connect 587 or even the 187 south of Sacaton to Ellsworth Rd. and Hunt Hwy. then go north to connect to the 24 to the 202 loop. That would cut a lot of time and miles from the trip between AJ and Tucson.	Comment noted.
107.	Online			The alternative route that runs south via Ironwood would be best alternative. But please consider connecting SR24 to any north/south freeway as this would make it easier to connect from the 202 San Tan Freeway without having to drive additional miles out of the way to reach the new freeway.	Comment noted. Comment regarding preferred route noted, as well as support for building SR 24.
108.	Online			What will it look like? Where will the facility be elevated?	Preliminary design of the proposed facility would be described in the EIS (and accompanying Design Concept Report), a draft of which is anticipated at the end of 2016. The project is currently in the early stage of development.
109.	Online			According to the Route Alternatives as of 11/19/14 the best route looks like A E1, E2.	Comment noted. Comment regarding preferred route noted (reference is to earlier project segment notation, which may be found in the ASR).
110.	Online			I think it is great that a North South Corridor is being considered. Quick access to freeways can increase mobility, thus increasing trade and improving the overall economy. The proposed locations of this corridor though seem very odd. Why miss the opportunity to provide freeway access to the majority of the population in this affected region? Queen Creek, San Tan Valley (San Tan Heights, Johnson Ranch, Anthem, etc.), and many other more populated communities would be skipped and get little value from this. The freeway would definitely help trucking and transportation from Tucson to Apache Junction, but misses a greater opportunity to provide access to suburban areas	Comment noted. The alternatives being considered were developed through a scoping process that involved consideration of many inputs and criteria. The evaluation process is documented in the

				which would be more likely to travel into Phoenix, Mesa, and Scottsdale to increase overall trade.	ASR. Traffic interchanges will be provided to access the arterial streets to connect local communities.
111.	Online			<p>ABCD is my current ideal choice for alignment. This is based on current needs benefiting from a ABCD route 1 the most, that way there is a N/S freeway closer to expected growth from the GM facility (Eastmark) and airport while relieving the San Tan Valley and Queen Creek areas the most. Having said that, that is a limited scope view of a route that would ideally serve the whole community. I believe there is a need for the ABCD, but then there would be a need for a longer term 2ndary N/S route along the NOQ route 3 option, most likely 25+ years out for that corridor. I do believe they will both be needed and we should not get stuck in current vision views and limit it to 1 route. This would happen if a route were chosen more centrally located such as the IJOQ route or a AEGH route. If we were limited to the case of only being able to plan for 1 route and no future studies or route alternatives would be planned, I would be happy with an IJOQ route. I do see severe future limitations to this route. It serves the few without the benefit of the many even with future developments in yellow considered. Then we would have 1 big freeway right dab in the middle without the ability to have a second in the future. The growth and opportunities from the GM facility (Eastmark) and the growth from the Airport should be major considerations in any freeway planning N/S. All routes should align with 87 at the bottom. There is no reason that cannot be utilized and built out beyond what it currently is. There is nothing at the end of it that causes any major issues in my opinion. Thank you for considering my opinions on the route plan.</p>	Comment noted. Comment regarding preferred route references naming identified in Figure 39 of the ASR, segments of which have been eliminated from further evaluation (refer to ASR). Preference for Segment A noted.
112.	Online			<p>Regarding Monday night's meeting, Nov 17, at Walker Butte Elementary, 29697 N. Desert Willow Blvd: If the intent and purpose of this meeting was to inform local citizens about proposed routes and to answer their specific questions, then this meeting was mostly a FAILURE. If the intent and purpose of this meeting was to meet the legal requirements for a public meeting on this subject, without actually publicly sharing attendees questions and answers with ALL those in attendance, then it was a grand success! Having officials posted around the room and answering questions for individuals is NOT the best way to inform the public! It is, on the other hand, a good way to avoid sharing what might be unfavorable answers . . . with the entire group. What a waste of time! Surely some of the people asked the same or similar question many times over, but asking different officials. The result would be that multiple officials spent time on the same subject yet only a very small group of people heard the answers to those questions. One would at least hope that they all received the same answers, but there's no way of knowing that, is there? This meeting was a lost opportunity for educating concerned citizens. And what was the excuse given for doing the Q&amp;A this way? "We weren't expecting this many people to show up, maybe only about 40 or so". Really?! Your job is to inform the public and receive feedback. What difference does it make that there were more people than you expected? The informing part was very poorly executed and that is my feedback. Did you think it would take too much of your time to answer the questions publicly? That's your job, isn't it? Are there questions you thought might be asked that you were afraid to answer in front of a large group? Like, for instance, how the construction would be funded . . . perhaps, like other proposed or completed highways in the U.S., by building it as a toll road?</p>	Comment noted. The format was chosen to allow participants to come and go (open house format) at their convenience. Reference to tolling was made in the presentation as a possible funding option, and team members were on hand to answer any questions related to funding. No specific funding source has been identified for the project at this time, and it will likely take a combination of funding sources to develop the project if the EIS recommends a build alternative. As the project advances through the EIS and preliminary design phase, a

				Built by foreign construction companies, as has been done in other states? And, as has been done in other states, operated by foreign companies with proceeds going outside the U.S.? And with 50-year guaranteed annual profits for those companies for which we taxpayers will be on the hook if those profits aren't met, as has been the case in other states? I certainly hope the remaining meetings are not handled this way!	cost estimate will be prepared, and additional information will be shared with the public when the draft EIS is prepared for review.
113.	Online			At the Castlegate community we are starting a petition to not have the highway put into the desert just behind us. It is hard to tell where exactly the highway would be put but looking at the maps, it shows one option is between the canal and our backyards. Is that true? Many of us feel that Ironwood is a better choice. That road is dangerous at this time. There are some people driving 80mph+ and others driving the posted limit of 50mph. The disparity in speed is dangerous and causes quite a bit of road rage. There is no safe spot to pull over so it is dangerous for the officers to patrol that area also. Looking forward to the meeting tonight. James	Comment noted. The western Alternative (Segment E2) is located along the western side of the Central Arizona Project Canal, and to the east of the Castlegate community. Comment regarding opposition to specific route segment (E2) noted.
114.	Online			If feasible, I would recommend the farthest east route for the proposed corridor. I feel this would provide more opportunities for people in the East valley to be able to travel North and South.	Comment noted. Comment regarding preferred route noted.
115.	Email	Michael	Campbell	<p>From: Michael Campbell [REDACTED]  Sent: Thursday, November 20, 2014 8:03 PM  To: Crowther, Brent  Subject: North-South Corridor Study</p> <p>Brent,  Thanks for taking the time to discuss the route alternatives with me this evening. Per our conversation I would like a blown up map showing two important intersections. First one is the intersection of Valley Farms Rd and Va Ki Inn and the second is the intersection of Va Ki Inn and Clemans Road. My family have farm land and houses at these intersections. I've also attached a photo with a circle around the area I'm referencing.  Thanks again for your help.  Michael Campbell</p>	Comment noted. A map of the area in question showing the alternatives was provided to Mr. Campbell on 12/1/14.
116.	Email	Mark	Voigt	<p>From: Mark Voigt [REDACTED]  Sent: Friday, November 21, 2014 8:06 AM  To: Lars Jacoby  Cc: 'Dave Rogers'  Subject: RE: What time are the hearings at the various locations?</p> <p>Lars: On the various routes that are being considered, could we get a map that shows in more detail the underlying properties associated with the segment called O-3 which is in the Magma Ranch area? We own 169 acres at the northwest corner of Judd and Felix and we would like to pin point this segment's relationship to this property in more detail. We realize the exact route and width have not been chosen but would like to understand this segment a little better. Thanks so much.  MAV</p>	Comment noted. A map of the area in question showing the alternatives was provided to Mr. Voigt on 12/12/2014.

117.	Email	Chris	Webb	<p>From: Chris Webb [REDACTED]  Sent: Wednesday, December 10, 2014 12:30 PM  To: Victor Yang  Cc: LaBianca, Michael; Angelica Romo  Subject: RE: North-South Freeway October 2014 ASR: Comment Letter from Stakeholder; PRI  Importance: High</p> <p>Victor,  Please find attached a comment letter from Property Reserve, Inc. ("PRI") regarding the October 2014 ASR. PRI has been involved with the corridor study process since the beginning and requests that the attached comments be incorporated into ADOT's file and considered as you move into the EIS/DCR process.</p> <p>Thanks, Chris</p> <p>Chris Webb  Director of Project Management</p> <p>[REDACTED]  [REDACTED]  [REDACTED]  [REDACTED]</p>	<p>From: Victor Yang [mailto:VYang@azdot.gov]  Sent: Wednesday, December 10, 2014  To: 'Chris Webb'  Cc: LaBianca, Michael; Angelica Romo  Subject: RE: North-South Freeway October 2014 ASR: Comment Letter from Stakeholder; PRI</p> <p>Chris,  Thank you for your comments/inputs. Your comments will be reviewed and evaluated along with other evaluation criteria (agency comments, other public comments, engineering, environmental) and incorporated into our DEIS and IDCR.  Please feel free to contact me if you have any additional questions.</p> <p>Thanks,</p> <p>Victor Yang P.E.  Senior Project Manager</p>
118.				<p>From: Tony Bianchi [REDACTED]  Sent: Thursday, December 18, 2014 6:00 PM  To: Victor Yang; Projects  Subject: Phoenix-Mesa Gateway North (3)</p> <p>Good Afternoon Victor:</p> <p>I have attached an amended comment letter and supporting map in regards to North-South Corridor public comments. The map is meant to show connectivity and not to indicate alignment</p>	<p>Email reply,  Tony,</p> <p>Thank you for your comments. I appreciate your involvement in this project. We will review your comments and incorporate them into the project development process.</p>

				<p>preference.  We rec'd some feedback &amp; comments after a recent meeting that prompted us to update the Airport Authority's provided comments.  Please accept my sincere apologies for providing multiple comment letters.  If this version could replace the versions sent on 12/9 &amp; 12/11 it would be appreciated.  Please let me know if you have any questions.</p> <p>Thanks,  Tony Bianchi  Airport Planner  Phoenix-Mesa Gateway Airport Authority  [REDACTED]  [REDACTED]  [REDACTED]  [REDACTED]</p>	<p>Thanks,  Victor Yang P.E.</p>
119.	Email	Beau J.	Goldstein	<p>From: Goldstein, Beau  To: LaBianca, Michael  Cc: Victor Yang  Subject: North-South Corridor study, Alt report Oct 2014  Date: Wednesday, December 03, 2014 12:18:07 PM  I have the following comments:  Page 8: SCIP is not listed as a NEPA Cooperator. We asked for a cooperating invitation in 2011.  Page 47: Other major SCIP canals not mentioned that could be affected include the Northside Canal and Florence-Casa grande Canal.  Page 52: SCIP is a water and electric utility.</p> <p>Over the years SCIP has also reiterated the necessity of coordinating with us regarding encroachment permits to cross our facilities (both conveyance and delivery features). Engineering designs and other submittals will be necessary. I suggest following up with Clarence Begay <a href="mailto:clarence.begay@bia.gov">clarence.begay@bia.gov</a> to ensure you understand the permitting requirements.</p> <p>Thank you,  Beau J. Goldstein, RPA  BIA SCIP, Acting Environmental Coordinator  BIA WRO, Contractor  [REDACTED]</p>	<p>Comments are received and noted. Further coordination with SCIP will be taken to address their concern.</p>

120.	Printed material	Joseph	Aldrich	[Major Aldrich is with the Arizona Army National Guard; For attachment, reference Exhibit 6 – Rittenhouse Army Heliport & The North-South Corridor Study]	Comment noted. The Arizona Department of Emergency and Military Affairs (consists of the Army and the Air National Guard, the Division of Emergency Management, and the Joint Programs Division) is represented as a NSCS Stakeholder Agency. Comment noted regarding opposition to Segment E for the North-South freeway, and “that SR 24 stays north of the sub-station and Rittenhouse.”
------	------------------	--------	---------	---	---



Exhibit 1: Town of Florence Resolution 1490-14

**RESOLUTION NO. 1490-14**

**A RESOLUTION OF THE TOWN OF FLORENCE, PINAL COUNTY, ARIZONA, AFFIRMING THE TOWN OF FLORENCE'S PREFERENCES REGARDING THE PROPOSED ADOT NORTH-SOUTH FREEWAY CORRIDOR.**

**WHEREAS**, the Town of Florence has proactively worked to identify and support the short, mid and long-term transportation needs and goals for the Town; and

**WHEREAS**, the Town of Florence has been actively engaged with the ADOT North-South Freeway and Passenger Rail Corridor Studies to protect the long term transportation needs of the Town; and

**WHEREAS**, the proper alignment and future development of the proposed ADOT Freeway is critical to the long-term prosperity and sustainability of the Town of Florence; and

**WHEREAS**, the Town of Florence 2020 General Plan Future Land Use Map contained within the Land Use Element indicates the Town's conceptual alignment of the proposed North-South ADOT Freeway Corridor, as well as the proposed conceptual alignment of the ADOT Passenger Rail Corridor; and

**WHEREAS**, an ongoing public participation process, including the holding of a public hearings of the Town of Florence Planning and Zoning Commission, public hearings of the Council of the Town of Florence, and public outreach to impacted stakeholders has occurred to establish the Town's preferences for the future ADOT North-south Freeway Corridor on the Town's Future Land Use Map; and

**WHEREAS**, the current ADOT North-South Freeway Study alternatives do not precisely match the preferences of the Town via the approved Future Land Use Map, the Town affirms its support of the Future Land Use Map, but expresses its corridor segment preferences within the Town's Planning Area to be: Q3, V, X and AO; and

**WHEREAS**, the Town must take a stance against alternatives that vary substantially from the Town's preferences and that would be damaging to the Town's future prosperity and sustainability, particularly referring to objectionable segments G, Q and AB; and

**WHEREAS**, the Town must support alternatives that are in support of the Town's position as the County Seat of Pinal County and a major employer for the Town of Florence; and

**WHEREAS**, the positions stated via this Resolution have been found to: be

**Exhibit 1: Town of Florence Resolution 1490-14 (Continued)**

appropriate; be consistent with the goals, objectives and strategies of the Florence 2020 General Plan; Specifically, the Amendment is consistent with Goals One and Two of the Circulation Element that support a safe, efficient, balanced and comprehensive transportation system and Goal One of the Economic Development Element that states "Develop a sustainable economy in order to maintain a vibrant and healthy community". Thus, a determination has been made that this Resolution should be approved.


**THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED** by the Mayor and Council of the Town of Florence, Arizona, as follows:

The Mayor and Council of the Town of Florence hereby adopt this resolution affirming the Town's preferences regarding the ADOT North-South Freeway Corridor.


**PASSED AND ADOPTED** by the Mayor and Council of the Town of Florence, Arizona, this 8<sup>th</sup> day of December, 2014.

  
Tom J. Rahkin, Mayor

**ATTEST:**

  
Lisa Garcia, Town Clerk

**APPROVED AS TO FORM:**

  
James E. Mannato, Town Attorney

**Exhibit 2: City of Eloy**



## CITY OF ELOY

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT  
PLANNING & ZONING • BUILDING & SAFETY • CODE ENFORCEMENT

December 11, 2014

OK

Mr. Victor Yang  
c/o North-South Corridor Study  
1655 W. Jackson Street, #126F  
Phoenix, Arizona 85007

Re: City Preferred Corridor/Alternative Selection Report (ASR)  
North-South Corridor Study

Dear Mr. Yang:

On behalf of the City of Eloy, I would like to formally identify our support for two of the segments under consideration for the North-South Corridor Study that will be located within our defined Planning Area. We support the segments of AA and Z, which constitutes approximately eight miles of the approximate 45-mile corridor as shown on the map to the right. The area to the north of the green dotted line is now located within the City of Coolidge Planning Area.

The City of Eloy desires the north-south corridor to be located within the AA and Z Corridor segments based on the following:



**Reduced Right of Way Cost/Acquisition Cost.** These two segments would utilize the existing right of way on SR 87. Although the existing right of way may need to be reconfigured to accommodate the selected roadway and passenger rail cross-section, it would be more cost effective than acquiring all, or a significant amount of, new right of way. Acquisition adjacent to SR 87 would also occur in a more expeditious manner, based on the historical and intended use of this corridor as opposed to private and state land parcels that would be severed.

347

### Exhibit 2: City of Eloy (Continued)

**Proximity and Connectivity to Downtown Eloy.** Due to the multi-modal capabilities intended for this corridor, having the proximity to our downtown area is very important for its future rehabilitation and vitality. If the AA and Z segments are selected, then the approximate 1.5 mile distance from the high volume roadway/passenger rail corridor would be adequately buffered. A shorter east-west connection to our downtown would also result with a future interchange/transit circulator stop/park and ride facility adjacent to the corridors' intersection with Battaglia Drive.

**Balance the Capture of Vehicular and Transit Trips.** The identification of the AA and Z segments would position the north-south corridor further to the west. This location would allow for the opportunity to balance the amount of existing and future private and state land development that could locate on both sides of the corridor, maximizing its function to capture and disperse a larger share of vehicle trips generated in the region. These segments also create a more functional geographical balance than the alternative corridors, capturing trips within the five mile area to the west of SR 87 (I-10 would capture the trips five miles further to the west) and the six mile area to the east of SR 87.

**Leveraging the Economic Development Potential of the SR 87 Corridor.** The ability to utilize and effectively channel the projected amount of future north-south vehicular traffic using only this facility (as opposed to the north-south corridor and SR 87) will allow the City of Eloy to benefit from the concentrated future job creation and higher density residential potential that this multi-modal facility would create. We believe that one major multi-modal corridor would lead to a much better opportunity for the City to achieve its jobs/housing balance objectives.

**Minimizing the Cost of Mitigating Environmental Hazards.** The two corridor segments (AA and Z) would be located in areas where the incidence of earth fissuring is not as prevalent as the alternative corridor segments located to the east. In addition, these two corridors are not located within high risk flood zones as identified by the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA). Locating the corridor away from geotechnical and flood hazards should not only translate to a reduced capital cost of the facility but also reduced operation and maintenance costs when it is constructed.

In conclusion, I trust that the five points identified and described above clearly communicate our desire to see the Eloy portion of the North-South Corridor located within the AA and Z segments. Thank you for the opportunity to submit our comments and communicate our intentions. If you have any questions, or require additional information, please do not hesitate to contact me at [jvlaming@ci.ely.arizona.us](mailto:jvlaming@ci.ely.arizona.us) or at 520.466.2578.

Sincerely,



Joy Vlaming  
Interim Community Development Director

Cc: Harvey Krauss, City Manager  
James Humble, Public Works Director

1137 West Houser Road, Eloy, Arizona 85131 • 520/466-2578 • FAX 520/464-1438  
"Right in the Heart of Arizona's Future"

### Exhibit 3: Rose Law Group



CHRIS K. WEBB  
7144 E. Stenson Drive, Suite 300  
Scottsdale, AZ 85251  
Phone 480.240.5648 Fax 480.505.3925  
CWebb@roslawgroup.com  
www.roslawgroup.com

December 8, 2014

SENT VIA US MAIL & EMAIL

Mr. Victor Yang  
Senior Project Manager  
ADOT Urban Project Management Group  
1611 West Jackson, EM01  
Phoenix, Arizona 85007  
[vyang@azdot.gov](mailto:vyang@azdot.gov)

RE: North-South Freeway Corridor Study – October 2014 ASR Alternatives

Dear Mr. Yang,

This letter is sent on behalf of Property Reserve, Inc. ("PRI"), a subsidiary of the Corporation of the Presiding Bishop of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints ("CPB"), the owner of approximately 3,860 total acres within the corridor study area, located between Vah Ki Inn Road and Bartlett Road, just northeast of Coolidge.

This letter is sent to: (1) re-emphasize PRI's preference for an alignment following ASR Corridor Segments AN & AB between Bartlett Road and Vah Ki Inn Road, and (2) identify PRI's preferred 400' alignment through these two Corridor Segments.

**(1) Corridor Segments AN & AB:**

As indicated in prior correspondence to ADOT throughout the North-South Freeway Corridor Study process, PRI, along with other stakeholders in the area, believe Corridor Segments AN & AB to be superior and preferable to Corridor Segments AC & AO for the following reasons:

- a. Corridor Segments AN & AB are universally supported by the major property owners and stakeholders in the area, as well as the City of Coolidge, the Town of Florence, and the City of Eloy. All three of these municipalities have adopted resolutions in support of corridors that follow Segments AN & AB and have included corresponding alignments into their respective General Plans.

**Exhibit 3: Rose Law Group (Continued)**

- b. Corridor Segments AC & AO cut diagonally through the middle of the planned "Sendra" development, located near Vah Ki Inn Road and Valley Farms Road, as well as the PRI property between Bartlett Road and Coolidge Avenue. The diagonal intersection with major east-west arterial streets such as Bartlett Road, Martin Road, Coolidge Avenue and Vah Ki Inn Road will result in inefficient development and unnecessary intersection complications. Conversely, Corridor Segments AN & AB provide for perpendicular intersections with the major arterial streets in the area and minimize detrimental impacts to the development potential of the surrounding property.

**(2) Preferred 400' Alignment:**

It is our understanding that through the EIS/DCR process that will occur over the next 18 months, ADOT will identify a preferred 400' wide alignment through the remaining ASR Corridors. Within the 1,500' wide corridor comprised of Segments AN & AB, PRI has identified a "preferred" 400' wide alignment for the right-of-way that will ultimately be required. The preferred alignment is depicted on **Exhibit "A"** attached hereto. This alignment represents the most advantageous alignment for ADOT, the local municipalities and PRI for the following reasons:

- a. It takes maximum advantage of the existing rights-of-way along the Clemans Road and Wheeler Road alignments, thereby reducing ADOT's right-of-way acquisition costs.
- b. It maximizes perpendicular intersections with the east-west arterial streets between Bartlett Road and Vah Ki Inn Road, thereby resulting in efficiently designed and operating intersections and maximizing the development potential of the land on each corner.
- c. It results in the least disruption to the development potential of the surrounding property.

PRI respectfully requests ADOT's consideration of the proposed 400' alignment as the North-South Freeway Corridor Study moves through the EIS/DCR process. Please call me at (480) 240-5648 with any questions or comments.

Sincerely,

  
Chris K. Webb

**Exhibit 3: Rose Law Group (Continued)**

Exhibit "A"




Exhibit 4: Superstition Vistas





January 8, 2015

Victor Yang, Senior Project Manager  
Urban Project Management Group

Re: North South Corridor Study

Dear Mr. Yang,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Alternative Selection Report for the North South Corridor Study. We sincerely appreciate the ongoing work of the Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) on this important transportation corridor and your efforts to widely publicize the results of your findings to date.

On January 7<sup>th</sup>, the Superstition Vistas Steering Committee met to discuss this report, and to provide ADOT with comments. The Superstition Vistas Steering Committee is a long standing group that has guided the planning associated with the 275 square miles of largely vacant Arizona State Trust property, located in Northern Pinal County, now known as Superstition Vistas. This committee was extremely active for a number of years and was instrumental in the development of a high level plan for this important area of the central Arizona.

The multi-faceted planning work and recommendations of the Committee, which is made up of public and private sector's stakeholders, were utilized by the Arizona State Land Department officials as they developed a Superstition Vistas Area Conceptual Plan that was incorporated as an Amendment into the Pinal County Comprehensive Plan in late 2011.

Although development activity has slowed in this region, the Committee is extremely interested in the location of future freeway corridors as they transverse the Superstition Vistas' property. After discussions of the various alternatives, the committee made a motion to support the following alternatives:

#### Exhibit 4: Superstition Vistas (Continued)

- 1) In the northern most segment of the proposed corridor, the Committee recommended Segments I, J, and O3.
- 2) In the section within the Town of Florence planning area, the Committee recommended that we support the same alternatives that the Town of Florence previously identified in the Resolution #1490-14, which passed on December 8, 2014. As stated in the resolution, the town's segment preferences within their Planning area are: O3, V, X and AO.
- 3) Certain members of the Committee, including the Town of Queen Creek and Pinal County, expressed a keen interest in alleviating the East-West traffic congestion issues that now occur on the arterial streets in this region. The full committee is extremely sympathetic to these concerns and urged that all appropriate steps be taken to expedite improvements at the local level and to actively support efforts to speed the construction of State Route 24 East into Pinal County.

Again, we appreciate the opportunity to provide comments during this phase of the North South Corridor Project.

The Committee has requested that the East Valley Partnership staff continue to monitor this study through the next phases. We anticipate that we will be active participants and provide input as the next phases of this study are completed.

Please call me at (602) 363-5033 if you have any questions regarding this matter.

Sincerely,



Mike Hutchinson  
Project Manager  
Superstition Vistas Steering Committee

Cc: Superstition Vistas Steering Committee

## Exhibit 5: Pinal Land Holdings

## PINAL LAND HOLDINGS, LLC

January 9, 2015

Victor Yang P.E.  
Senior Project Manager  
Urban Project Management Group  
1611 W. Jackson, EM01  
Phoenix, AZ 85007

RE: North - South Corridor Study, October 2014 Alternative Selection Report Comments

Dear Mr. Yang,

As you know, Pinal Land Holdings (PLH) controls more than 11,000 acres previously owned by the City of Mesa, and is a major stakeholder in the vicinity of the potential alignments for the southern portion of the North-South Corridor. We are very about excited about the potential of a new freeway for the region and are eager to assist in moving this project forward. We appreciate the efforts of you and your team at ADOT and are grateful for the opportunity to provide comments on the Alternative Selection Report. Below you will find a list of our comments and the supporting documents have been attached.

- Section 2.1.3, page 20, many of these roads have been widened. This section should be updated if they impact the rankings.
- Section 2.3 & Figure 14. This section does not take into consideration the masterplan that has been completed for our entire 11,000 acres and specifically the plans for an intermodal logistics park on the southernmost 1,600 acres.
  - The attached map shows the location of the PLH controlled land. It is outlined in red, blue and yellow.
  - The areas circled in purple represent the first parcels likely to be developed prior to 2020.
    - The other parcels may develop before or after 2020.
  - All the PLH land has been incorporated into the Coolidge General plan. Attached you will find the land use map approved by Coolidge.
    - The majority of the land has been designated as urban neighborhood and will be developed into single family residential, multifamily residential, local and regional retail, office, educational and city center projects.
    - The area shaded in blue at the southern end has been designated as industrial and manufacturing and is being developed as intermodal terminal and industrial park. We are working aggressively with multiple public and private agencies to develop these parcels.


---

7702 E. Doubletree Ranch Road, Suite 230 • Scottsdale, Arizona 85258 • 480.209.9365

### Exhibit 5: Pinal Land Holdings (Continued)



Exhibit 5: Pinal Land Holdings (Continued)



## Exhibit 5: Pinal Land Holdings (Continued)

Page | 2

- We have been working with the Union Pacific for a number of years and have 100% completed and approved construction drawings for the rail improvements
- This development will have a significant impact on the North-South Corridor
- Figure 27, page 69, Again, this map does not take into consideration the future development on the PLH land described above.
- Figure 37, page 93, we agree with the local stakeholders and public on the location of the southern portion of the corridor.

Again, we appreciate the opportunity to share our concerns on this project and please to do not hesitate to contact us with any follow up questions or comments.

Thank you,



Matthew McCormick  
Vice President of Acquisitions  
Pinal Land Holdings, LLC

Exhibit 6: Rittenhouse Army Heliport & The North-South Corridor Study



*7/17/14 Received from  
W. Aldrich  
②*

# Rittenhouse Army Heliport & The North-South Corridor Study

Arizona Army National Guard  
By  
MAJ Joseph Aldrich  
602-629-4221  
[joseph.d.aldrich.mil@mail.mil](mailto:joseph.d.aldrich.mil@mail.mil)



# Rittenhouse Army Heliport (AZ38)

ADOT to hold meetings for North-South Corridor Study in Pinal County

Wednesday, 12 November 2014 10:33 AM PST AZDT 5:01 AM PST

Rittenhouse Army Heliport



## History of Rittenhouse Army Heliport

- The town was called Rittenhouse until 1947, when a new post office was established under the name of Queen Creek.
- Pilots conducted flight training at the Rittenhouse Air Force Base during World War II until 1966.
- The old Rittenhouse airfield got a new lease on life in 1999, when the Rittenhouse Army Heliport was once again listed with the FAA as an active military facility under the control of the Arizona Army National Guard.
- Arizona Army National Guard Pilots continue to conduct Pilot and Crew Chief training on almost a daily basis at Rittenhouse Army Heliport.

Source:  
<http://www.queencreek.org/about-us/town-history/historical-stories/rittenhouse-air-force-base>

## Uses of Rittenhouse Army Heliport


- **Helicopter Flight Training:**
  - Sling Load Training (3,000 – 6,000 lbs Loads)
  - Bambi Bucket / Wild land Firefighting Training
  - Emergency Procedure Training
  - Dust Landings Training
  - Slope Landings Training
  - Multi-Ship / Formation Flight Training
  - Night Vision Goggles Training
- **Field Training Exercises (FTX)**

Exhibit 6: Rittenhouse Army Heliport & The North-South Corridor Study

## Rittenhouse Army Heliport (AZ38)




Exhibit 6: Rittenhouse Army Heliport & The North-South Corridor Study



## Arizona Army Guard aviators train to fight wildfires at Rittenhouse



**Note:**  
Bambi Bucket holds  
660 gallons of water



**Exhibit 6: Rittenhouse Army Heliport & The North-South Corridor Study**



## Dust Landings & Multi-ship Training



**Exhibit 6: Rittenhouse Army Heliport & The North-South Corridor Study**



## Sling Load Training



**Note:**

In the very unlikely event of an Emergency/Engine Failure, the aircrew will drop/release the 4,000 plus Pound concrete block into the open desert.



**Exhibit 6: Rittenhouse Army Heliport & The North-South Corridor Study**

The AZ ARNG requests that route E is **not** used for the North-South Freeway and that the State Route 24 stays North of the sub-station and Rittenhouse.



Exhibit 6: Rittenhouse Army Heliport & The North-South Corridor Study

# Questions

Arizona Army National Guard

By

MAJ Joseph Aldrich

602-629-4221

[joseph.d.aldrich.mil@mail.mil](mailto:joseph.d.aldrich.mil@mail.mil)

## **2017 Alternatives Update**

### **Agency and Public Comments and Comment Summary**

The following documents present the agency and public feedback gathered in late 2017 in response to information provided regarding the North-South Corridor Study Tier 1 Draft Environmental Impact Statement action corridor alternatives.

*This page is intentionally left blank.*

**From:** Victor Yang  
**To:** [Rice, Jesse M CIV USARMY CESPL \(US\)](#); [Aryan Lirange](#)  
**Cc:** [LaBianca, Michael](#); [ADOT NSCS](#)  
**Subject:** RE: [EXTERNAL] RE: North South Corridor Study H7454 01L/STP 999-A(365)X - Agency Stakeholder Meeting  
**Date:** Thursday, December 21, 2017 11:37:44 AM  
**Attachments:** [image001.png](#)

---

Jesse,

Thank you Jesse for your quick response within such a short time period. Your comments will be noted in this process. We will closely work with you as we move forward in this Tier I process.

Happy Holidays,

Victor Yang P.E.

**Major Projects Group Manager**

Multimodal Planning Division

205 S.17<sup>th</sup> Ave, MD605E

Phoenix, AZ 85007

Direct (602) 712-8715

Fax (602) 712-8992

[Vyang@azdot.gov](mailto:Vyang@azdot.gov)



---

**From:** Rice, Jesse M CIV USARMY CESPL (US) [<mailto:Jesse.M.Rice@usace.army.mil>]  
**Sent:** Thursday, December 21, 2017 11:23 AM  
**To:** Victor Yang; Aryan Lirange  
**Subject:** RE: [EXTERNAL] RE: North South Corridor Study H7454 01L/STP 999-A(365)X - Agency Stakeholder Meeting

Good Morning,

Thank you for providing the materials from last week's meeting. I was not able to attend but I did want to respond to the materials and provide some feedback regarding the alternatives. It also appears that the Corps has not provided any substantial comments to date, so I wanted to provide some information that is similar to what we have provided on other Tier I studies occurring within Arizona.

At this stage of project development and with the minimal information provided, it is difficult for the Corps to identify a specific preferred alternative at this time for the North-South Corridor. The acres of Waters of the U.S. (WUS) within each corridor alternative and sensitivity or value of these resources are unknown or has not been made available. The Corps recognizes that conducting a jurisdictional determination at this stage would likely not be an effective use of resources due to the

extensive area of the study area and the uncertain timeline for project implementation. However, a thorough analysis of the impacts to aquatic resources which may be WUS at this stage of analysis will set the stage for future Tier II studies and ensure the activity complies with the 404(b)1 Guidelines should a Section 404 permit be required (40 CFR 230). Efforts should be made to demonstrate that impacts to WUS have been avoided or minimized throughout project development.

The alternatives analysis at the Tier I stage should contain sufficient information to support a quantitative impacts analysis regarding potential WUS. It is important that corridor alternatives which may result in the Least Environmentally Damaging Practicable Alternative (LEDPA) at the Tier II stage are not eliminated at the Tier I stage and that the analysis is at a sufficient level to support the rationale (40 CFR 230.10). Geospatial analyses of publicly available data along with consultation with resource agencies will assist in developing an estimate of the acres of aquatic resources present in each corridor alternative and to identify any particular resources which may be sensitive or have high values. These efforts at the Tier I stage will identify the corridor (or corridors) most likely to result in a Tier II project that is the LEDPA.

Please let me know if you have any further questions or would like to discuss this further.

Thank you,

**Jesse Rice**

Project Manager

Regulatory Division, Arizona Branch

Phoenix, AZ

Los Angeles District, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers

[Jesse.M.Rice@usace.army.mil](mailto:Jesse.M.Rice@usace.army.mil)

Office: 602-230-6854

Government Mobile: 602-908-8028

Assist us in better serving you!

Please complete our brief customer survey, located at the following link:

[http://corpsmapu.usace.army.mil/cm\\_apex/f?p=regulatory\\_survey](http://corpsmapu.usace.army.mil/cm_apex/f?p=regulatory_survey)

---

**From:** Victor Yang [<mailto:VYang@azdot.gov>]

**Sent:** Friday, December 15, 2017 11:06 AM

**To:** Sara Allred <[SAllred@azdot.gov](mailto:SAllred@azdot.gov)>; Steve Beasley <[SBeasley@azdot.gov](mailto:SBeasley@azdot.gov)>; Vicki Bever <[VBever@azdot.gov](mailto:VBever@azdot.gov)>; Stephanie Brown <[SBrown@azdot.gov](mailto:SBrown@azdot.gov)>; Katie Rodriguez <[KRodriguez@azdot.gov](mailto:KRodriguez@azdot.gov)>; Brent Cain <[BCain@azdot.gov](mailto:BCain@azdot.gov)>; Laura Douglas <[LDouglas@azdot.gov](mailto:LDouglas@azdot.gov)>; Dave Edwards <[DEdwards2@azdot.gov](mailto:DEdwards2@azdot.gov)>; Charla Glendening <[CGlendening@azdot.gov](mailto:CGlendening@azdot.gov)>; Sayeed Hani <[SHani@azdot.gov](mailto:SHani@azdot.gov)>; Reza Karimvand <[RKarimvand@azdot.gov](mailto:RKarimvand@azdot.gov)>; Keith Killough <[KKillough@azdot.gov](mailto:KKillough@azdot.gov)>; Dianne Kresich <[DKresich@azdot.gov](mailto:DKresich@azdot.gov)>; Roderick F. Lane <[RLane@azdot.gov](mailto:RLane@azdot.gov)>; Gail Lewis <[GLewis2@azdot.gov](mailto:GLewis2@azdot.gov)>; Curtis Litin <[CLitin@azdot.gov](mailto:CLitin@azdot.gov)>; Carlos Lopez <[CLopez@azdot.gov](mailto:CLopez@azdot.gov)>; Kurt Miyamoto <[KMiyamoto@azdot.gov](mailto:KMiyamoto@azdot.gov)>; Kimberly Noetzel



<[KNoetzel@azdot.gov](mailto:KNoetzel@azdot.gov)>; Paul O'Brien <[PO'Brien@azdot.gov](mailto:PO'Brien@azdot.gov)>; Edward Ochmann  
<[EOchmann@azdot.gov](mailto:EOchmann@azdot.gov)>; Chris Page <[CPage@azdot.gov](mailto:CPage@azdot.gov)>; Ashek Rana <[ARana@azdot.gov](mailto:ARana@azdot.gov)>; Joseph  
Salazar <[JSalazar@azdot.gov](mailto:JSalazar@azdot.gov)>; Xuefan Xu <[XXu@azdot.gov](mailto:XXu@azdot.gov)>; 'rodney.bragg@aecom.com'  
<[rodney.bragg@aecom.com](mailto:rodney.bragg@aecom.com)>; 'RMiguel@ak-chin.nsn.us' <[RMiguel@ak-chin.nsn.us](mailto:RMiguel@ak-chin.nsn.us)>;  
'Sandra.Shade@ak-chin.nsn.us' <[Sandra.Shade@ak-chin.nsn.us](mailto:Sandra.Shade@ak-chin.nsn.us)>; 'cmcmwilli@azcorrections.gov'  
<[cmcmwilli@azcorrections.gov](mailto:cmcmwilli@azcorrections.gov)>; 'russell.a.carter20.nfg@mail.mil' <[russell.a.carter20.nfg@mail.mil](mailto:russell.a.carter20.nfg@mail.mil)>;  
'Dorenda.coleman@fmo.azdema.gov' <[Dorenda.coleman@fmo.azdema.gov](mailto:Dorenda.coleman@fmo.azdema.gov)>;  
'Janet.johnson@fmo.azdema.gov' <[Janet.johnson@fmo.azdema.gov](mailto:Janet.johnson@fmo.azdema.gov)>;  
'scott.sveinsson@fmo.azdema.gov' <[scott.sveinsson@fmo.azdema.gov](mailto:scott.sveinsson@fmo.azdema.gov)>; 'wl1@azdeq.gov'  
<[wl1@azdeq.gov](mailto:wl1@azdeq.gov)>; 'SHarrison@AZDPS.GOV' <[SHarrison@AZDPS.GOV](mailto:SHarrison@AZDPS.GOV)>; 'cboucher@azgfd.gov'  
<[cboucher@azgfd.gov](mailto:cboucher@azgfd.gov)>; 'ssprague@azgfd.gov' <[ssprague@azgfd.gov](mailto:ssprague@azgfd.gov)>; 'kterpening@azgfd.gov'  
<[kterpening@azgfd.gov](mailto:kterpening@azgfd.gov)>; 'jwindes@azgfd.gov' <[jwindes@azgfd.gov](mailto:jwindes@azgfd.gov)>; 'kwolff-krauter@azgfd.gov'  
<[kwolff-krauter@azgfd.gov](mailto:kwolff-krauter@azgfd.gov)>; 'djacobs@azstateparks.gov' <[djacobs@azstateparks.gov](mailto:djacobs@azstateparks.gov)>;  
'mwahsh@azstateparks.gov' <[mwahsh@azstateparks.gov](mailto:mwahsh@azstateparks.gov)>; 'medelman@azland.gov'  
<[medelman@azland.gov](mailto:medelman@azland.gov)>; 'mgreen@land.az.gov' <[mgreen@land.az.gov](mailto:mgreen@land.az.gov)>;  
'dcollins@azstateparks.gov' <[dcollins@azstateparks.gov](mailto:dcollins@azstateparks.gov)>; 'Will Russell'  
<[wrussell@azstateparks.gov](mailto:wrussell@azstateparks.gov)>; 'ryoung@azstateparks.gov' <[ryoung@azstateparks.gov](mailto:ryoung@azstateparks.gov)>;  
'tashbaugh@cagaz.org' <[tashbaugh@cagaz.org](mailto:tashbaugh@cagaz.org)>; 'mlucero@caagcentral.org'  
<[mlucero@caagcentral.org](mailto:mlucero@caagcentral.org)>; 'spatro@caagcentral.org' <[spatro@caagcentral.org](mailto:spatro@caagcentral.org)>; 'tfitzgerald@cap-  
az.com' <[tfitzgerald@cap-az.com](mailto:tfitzgerald@cap-az.com)>; 'pkernan@cap-az.com' <[pkernan@cap-az.com](mailto:pkernan@cap-az.com)>;  
'cthompson@cap-az.com' <[cthompson@cap-az.com](mailto:cthompson@cap-az.com)>; 'pzellmer@cap-az.com' <[pzellmer@cap-  
az.com](mailto:pzellmer@cap-<br/>az.com)>; 'mwever@AJCity.Net' <[mwever@AJCity.Net](mailto:mwever@AJCity.Net)>; 'eschmid@ajcity.net' <[eschmid@ajcity.net](mailto:eschmid@ajcity.net)>;  
'lkirch@AJCity.Net' <[lkirch@AJCity.Net](mailto:lkirch@AJCity.Net)>; 'deitel@casagrandeaz.gov' <[deitel@casagrandeaz.gov](mailto:deitel@casagrandeaz.gov)>;  
'klouis@casagrandeaz.gov' <[klouis@casagrandeaz.gov](mailto:klouis@casagrandeaz.gov)>; 'Amanda\_Grant@casagrandeaz.gov'  
<[Amanda\\_Grant@casagrandeaz.gov](mailto:Amanda_Grant@casagrandeaz.gov)>; 'glopez@coolidgeaz.com' <[glopez@coolidgeaz.com](mailto:glopez@coolidgeaz.com)>;  
'kbrown@eloyaz.gov' <[kbrown@eloyaz.gov](mailto:kbrown@eloyaz.gov)>; 'jvlaming@EloyAZ.gov' <[jvlaming@EloyAZ.gov](mailto:jvlaming@EloyAZ.gov)>;  
'james.hash@mesaaz.gov' <[james.hash@mesaaz.gov](mailto:james.hash@mesaaz.gov)>; 'beth.huning@mesaaz.gov'  
<[beth.huning@mesaaz.gov](mailto:beth.huning@mesaaz.gov)>; 'natalie.lewis@mesaaz.gov' <[natalie.lewis@mesaaz.gov](mailto:natalie.lewis@mesaaz.gov)>;  
'jake.west@mesaaz.gov' <[jake.west@mesaaz.gov](mailto:jake.west@mesaaz.gov)>; 'al.zubi@mesaaz.gov' <[al.zubi@mesaaz.gov](mailto:al.zubi@mesaaz.gov)>;  
'erik.guderian@mesaaz.gov' <[erik.guderian@mesaaz.gov](mailto:erik.guderian@mesaaz.gov)>; 'RJ.Zeder@MesaAZ.gov'  
<[RJ.Zeder@MesaAZ.gov](mailto:RJ.Zeder@MesaAZ.gov)>; 'fet@mail.maricopa.gov' <[fet@mail.maricopa.gov](mailto:fet@mail.maricopa.gov)>;  
'Larry.BenallieJr@gric.nsn.us' <[Larry.BenallieJr@gric.nsn.us](mailto:Larry.BenallieJr@gric.nsn.us)>; 'ddejong@gilariver.com'  
<[ddejong@gilariver.com](mailto:ddejong@gilariver.com)>; 'executivemail@gric.nsn.us' <[executivemail@gric.nsn.us](mailto:executivemail@gric.nsn.us)>;  
'Barnaby.Lewis2@gric.nsn.us' <[Barnaby.Lewis2@gric.nsn.us](mailto:Barnaby.Lewis2@gric.nsn.us)>; Gregory McDowell  
<[Gregory.McDowell@gric.nsn.us](mailto:Gregory.McDowell@gric.nsn.us)>; 'timothy.oliver@gric.nsn.us' <[timothy.oliver@gric.nsn.us](mailto:timothy.oliver@gric.nsn.us)>;  
'sasha.pachito@gric.nsn.us' <[sasha.pachito@gric.nsn.us](mailto:sasha.pachito@gric.nsn.us)>; 'david.white@gric.nsn.us'  
<[david.white@gric.nsn.us](mailto:david.white@gric.nsn.us)>; 'michael.labianca@hdrinc.com' <[michael.labianca@hdrinc.com](mailto:michael.labianca@hdrinc.com)>;  
'Cathy.LaFata@hdrinc.com' <[Cathy.LaFata@hdrinc.com](mailto:Cathy.LaFata@hdrinc.com)>; 'hehonianie@hopi.nsn.us'  
<[hehonianie@hopi.nsn.us](mailto:hehonianie@hopi.nsn.us)>; 'brent.crowther@kimley-horn.com' <[brent.crowther@kimley-  
horn.com](mailto:brent.crowther@kimley-<br/>horn.com)>; 'bhazlett@azmag.gov' <[bhazlett@azmag.gov](mailto:bhazlett@azmag.gov)>; M Henry (AzMAG)  
<[mhenry@azmag.gov](mailto:mhenry@azmag.gov)>; 'chill@azmag.gov' <[chill@azmag.gov](mailto:chill@azmag.gov)>; 'nprior@azmag.gov'  
<[nprior@azmag.gov](mailto:nprior@azmag.gov)>; 'deniselacey@mail.maricopa.gov' <[deniselacey@mail.maricopa.gov](mailto:deniselacey@mail.maricopa.gov)>;  
Jennifer Toth (Maricopa) <[jennifertoth@mail.maricopa.gov](mailto:jennifertoth@mail.maricopa.gov)>; 'Peter.S.Yucupicio@pasquayaqui-  
nsn.gov' <[Peter.S.Yucupicio@pasquayaqui-nsn.gov](mailto:Peter.S.Yucupicio@pasquayaqui-nsn.gov)>; 'tbianchi@gatewayairport.com'  
<[tbianchi@gatewayairport.com](mailto:tbianchi@gatewayairport.com)>; 'bdraper@gatewayairport.com' <[bdraper@gatewayairport.com](mailto:bdraper@gatewayairport.com)>;

'rsmith@gatewayairport.com' <[rsmith@gatewayairport.com](mailto:rsmith@gatewayairport.com)>; 'andrew.smith@pinalcountyaz.gov' <[andrew.smith@pinalcountyaz.gov](mailto:andrew.smith@pinalcountyaz.gov)>; Louis Andersen <[Louis.Andersen@pinalcountyaz.gov](mailto:Louis.Andersen@pinalcountyaz.gov)>; 'Scott.Bender@pinalcountyaz.gov' <[Scott.Bender@pinalcountyaz.gov](mailto:Scott.Bender@pinalcountyaz.gov)>; 'Elise.moore@pinalcountyaz.gov' <[Elise.moore@pinalcountyaz.gov](mailto:Elise.moore@pinalcountyaz.gov)>; 'brett.burningham@queencreek.org' <[brett.burningham@queencreek.org](mailto:brett.burningham@queencreek.org)>; 'Mohamed.youssef@queencreek.org' <[Mohamed.youssef@queencreek.org](mailto:Mohamed.youssef@queencreek.org)>; 'Jennifer.Jack@srpmic-nsn.gov' <[Jennifer.Jack@srpmic-nsn.gov](mailto:Jennifer.Jack@srpmic-nsn.gov)>; 'Rick.McFarlin@srpmic-nsn.gov' <[Rick.McFarlin@srpmic-nsn.gov](mailto:Rick.McFarlin@srpmic-nsn.gov)>; 'delbert.ray@srpmic-nsn.gov' <[delbert.ray@srpmic-nsn.gov](mailto:delbert.ray@srpmic-nsn.gov)>; 'Shane.Anton@srpmic-nsn.gov' <[Shane.Anton@srpmic-nsn.gov](mailto:Shane.Anton@srpmic-nsn.gov)>; 'angela.garcia-lewis@srpmic-nsn.gov' <[angela.garcia-lewis@srpmic-nsn.gov](mailto:angela.garcia-lewis@srpmic-nsn.gov)>; 'ryan.earwood@srpnet.com' <[ryan.earwood@srpnet.com](mailto:ryan.earwood@srpnet.com)>; 'Floyd.Hardin@srpnet.com' <[Floyd.Hardin@srpnet.com](mailto:Floyd.Hardin@srpnet.com)>; 'Allen.garrison@srpnet.com' <[Allen.garrison@srpnet.com](mailto:Allen.garrison@srpnet.com)>; 'dan.hawkins@srpnet.com' <[dan.hawkins@srpnet.com](mailto:dan.hawkins@srpnet.com)>; 'Elijah.lubandi@srpnet.com' <[Elijah.lubandi@srpnet.com](mailto:Elijah.lubandi@srpnet.com)>; 'robert.maldonado@srpnet.com' <[robert.maldonado@srpnet.com](mailto:robert.maldonado@srpnet.com)>; 'janeen.rohovit@srpnet.com' <[janeen.rohovit@srpnet.com](mailto:janeen.rohovit@srpnet.com)>; 'apachevern@yahoo.com' <[apachevern@yahoo.com](mailto:apachevern@yahoo.com)>; Irene Higgs <[ihiggs@scmpo.org](mailto:ihiggs@scmpo.org)>; 'Philip.Hobbs@tonation-nsn.gov' <[Philip.Hobbs@tonation-nsn.gov](mailto:Philip.Hobbs@tonation-nsn.gov)>; 'Andrew.Korchmaros@tonation-nsn.gov' <[Andrew.Korchmaros@tonation-nsn.gov](mailto:Andrew.Korchmaros@tonation-nsn.gov)>; 'edwardd.manuel@tonation-nsn.gov' <[edwardd.manuel@tonation-nsn.gov](mailto:edwardd.manuel@tonation-nsn.gov)>; 'jasper.kinsleyjr@tonation-nsn.gov' <[jasper.kinsleyjr@tonation-nsn.gov](mailto:jasper.kinsleyjr@tonation-nsn.gov)>; 'Steve.tipton@tonation-nsn.gov' <[Steve.tipton@tonation-nsn.gov](mailto:Steve.tipton@tonation-nsn.gov)>; 'peter.steere@tonation-nsn.gov' <[peter.steere@tonation-nsn.gov](mailto:peter.steere@tonation-nsn.gov)>; 'vburdette@tontoapache.org' <[vburdette@tontoapache.org](mailto:vburdette@tontoapache.org)>; 'Michelle.Orton@florenceaz.gov' <[Michelle.Orton@florenceaz.gov](mailto:Michelle.Orton@florenceaz.gov)>; 'jess.knudson@florenceaz.gov' <[jess.knudson@florenceaz.gov](mailto:jess.knudson@florenceaz.gov)>; Rice, Jesse M CIV USARMY CESPL (US) <[Jesse.M.Rice@usace.army.mil](mailto:Jesse.M.Rice@usace.army.mil)>; 'jason.kepler@az.usda.gov' <[jason.kepler@az.usda.gov](mailto:jason.kepler@az.usda.gov)>; 'andrew.burnes@az.usda.gov' <[andrew.burnes@az.usda.gov](mailto:andrew.burnes@az.usda.gov)>; 'cheryl.lambert@az.usda.gov' <[cheryl.lambert@az.usda.gov](mailto:cheryl.lambert@az.usda.gov)>; 'ferris.begay@bia.gov' <[ferris.begay@bia.gov](mailto:ferris.begay@bia.gov)>; 'clarence.begay@bia.gov' <[clarence.begay@bia.gov](mailto:clarence.begay@bia.gov)>; 'garry.cantley@bia.gov' <[garry.cantley@bia.gov](mailto:garry.cantley@bia.gov)>; 'arlan.riggs@bia.gov' <[arlan.riggs@bia.gov](mailto:arlan.riggs@bia.gov)>; 'nina.siquieros@bia.gov' <[nina.siquieros@bia.gov](mailto:nina.siquieros@bia.gov)>; 'cecilia.martinez@bia.gov' <[cecilia.martinez@bia.gov](mailto:cecilia.martinez@bia.gov)>; 'george.patton@bia.gov' <[george.patton@bia.gov](mailto:george.patton@bia.gov)>; 'beau.goldstein@bia.gov' <[beau.goldstein@bia.gov](mailto:beau.goldstein@bia.gov)>; 'paul.bonar@bia.gov' <[paul.bonar@bia.gov](mailto:paul.bonar@bia.gov)>; 'chip.lewis@bia.gov' <[chip.lewis@bia.gov](mailto:chip.lewis@bia.gov)>; 'george.martinez@bia.gov' <[george.martinez@bia.gov](mailto:george.martinez@bia.gov)>; 'dave.smith@bia.gov' <[dave.smith@bia.gov](mailto:dave.smith@bia.gov)>; 'ekender@blm.gov' <[ekender@blm.gov](mailto:ekender@blm.gov)>; 'mhartney@blm.gov' <[mhartney@blm.gov](mailto:mhartney@blm.gov)>; 'luhr@blm.gov' <[luhr@blm.gov](mailto:luhr@blm.gov)>; 'lcowger@blm.gov' <[lcowger@blm.gov](mailto:lcowger@blm.gov)>; 'caevans@usbr.gov' <[caevans@usbr.gov](mailto:caevans@usbr.gov)>; 'debra\_bills@fws.gov' <[debra\\_bills@fws.gov](mailto:debra_bills@fws.gov)>; 'Robert\_Lehman@fws.gov' <[Robert\\_Lehman@fws.gov](mailto:Robert_Lehman@fws.gov)>; 'scott\_richardson@fws.gov' <[scott\\_richardson@fws.gov](mailto:scott_richardson@fws.gov)>; 'karl\_pierce@nps.gov' <[karl\\_pierce@nps.gov](mailto:karl_pierce@nps.gov)>; 'Alycia\_Hayes@nps.gov' <[Alycia\\_Hayes@nps.gov](mailto:Alycia_Hayes@nps.gov)>; 'stephanie\_macdonald@nps.gov' <[stephanie\\_macdonald@nps.gov](mailto:stephanie_macdonald@nps.gov)>; 'Sherry\_Plowman@nps.gov' <[Sherry\\_Plowman@nps.gov](mailto:Sherry_Plowman@nps.gov)>; 'mike.n.williams@faa.gov' <[mike.n.williams@faa.gov](mailto:mike.n.williams@faa.gov)>; 'thomas.deitering@fhwa.dot.gov' <[thomas.deitering@fhwa.dot.gov](mailto:thomas.deitering@fhwa.dot.gov)>; 'alan.hansen@fhwa.dot.gov' <[alan.hansen@fhwa.dot.gov](mailto:alan.hansen@fhwa.dot.gov)>; 'aryan.lirange@fhwa.dot.gov' <[aryan.lirange@fhwa.dot.gov](mailto:aryan.lirange@fhwa.dot.gov)>; 'Rebecca.Yedlin@dot.gov' <[Rebecca.Yedlin@dot.gov](mailto:Rebecca.Yedlin@dot.gov)>; 'andrea.martin@dot.gov' <[andrea.martin@dot.gov](mailto:andrea.martin@dot.gov)>; 'leslie.rogers@dot.gov' <[leslie.rogers@dot.gov](mailto:leslie.rogers@dot.gov)>; 'meek.clifton@epa.gov' <[meek.clifton@epa.gov](mailto:meek.clifton@epa.gov)>; 'ardis@wapa.gov' <[ardis@wapa.gov](mailto:ardis@wapa.gov)>; 'rlupe@wmat.us'

<[rlupe@wmat.us](mailto:rlupe@wmat.us)>; 'jrussell-winiecki@yan-tribe.org' <[jrussell-winiecki@yan-tribe.org](mailto:jrussell-winiecki@yan-tribe.org)>;  
'Martha.martinez@srpmic-nsn.gov' <[Martha.martinez@srpmic-nsn.gov](mailto:Martha.martinez@srpmic-nsn.gov)>; Louis Andersen  
<[Louis.Andersen@pinalcountyaz.gov](mailto:Louis.Andersen@pinalcountyaz.gov)>; Aryan Lirange <[Aryan.Lirange@dot.gov](mailto:Aryan.Lirange@dot.gov)>; Thomas Flynn  
<[TFlynn@azdot.gov](mailto:TFlynn@azdot.gov)>; 'Watzek, Kurt' <[Kurt.Watzek@hdrinc.com](mailto:Kurt.Watzek@hdrinc.com)>; 'Chaney Curtis D'  
<[Curtis.Chaney@srpnet.com](mailto:Curtis.Chaney@srpnet.com)>; 'Hays Donald T (Don)' <[Don.Hays@srpnet.com](mailto:Don.Hays@srpnet.com)>; Rick Miller  
<[rmiller@coolidgeaz.com](mailto:rmiller@coolidgeaz.com)>; 'Stephen Brown - FCDX' <[StephenBrown@mail.maricopa.gov](mailto:StephenBrown@mail.maricopa.gov)>; 'Monica  
Antone' <[Monica.Antone@gric.nsn.us](mailto:Monica.Antone@gric.nsn.us)>; David Madril <[David.Madril@tonation-nsn.gov](mailto:David.Madril@tonation-nsn.gov)>; Paul  
O'Brien <[PO'Brien@azdot.gov](mailto:PO'Brien@azdot.gov)>; 'rodney.bragg@aecom.com' <[rodney.bragg@aecom.com](mailto:rodney.bragg@aecom.com)>;  
'RMiguel@ak-chin.nsn.us' <[RMiguel@ak-chin.nsn.us](mailto:RMiguel@ak-chin.nsn.us)>; 'Sandra.Shade@ak-chin.nsn.us'  
<[Sandra.Shade@ak-chin.nsn.us](mailto:Sandra.Shade@ak-chin.nsn.us)>; 'cmcwilli@azcorrections.gov' <[cmcwilli@azcorrections.gov](mailto:cmcwilli@azcorrections.gov)>;  
'russell.a.carter20.nfg@mail.mil' <[russell.a.carter20.nfg@mail.mil](mailto:russell.a.carter20.nfg@mail.mil)>;  
'Dorenda.coleman@fmo.azdema.gov' <[Dorenda.coleman@fmo.azdema.gov](mailto:Dorenda.coleman@fmo.azdema.gov)>;  
'Janet.johnson@fmo.azdema.gov' <[Janet.johnson@fmo.azdema.gov](mailto:Janet.johnson@fmo.azdema.gov)>;  
'scott.sveinsson@fmo.azdema.gov' <[scott.sveinsson@fmo.azdema.gov](mailto:scott.sveinsson@fmo.azdema.gov)>; 'wl1@azdeq.gov'  
<[wl1@azdeq.gov](mailto:wl1@azdeq.gov)>; 'SHarrison@AZDPS.GOV' <[SHarrison@AZDPS.GOV](mailto:SHarrison@AZDPS.GOV)>; 'cboucher@azgfd.gov'  
<[cboucher@azgfd.gov](mailto:cboucher@azgfd.gov)>; 'ssprague@azgfd.gov' <[ssprague@azgfd.gov](mailto:ssprague@azgfd.gov)>; 'kterpening@azgfd.gov'  
<[kterpening@azgfd.gov](mailto:kterpening@azgfd.gov)>; 'jwindes@azgfd.gov' <[jwindes@azgfd.gov](mailto:jwindes@azgfd.gov)>; 'kwolff-krauter@azgfd.gov'  
<[kwolff-krauter@azgfd.gov](mailto:kwolff-krauter@azgfd.gov)>; 'djacobs@azstateparks.gov' <[djacobs@azstateparks.gov](mailto:djacobs@azstateparks.gov)>;  
'mwalsh@azstateparks.gov' <[mwalsh@azstateparks.gov](mailto:mwalsh@azstateparks.gov)>; 'medelman@azland.gov'  
<[medelman@azland.gov](mailto:medelman@azland.gov)>; 'mgreen@land.az.gov' <[mgreen@land.az.gov](mailto:mgreen@land.az.gov)>;  
'dcollins@azstateparks.gov' <[dcollins@azstateparks.gov](mailto:dcollins@azstateparks.gov)>; 'Will Russell'  
<[wrussell@azstateparks.gov](mailto:wrussell@azstateparks.gov)>; 'ryoung@azstateparks.gov' <[ryoung@azstateparks.gov](mailto:ryoung@azstateparks.gov)>;  
'tashbaugh@cagaz.org' <[tashbaugh@cagaz.org](mailto:tashbaugh@cagaz.org)>; 'mlucero@caagcentral.org'  
<[mlucero@caagcentral.org](mailto:mlucero@caagcentral.org)>; 'spatro@caagcentral.org' <[spatro@caagcentral.org](mailto:spatro@caagcentral.org)>; 'tfitzgerald@cap-  
az.com' <[tfitzgerald@cap-az.com](mailto:tfitzgerald@cap-az.com)>; 'pkernan@cap-az.com' <[pkernan@cap-az.com](mailto:pkernan@cap-az.com)>;  
'cthompson@cap-az.com' <[cthompson@cap-az.com](mailto:cthompson@cap-az.com)>; 'pzellmer@cap-az.com' <[pzellmer@cap-  
az.com](mailto:pzellmer@cap-<br/>az.com)>; 'mwever@AJCity.Net' <[mwever@AJCity.Net](mailto:mwever@AJCity.Net)>; 'eschmid@ajcity.net' <[eschmid@ajcity.net](mailto:eschmid@ajcity.net)>;  
'lkirch@AJCity.Net' <[lkirch@AJCity.Net](mailto:lkirch@AJCity.Net)>; 'deitel@casagrandeaz.gov' <[deitel@casagrandeaz.gov](mailto:deitel@casagrandeaz.gov)>;  
'klouis@casagrandeaz.gov' <[klouis@casagrandeaz.gov](mailto:klouis@casagrandeaz.gov)>; 'Amanda\_Grant@casagrandeaz.gov'  
<[Amanda\\_Grant@casagrandeaz.gov](mailto:Amanda_Grant@casagrandeaz.gov)>; 'glopez@coolidgeaz.com' <[glopez@coolidgeaz.com](mailto:glopez@coolidgeaz.com)>;  
'kbrown@eloyaz.gov' <[kbrown@eloyaz.gov](mailto:kbrown@eloyaz.gov)>; 'jvlaming@EloyAZ.gov' <[jvlaming@EloyAZ.gov](mailto:jvlaming@EloyAZ.gov)>;  
'james.hash@mesaaz.gov' <[james.hash@mesaaz.gov](mailto:james.hash@mesaaz.gov)>; 'beth.huning@mesaaz.gov'  
<[beth.huning@mesaaz.gov](mailto:beth.huning@mesaaz.gov)>; 'natalie.lewis@mesaaz.gov' <[natalie.lewis@mesaaz.gov](mailto:natalie.lewis@mesaaz.gov)>;  
'jake.west@mesaaz.gov' <[jake.west@mesaaz.gov](mailto:jake.west@mesaaz.gov)>; 'al.zubi@mesaaz.gov' <[al.zubi@mesaaz.gov](mailto:al.zubi@mesaaz.gov)>;  
'erik.guderian@mesaaz.gov' <[erik.guderian@mesaaz.gov](mailto:erik.guderian@mesaaz.gov)>; 'RJ.Zeder@MesaAZ.gov'  
<[RJ.Zeder@MesaAZ.gov](mailto:RJ.Zeder@MesaAZ.gov)>; 'fet@mail.maricopa.gov' <[fet@mail.maricopa.gov](mailto:fet@mail.maricopa.gov)>;  
'Larry.BenallieJr@gric.nsn.us' <[Larry.BenallieJr@gric.nsn.us](mailto:Larry.BenallieJr@gric.nsn.us)>; 'ddejong@gilariver.com'  
<[ddejong@gilariver.com](mailto:ddejong@gilariver.com)>; 'executivemail@gric.nsn.us' <[executivemail@gric.nsn.us](mailto:executivemail@gric.nsn.us)>;  
'Barnaby.Lewis2@gric.nsn.us' <[Barnaby.Lewis2@gric.nsn.us](mailto:Barnaby.Lewis2@gric.nsn.us)>; Gregory McDowell  
<[Gregory.McDowell@gric.nsn.us](mailto:Gregory.McDowell@gric.nsn.us)>; 'timothy.oliver@gric.nsn.us' <[timothy.oliver@gric.nsn.us](mailto:timothy.oliver@gric.nsn.us)>;  
'sasha.pachito@gric.nsn.us' <[sasha.pachito@gric.nsn.us](mailto:sasha.pachito@gric.nsn.us)>; 'david.white@gric.nsn.us'  
<[david.white@gric.nsn.us](mailto:david.white@gric.nsn.us)>; 'michael.labianca@hdrinc.com' <[michael.labianca@hdrinc.com](mailto:michael.labianca@hdrinc.com)>;  
'Cathy.LaFata@hdrinc.com' <[Cathy.LaFata@hdrinc.com](mailto:Cathy.LaFata@hdrinc.com)>; 'hehonianie@hopi.nsn.us'  
<[hehonianie@hopi.nsn.us](mailto:hehonianie@hopi.nsn.us)>; 'brent.crowther@kimley-horn.com' <[brent.crowther@kimley-  
horn.com](mailto:brent.crowther@kimley-<br/>horn.com)>; 'bhazlett@azmag.gov' <[bhazlett@azmag.gov](mailto:bhazlett@azmag.gov)>; M Henry (AzMAG)

<[mhenry@azmag.gov](mailto:mhenry@azmag.gov)>; 'chill@azmag.gov' <[chill@azmag.gov](mailto:chill@azmag.gov)>; 'nprior@azmag.gov'  
<[nprior@azmag.gov](mailto:nprior@azmag.gov)>; 'deniselacey@mail.maricopa.gov' <[deniselacey@mail.maricopa.gov](mailto:deniselacey@mail.maricopa.gov)>;  
'Peter.S.Yucupicio@pascuayaqui-nsn.gov' <[Peter.S.Yucupicio@pascuayaqui-nsn.gov](mailto:Peter.S.Yucupicio@pascuayaqui-nsn.gov)>;  
'tbianchi@gatewayairport.com' <[tbianchi@gatewayairport.com](mailto:tbianchi@gatewayairport.com)>; 'bdraper@gatewayairport.com'  
<[bdraper@gatewayairport.com](mailto:bdraper@gatewayairport.com)>; 'rsmith@gatewayairport.com' <[rsmith@gatewayairport.com](mailto:rsmith@gatewayairport.com)>;  
'andrew.smith@pinalcountyaz.gov' <[andrew.smith@pinalcountyaz.gov](mailto:andrew.smith@pinalcountyaz.gov)>;  
'Scott.Bender@pinalcountyaz.gov' <[Scott.Bender@pinalcountyaz.gov](mailto:Scott.Bender@pinalcountyaz.gov)>;  
'Elise.moore@pinalcountyaz.gov' <[Elise.moore@pinalcountyaz.gov](mailto:Elise.moore@pinalcountyaz.gov)>;  
'brett.burningham@queencreek.org' <[brett.burningham@queencreek.org](mailto:brett.burningham@queencreek.org)>;  
'Mohamed.youssef@queencreek.org' <[Mohamed.youssef@queencreek.org](mailto:Mohamed.youssef@queencreek.org)>;  
'Jennifer.Jack@srpmic-nsn.gov' <[Jennifer.Jack@srpmic-nsn.gov](mailto:Jennifer.Jack@srpmic-nsn.gov)>; 'Rick.McFarlin@srpmic-nsn.gov'  
<[Rick.McFarlin@srpmic-nsn.gov](mailto:Rick.McFarlin@srpmic-nsn.gov)>; 'delbert.ray@srpmic-nsn.gov' <[delbert.ray@srpmic-nsn.gov](mailto:delbert.ray@srpmic-nsn.gov)>;  
'Shane.Anton@srpmic-nsn.gov' <[Shane.Anton@srpmic-nsn.gov](mailto:Shane.Anton@srpmic-nsn.gov)>; 'angela.garcia-lewis@srpmic-  
nsn.gov' <[angela.garcia-lewis@srpmic-nsn.gov](mailto:angela.garcia-lewis@srpmic-nsn.gov)>; 'ryan.earwood@srpnet.com'  
<[ryan.earwood@srpnet.com](mailto:ryan.earwood@srpnet.com)>; 'Floyd.Hardin@srpnet.com' <[Floyd.Hardin@srpnet.com](mailto:Floyd.Hardin@srpnet.com)>;  
'Allen.garrison@srpnet.com' <[Allen.garrison@srpnet.com](mailto:Allen.garrison@srpnet.com)>; 'dan.hawkins@srpnet.com'  
<[dan.hawkins@srpnet.com](mailto:dan.hawkins@srpnet.com)>; 'Elijah.lubandi@srpnet.com' <[Elijah.lubandi@srpnet.com](mailto:Elijah.lubandi@srpnet.com)>;  
'robert.maldonado@srpnet.com' <[robert.maldonado@srpnet.com](mailto:robert.maldonado@srpnet.com)>; 'janeen.rohovit@srpnet.com'  
<[janeen.rohovit@srpnet.com](mailto:janeen.rohovit@srpnet.com)>; 'apachevern@yahoo.com' <[apachevern@yahoo.com](mailto:apachevern@yahoo.com)>; Irene Higgs  
<[ihiggs@scmpo.org](mailto:ihiggs@scmpo.org)>; 'Philip.Hobbs@tonation-nsn.gov' <[Philip.Hobbs@tonation-nsn.gov](mailto:Philip.Hobbs@tonation-nsn.gov)>;  
'Andrew.Korchmaros@tonation-nsn.gov' <[Andrew.Korchmaros@tonation-nsn.gov](mailto:Andrew.Korchmaros@tonation-nsn.gov)>;  
'edwardd.manuel@tonation-nsn.gov' <[edwardd.manuel@tonation-nsn.gov](mailto:edwardd.manuel@tonation-nsn.gov)>;  
'jasper.kinsleyjr@tonation-nsn.gov' <[jasper.kinsleyjr@tonation-nsn.gov](mailto:jasper.kinsleyjr@tonation-nsn.gov)>; 'Steve.tipton@tonation-  
nsn.gov' <[Steve.tipton@tonation-nsn.gov](mailto:Steve.tipton@tonation-nsn.gov)>; 'peter.steere@tonation-nsn.gov'  
<[peter.steere@tonation-nsn.gov](mailto:peter.steere@tonation-nsn.gov)>; 'vburdette@tontoapache.org' <[vburdette@tontoapache.org](mailto:vburdette@tontoapache.org)>;  
'Michelle.Orton@florenceaz.gov' <[Michelle.Orton@florenceaz.gov](mailto:Michelle.Orton@florenceaz.gov)>; 'jess.knudson@florenceaz.gov'  
<[jess.knudson@florenceaz.gov](mailto:jess.knudson@florenceaz.gov)>; Rice, Jesse M CIV USARMY CESPL (US)  
<[Jesse.M.Rice@usace.army.mil](mailto:Jesse.M.Rice@usace.army.mil)>; 'jason.kepler@az.usda.gov' <[jason.kepler@az.usda.gov](mailto:jason.kepler@az.usda.gov)>;  
'andrew.burnes@az.usda.gov' <[andrew.burnes@az.usda.gov](mailto:andrew.burnes@az.usda.gov)>; 'cheryl.lambert@az.usda.gov'  
<[cheryl.lambert@az.usda.gov](mailto:cheryl.lambert@az.usda.gov)>; 'ferris.begay@bia.gov' <[ferris.begay@bia.gov](mailto:ferris.begay@bia.gov)>;  
'clarence.begay@bia.gov' <[clarence.begay@bia.gov](mailto:clarence.begay@bia.gov)>; 'garry.cantley@bia.gov'  
<[garry.cantley@bia.gov](mailto:garry.cantley@bia.gov)>; 'arlan.riggs@bia.gov' <[arlan.riggs@bia.gov](mailto:arlan.riggs@bia.gov)>; 'nina.siquieros@bia.gov'  
<[nina.siquieros@bia.gov](mailto:nina.siquieros@bia.gov)>; 'cecilia.martinez@bia.gov' <[cecilia.martinez@bia.gov](mailto:cecilia.martinez@bia.gov)>;  
'george.patton@bia.gov' <[george.patton@bia.gov](mailto:george.patton@bia.gov)>; 'beau.goldstein@bia.gov'  
<[beau.goldstein@bia.gov](mailto:beau.goldstein@bia.gov)>; 'paul.bonar@bia.gov' <[paul.bonar@bia.gov](mailto:paul.bonar@bia.gov)>; 'chip.lewis@bia.gov'  
<[chip.lewis@bia.gov](mailto:chip.lewis@bia.gov)>; 'george.martinez@bia.gov' <[george.martinez@bia.gov](mailto:george.martinez@bia.gov)>;  
'dave.smith@bia.gov' <[dave.smith@bia.gov](mailto:dave.smith@bia.gov)>; 'ekender@blm.gov' <[ekender@blm.gov](mailto:ekender@blm.gov)>;  
'mhartney@blm.gov' <[mhartney@blm.gov](mailto:mhartney@blm.gov)>; 'luhr@blm.gov' <[luhr@blm.gov](mailto:luhr@blm.gov)>; 'lcowger@blm.gov'  
<[lcowger@blm.gov](mailto:lcowger@blm.gov)>; 'caevans@usbr.gov' <[caevans@usbr.gov](mailto:caevans@usbr.gov)>; 'debra\_bills@fws.gov'  
<[debra\\_bills@fws.gov](mailto:debra_bills@fws.gov)>; 'Robert\_Lehman@fws.gov' <[Robert\\_Lehman@fws.gov](mailto:Robert_Lehman@fws.gov)>;  
'scott\_richardson@fws.gov' <[scott\\_richardson@fws.gov](mailto:scott_richardson@fws.gov)>; 'karl\_pierce@nps.gov'  
<[karl\\_pierce@nps.gov](mailto:karl_pierce@nps.gov)>; 'Alycia\_Hayes@nps.gov' <[Alycia\\_Hayes@nps.gov](mailto:Alycia_Hayes@nps.gov)>;  
'stephanie\_macdonald@nps.gov' <[stephanie\\_macdonald@nps.gov](mailto:stephanie_macdonald@nps.gov)>; 'Sherry\_Plowman@nps.gov'  
<[Sherry\\_Plowman@nps.gov](mailto:Sherry_Plowman@nps.gov)>; 'mike.n.williams@faa.gov' <[mike.n.williams@faa.gov](mailto:mike.n.williams@faa.gov)>;  
'thomas.deitering@fhwa.dot.gov' <[thomas.deitering@fhwa.dot.gov](mailto:thomas.deitering@fhwa.dot.gov)>; 'alan.hansen@fhwa.dot.gov'



<[alan.hansen@fhwa.dot.gov](mailto:alan.hansen@fhwa.dot.gov)>; 'aryan.lirange@fhwa.dot.gov' <[aryan.lirange@fhwa.dot.gov](mailto:aryan.lirange@fhwa.dot.gov)>;  
'Rebecca.Yedlin@dot.gov' <[Rebecca.Yedlin@dot.gov](mailto:Rebecca.Yedlin@dot.gov)>; 'andrea.martin@dot.gov'  
<[andrea.martin@dot.gov](mailto:andrea.martin@dot.gov)>; 'leslie.rogers@dot.gov' <[leslie.rogers@dot.gov](mailto:leslie.rogers@dot.gov)>; 'meek.clifton@epa.gov'  
<[meek.clifton@epa.gov](mailto:meek.clifton@epa.gov)>; 'ardis@wapa.gov' <[ardis@wapa.gov](mailto:ardis@wapa.gov)>; 'rlupe@wmat.us'  
<[rlupe@wmat.us](mailto:rlupe@wmat.us)>; 'jrusell-winiecki@yan-tribe.org' <[jrusell-winiecki@yan-tribe.org](mailto:jrusell-winiecki@yan-tribe.org)>;  
'Martha.martinez@srpmic-nsn.gov' <[Martha.martinez@srpmic-nsn.gov](mailto:Martha.martinez@srpmic-nsn.gov)>; Louis Andersen  
<[Louis.Andersen@pinalcountyz.gov](mailto:Louis.Andersen@pinalcountyz.gov)>; Aryan Lirange <[Aryan.Lirange@dot.gov](mailto:Aryan.Lirange@dot.gov)>; 'Watzek, Kurt'  
<[Kurt.Watzek@hdrinc.com](mailto:Kurt.Watzek@hdrinc.com)>; 'Chaney Curtis D' <[Curtis.Chaney@srpnet.com](mailto:Curtis.Chaney@srpnet.com)>; 'Hays Donald T (Don)'  
<[Don.Hays@srpnet.com](mailto:Don.Hays@srpnet.com)>; Rick Miller <[rmiller@coolidgeaz.com](mailto:rmiller@coolidgeaz.com)>; Stephen Brown - FCDX  
<[StephenBrown@mail.maricopa.gov](mailto:StephenBrown@mail.maricopa.gov)>; Monica Antone <[Monica.Antone@gric.nsn.us](mailto:Monica.Antone@gric.nsn.us)>; David Madril  
<[David.Madril@tonation-nsn.gov](mailto:David.Madril@tonation-nsn.gov)>

**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] RE: North South Corridor Study H7454 01L/STP 999-A(365)X - Agency Stakeholder Meeting

Good Morning,

Thank you for attending yesterday's Stakeholder Agency Meeting.  
During the meeting yesterday we discussed about the Cooperating and Participating Agencies Corridor Preference Form. This is one of the attachments that I emailed to all of you on 12/13/2017 (one of the four email attachments of meeting material). I have attached this form in this email again. This form provides another opportunity for all cooperating and participating agencies on this project to submit comments on their preferred corridor alignments. The deadline for submitting is 12/28/2017 (one per agency).  
If you have any questions please feel free to contact me.

Happy Holiday!

Victor Yang P.E.

**Major Projects Group Manager**

Multimodal Planning Division

205 S.17<sup>th</sup> Ave, MD605E

Phoenix, AZ 85007

Direct (602) 712-8715

Fax (602) 712-8992

[Vyang@azdot.gov](mailto:Vyang@azdot.gov)



---

**From:** Victor Yang

**Sent:** Wednesday, December 13, 2017 4:13 PM

**To:** Sara Allred; Steve Beasley; Vicki Bever; Stephanie Brown; Katie Rodriguez; Brent Cain; Laura Douglas; Dave Edwards; Charla Glendening; Sayeed Hani; Reza Karimvand; Keith Killough; Dianne Kresich; Roderick F. Lane; Gail Lewis; Curtis Litin; Carlos Lopez; Kurt Miyamoto; Kimberly Noetzel;

'pobrien@azdot.gov'; Edward Ochmann; Chris Page; Ashek Rana; Joseph Salazar; Jay Van Echo; Xuefan Xu; 'rodney.bragg@aecom.com'; 'RMiguel@ak-chin.nsn.us'; 'Sandra.Shade@ak-chin.nsn.us'; 'cmcwilli@azcorrections.gov'; 'russell.a.carter20.nfg@mail.mil'; 'Dorenda.coleman@fmo.azdema.gov'; 'Janet.johnson@fmo.azdema.gov'; 'scott.sveinsson@fmo.azdema.gov'; 'wl1@azdeq.gov'; 'SHarrison@AZDPS.GOV'; 'cboucher@azgfd.gov'; 'ssprague@azgfd.gov'; 'kterpening@azgfd.gov'; 'jwindes@azgfd.gov'; 'kwolff-krauter@azgfd.gov'; 'djacobs@azstateparks.gov'; 'mwalth@azstateparks.gov'; 'medelman@azland.gov'; 'mgreen@land.az.gov'; 'dcollins@azstateparks.gov'; 'Will Russell'; 'ryoung@azstateparks.gov'; 'tashbaugh@cagaz.org'; 'mlucero@caagcentral.org'; 'spatro@caagcentral.org'; 'tfitzgerald@cap-az.com'; 'pkernan@cap-az.com'; 'cthompson@cap-az.com'; 'pzellmer@cap-az.com'; 'mwever@AJCity.Net'; 'eschmid@ajcity.net'; 'lkirch@AJCity.Net'; 'deitel@casagrandeaz.gov'; 'klouis@casagrandeaz.gov'; 'Amanda\_Grant@casagrandeaz.gov'; 'glopez@coolidgeaz.com'; 'kbrown@eloyaz.gov'; 'jvlaming@EloyAZ.gov'; 'james.hash@mesaaz.gov'; 'beth.huning@mesaaz.gov'; 'natalie.lewis@mesaaz.gov'; 'jake.west@mesaaz.gov'; 'al.zubi@mesaaz.gov'; 'erik.guderian@mesaaz.gov'; 'RJ.Zeder@MesaAZ.gov'; 'fet@mail.maricopa.gov'; 'Larry.BenallieJr@gric.nsn.us'; 'ddejong@gilariver.com'; 'executivemail@gric.nsn.us'; 'Barnaby.Lewis2@gric.nsn.us'; Gregory McDowell; 'timothy.oliver@gric.nsn.us'; 'sasha.pachito@gric.nsn.us'; 'david.white@gric.nsn.us'; 'michael.labianca@hdrinc.com'; 'Cathy.LaFata@hdrinc.com'; 'hehonanie@hopi.nsn.us'; 'brent.crowther@kimley-horn.com'; 'bhazlett@azmag.gov'; M Henry (AzMAG); 'chill@azmag.gov'; 'npryor@azmag.gov'; 'deniselacey@mail.maricopa.gov'; Jennifer Toth (Maricopa); 'Peter.S.Yucupicio@pascuayaqui-nsn.gov'; 'tbianchi@gatewayairport.com'; 'bdraper@gatewayairport.com'; 'rsmith@gatewayairport.com'; 'andrew.smith@pinalcountyaz.gov'; Louis Andersen; 'Scott.Bender@pinalcountyaz.gov'; 'Elise.moore@pinalcountyaz.gov'; 'brett.burningham@queencreek.org'; 'Mohamed.youssef@queencreek.org'; 'Jennifer.Jack@srpmic-nsn.gov'; 'Rick.McFarlin@srpmic-nsn.gov'; 'delbert.ray@srpmic-nsn.gov'; 'Shane.Anton@srpmic-nsn.gov'; 'angela.garcia-lewis@srpmic-nsn.gov'; 'ryan.earwood@srpnet.com'; 'Floyd.Hardin@srpnet.com'; 'Allen.garrison@srpnet.com'; 'dan.hawkins@srpnet.com'; 'Elijah.lubandi@srpnet.com'; 'robert.maldonado@srpnet.com'; 'janeen.rohovit@srpnet.com'; 'apachevern@yahoo.com'; Irene Higgs; 'Philip.Hobbs@tonation-nsn.gov'; 'Andrew.Korchmaros@tonation-nsn.gov'; 'edwardd.manuel@tonation-nsn.gov'; 'jasper.kinsleyjr@tonation-nsn.gov'; 'Steve.tipton@tonation-nsn.gov'; 'peter.steere@tonation-nsn.gov'; 'vburdette@tontoapache.org'; 'Michelle.Orton@florenceaz.gov'; 'jess.knudson@florenceaz.gov'; 'Jesse.M.Rice@usace.army.mil'; 'jason.kepler@az.usda.gov'; 'andrew.burnes@az.usda.gov'; 'cheryl.lambert@az.usda.gov'; 'ferris.begay@bia.gov'; 'clarence.begay@bia.gov'; 'garry.cantley@bia.gov'; 'arlan.riggs@bia.gov'; 'nina.siquieros@bia.gov'; 'cecilia.martinez@bia.gov'; 'george.patton@bia.gov'; 'beau.goldstein@bia.gov'; 'paul.bonar@bia.gov'; 'chip.lewis@bia.gov'; 'george.martinez@bia.gov'; 'dave.smith@bia.gov'; 'ekender@blm.gov'; 'mhartney@blm.gov'; 'luhr@blm.gov'; 'lcowger@blm.gov'; 'caevans@usbr.gov'; 'debra\_bills@fws.gov'; 'Robert\_Lehman@fws.gov'; 'scott\_richardson@fws.gov'; 'karl\_pierce@nps.gov'; 'Alycia\_Hayes@nps.gov'; 'stephanie\_macdonald@nps.gov'; 'Sherry\_Plowman@nps.gov'; 'mike.n.williams@faa.gov'; 'thomas.deitering@fhwa.dot.gov'; 'alan.hansen@fhwa.dot.gov'; 'aryan.lirange@fhwa.dot.gov'; 'Rebecca.Yedlin@dot.gov'; 'andrea.martin@dot.gov'; 'leslie.rogers@dot.gov'; 'meek.clifton@epa.gov'; 'ardis@wapa.gov'; 'rlupe@wmat.us'; 'jrussell-winiecki@yan-tribe.org'; 'Martha.martinez@srpmic-nsn.gov'; Louis Andersen; Aryan Lirange; Thomas Flynn; 'Watzek, Kurt'; 'Chaney Curtis D'; 'Hays Donald T (Don)'; Rick Miller; 'Stephen Brown - FCDX'; 'Monica Antone'; David Madril; 'pobrien@azdot.gov'; 'rodney.bragg@aecom.com'; 'RMiguel@ak-chin.nsn.us'; 'Sandra.Shade@ak-chin.nsn.us'; 'cmcwilli@azcorrections.gov'; 'russell.a.carter20.nfg@mail.mil'; 'Dorenda.coleman@fmo.azdema.gov'; 'Janet.johnson@fmo.azdema.gov'; 'scott.sveinsson@fmo.azdema.gov'; 'wl1@azdeq.gov'; 'SHarrison@AZDPS.GOV'; 'cboucher@azgfd.gov'; 'ssprague@azgfd.gov'; 'kterpening@azgfd.gov'; 'jwindes@azgfd.gov'; 'kwolff-krauter@azgfd.gov'; 'djacobs@azstateparks.gov'; 'mwalth@azstateparks.gov'; 'medelman@azland.gov'; 'mgreen@land.az.gov'; 'dcollins@azstateparks.gov'; 'Will Russell'; 'ryoung@azstateparks.gov'; 'tashbaugh@cagaz.org'; 'mlucero@caagcentral.org'; 'spatro@caagcentral.org'; 'tfitzgerald@cap-az.com'; 'pkernan@cap-az.com'; 'cthompson@cap-az.com'; 'pzellmer@cap-az.com'; 'mwever@AJCity.Net'; 'eschmid@ajcity.net'; 'lkirch@AJCity.Net'; 'deitel@casagrandeaz.gov'; 'klouis@casagrandeaz.gov'; 'Amanda\_Grant@casagrandeaz.gov'; 'glopez@coolidgeaz.com'; 'kbrown@eloyaz.gov'; 'jvlaming@EloyAZ.gov'; 'james.hash@mesaaz.gov'; 'beth.huning@mesaaz.gov'; 'natalie.lewis@mesaaz.gov'; 'jake.west@mesaaz.gov'; 'al.zubi@mesaaz.gov'; 'erik.guderian@mesaaz.gov'; 'RJ.Zeder@MesaAZ.gov'; 'fet@mail.maricopa.gov'; 'Larry.BenallieJr@gric.nsn.us'; 'ddejong@gilariver.com'; 'executivemail@gric.nsn.us'; 'Barnaby.Lewis2@gric.nsn.us'; 'gregory.mcdowell@gric.nsn.us'; 'timothy.oliver@gric.nsn.us'; 'sasha.pachito@gric.nsn.us';

'david.white@gric.nsn.us'; 'michael.labianca@hdrinc.com'; 'Cathy.LaFata@hdrinc.com';  
'hehonianie@hopi.nsn.us'; 'brent.crowther@kimley-horn.com'; 'bhazlett@azmag.gov';  
'mhenry@azmag.gov'; 'chill@azmag.gov'; 'nprior@azmag.gov'; 'deniselacey@mail.maricopa.gov';  
'Peter.S.Yucupicio@pascuayaqui-nsn.gov'; 'tbianchi@gatewayairport.com';  
'bdraper@gatewayairport.com'; 'rsmith@gatewayairport.com'; 'andrew.smith@pinalcountyaz.gov';  
'Scott.Bender@pinalcountyaz.gov'; 'Elise.moore@pinalcountyaz.gov';  
'brett.burningham@queencreek.org'; 'Mohamed.youssef@queencreek.org'; 'Jennifer.Jack@srpmic-nsn.gov';  
'Rick.McFarlin@srpmic-nsn.gov'; 'delbert.ray@srpmic-nsn.gov'; 'Shane.Anton@srpmic-nsn.gov';  
'angela.garcia-lewis@srpmic-nsn.gov'; 'ryan.earwood@srpnet.com'; 'Floyd.Hardin@srpnet.com';  
'Allen.garrison@srpnet.com'; 'dan.hawkins@srpnet.com'; 'Elijah.lubandi@srpnet.com';  
'robert.maldonado@srpnet.com'; 'janeen.rohovit@srpnet.com'; 'apachevern@yahoo.com'; 'Irene Higgs  
([IHiggs@scmpo.org](mailto:IHiggs@scmpo.org))'; 'Philip.Hobbs@tonation-nsn.gov'; 'Andrew.Korchmaros@tonation-nsn.gov';  
'edwardd.manuel@tonation-nsn.gov'; 'jasper.kinsleyjr@tonation-nsn.gov'; 'Steve.tipton@tonation-nsn.gov';  
'peter.steere@tonation-nsn.gov'; 'vburdette@tontoapache.org';  
'Michelle.Orton@florenceaz.gov'; 'jess.knudson@florenceaz.gov'; 'Jesse.M.Rice@usace.army.mil';  
'jason.kepler@az.usda.gov'; 'andrew.burnes@az.usda.gov'; 'cheryl.lambert@az.usda.gov';  
'ferris.begay@bia.gov'; 'clarence.begay@bia.gov'; 'garry.cantley@bia.gov'; 'arlan.riggs@bia.gov';  
'nina.siqueros@bia.gov'; 'cecilia.martinez@bia.gov'; 'george.patton@bia.gov'; 'beau.goldstein@bia.gov';  
'paul.bonar@bia.gov'; 'chip.lewis@bia.gov'; 'george.martinez@bia.gov'; 'dave.smith@bia.gov';  
'ekender@blm.gov'; 'mhartney@blm.gov'; 'luhr@blm.gov'; 'lcowger@blm.gov'; 'caevans@usbr.gov';  
'debra\_bills@fws.gov'; 'Robert\_Lehman@fws.gov'; 'scott\_richardson@fws.gov'; 'karl\_pierce@nps.gov';  
'Alycia\_Hayes@nps.gov'; 'stephanie\_macdonald@nps.gov'; 'Sherry\_Plowman@nps.gov';  
'mike.n.williams@faa.gov'; 'thomas.deitering@fhwa.dot.gov'; 'alan.hansen@fhwa.dot.gov';  
'aryan.lirange@fhwa.dot.gov'; 'Rebecca.Yedlin@dot.gov'; 'andrea.martin@dot.gov';  
'leslie.rogers@dot.gov'; 'meek.clifton@epa.gov'; 'ardis@wapa.gov'; 'rlupe@wmat.us'; 'jrussell-  
winiecki@yan-tribe.org'; 'Martha.martinez@srpmic-nsn.gov'; 'Louis M. Andersen'; 'Lirange, Aryan  
(FHWA)'; 'Watzek, Kurt'; 'Chaney Curtis D'; 'Hays Donald T (Don)'; 'Rick Miller'; 'Stephen Brown - FCDX';  
'Monica Antone'; 'David Madril'

**Subject:** North South Corridor Study H7454 01L/STP 999-A(365)X - Agency Stakeholder Meeting

Good afternoon,

Attached meeting material for tomorrow Agency Stakeholder meeting. Skype Link and parking direction is included in the meeting invite sent to you earlier. Look forward to seeing you.

Best,

Victor Yang P.E.

**Major Projects Group Manager**

Multimodal Planning Division

205 S.17<sup>th</sup> Ave, MD605E

Phoenix, AZ 85007

Direct (602) 712-8715

Fax (602) 712-8992

[Vyang@azdot.gov](mailto:Vyang@azdot.gov)



you are not the intended recipient, please contact the sender by email, and delete or destroy all copies plus attachments.



## North-South Corridor Study Cooperating and Participating Agency Corridor Preference

We identify the following action corridor alternative(s) as our preferred alternative. We recognize that the North-South Corridor Study Tier 1 Draft Environmental Impact Statement will identify a recommended preferred action corridor alternative, and this form provides us the opportunity to provide our preference to be considered in that process.

We acknowledge that as more information is provided through the National Environmental Policy Act process, we will continue to provide comments throughout the study, and that input will be considered by the study team.

### Preferred Action Corridor Alternative

The map to the right (or the webmap found at <https://northsouthtier1deis.hdrgateway.com/Home/Map>) identifies all action corridor alternatives by segment under consideration in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Our preference for each segment, based on a continuous corridor (for example, the E1a Alternative in Segment 1 connects only with E2a or W2b in Segment 2), is indicated on the form provided on the 2<sup>nd</sup> page of this form.

Please complete:

Name of agency:

City of Coolidge, AZ

Agency contact for this study:


Gilbert Lopez, Development Services Director

Email address:

[glopez@coolidgeaz.com](mailto:glopez@coolidgeaz.com)

Phone number:

520-723-6075



## Cooperating and Participating Agency Corridor Preference

Segment	Alternative	Comment
Segment 1	E1a	
	E1b	
	W1a	
	W1b	
Segment 2	E2a	
	E2b	
	W2a	
	W2b	
Segment 3	E3a	City of Coolidge preferred Easternmost Alternative (please see attached supporting narrative and maps)
	E3b	City of Coolidge preferred Easternmost Alternative (please see attached supporting narrative and maps)
	E3c	
	E3d	
	W3	
Segment 4	E4	City of Coolidges preferred Easternmost Alternative (please see attached supporting narrative and maps)
	W4	

Please provide completed forms by December 28, 2017 to:

Aryan Lirange  
 Senior Urban Engineer  
 Federal Highway Administration  
 4000 N. Central Ave., Suite 1500  
 Phoenix, Arizona 85012  
 (602) 382-8973  
[aryan.lirange@dot.gov](mailto:aryan.lirange@dot.gov)

or Victor Yang  
 Project Manager  
 Arizona Department of Transportation  
 205 S.17th Ave, MD605E  
 Phoenix AZ 85007  
 (602) 712-8715  
[VYang@azdot.gov](mailto:VYang@azdot.gov)

## **Coolidge Response to the North / South Freeway Alternative Proposals covering Preferred Easternmost Alternative, Segment 3 - E3a, E3b and Segment 4 - E4**

The westernmost W-3 and W-4 alternate route had originally been considered but was removed following a very lengthy public participation effort involving multiple agencies, landowners and government jurisdictions from Apache Junction to Eloy. This Study has considered several regional routes connecting Apache Junction at the U.S. 60 with I-10 South of Eloy. Many agencies including the City of Coolidge have been very active in offering comments on the proposed alignments since the beginning of this alignment study. Former Mayor Shope and the City Council (which included current Mayor Jon Thompson) approved a resolution supporting a preferred route through Coolidge which does not follow the new westernmost W-3 and W-4 route. This route was recently added back to the map due to cultural resources that should be avoided between Coolidge and Florence North of Highway 287. This W-3 route would also negatively impact existing housing and planned subdivisions, along with the potentially historical Kenilworth School, which lies directly in W-3 corridors path.

The City has negotiated and approved development agreements with some of the larger landowners to the East of Coolidge, specifically purple corridor E3a and E3b south of Hwy 287, including PRI and Westcor Development. City officials have consistently advocated for the City's preferred route with ADOT and the public.

As the corridor route travels south into segment 4, it is clear that the easternmost route E4, provides the greatest transportation and economic benefit, while also leaving existing state route 87 to handle local traffic from the existing prisons and houses fronting on Hwy 87 west of the Union Pacific Railroad. The cost and technological challenges of designing and building a grade separation for the railroad would be challenging at best and very cost prohibitive.


Having driven from Coolidge to Glendale and back for work, mainly on I-10, has really highlighted the need for reliever or nearby alternate routes that can be used in the event of an accident. With no alternatives, parts of I-10 become a parking lot for hours on end, which is very scary and potentially dangerous in 115 degree summer heat. It is always better to add additional road capacity versus converting the existing into a limited access corridor.

There was also some discussion at our December 14, 2017 stakeholders meeting about potential impact to “Prime and unique farmland” as described under NEPA. While we celebrate our significant agricultural heritage and support its contribution to our culture and economy, it’s well known that some crops utilize more water than others. The reality is that some of the main crops common to this area, like cotton, have not provided enough return on investment, because of the current market and the cost of water during the most recent drought. A lot of farmland currently sits fallow because there is not enough surface water to farm it.

The city, through the mandatory General Plan process has designated some of these properties as Industrial and Manufacturing because of their unique location and proximity to the existing railroad and the North South Corridor, which is expected to bring economic prosperity to an economically challenged region. Many of the farmers sold their land to developers, which continue to lease the land back to them for agriculture until such time that the land is developed for a better and higher use. It is clear that this situation does not meet the definition of what Prime and Unique farmland as presented within the Farmland Protection Policy Act (FPPA, part of Public Law 97-98) and the criteria found under 7 CFR Section 658.5.

This preferred route is illustrated on the City’s General Plan approved by the Mayor and City Council and supported by the voters in a November 2014 election.







## North-South Corridor Study Tier 1 Environmental Impact Statement

### North-South Corridor Study Cooperating and Participating Agency Corridor Preference

We identify the following action corridor alternative(s) as our preferred alternative. We recognize that the North-South Corridor Study Tier 1 Draft Environmental Impact Statement will identify a recommended preferred action corridor alternative, and this form provides us the opportunity to provide our preference to be considered in that process.

We acknowledge that as more information is provided through the National Environmental Policy Act process, we will continue to provide comments throughout the study, and that input will be considered by the study team.

### Preferred Action Corridor Alternative

The map to the right (or the webmap found at <https://northsouthtier1deis.hdrgateway.com/Home/Map>) identifies all action corridor alternatives by segment under consideration in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Our preference for each segment, based on a continuous corridor (for example, the E1a Alternative in Segment 1 connects only with E2a or W2b in Segment 2), is indicated on the form provided on the 2<sup>nd</sup> page of this form.

Please complete:

Name of agency:

Bureau of Reclamation


Agency contact for this study:

Calwans@usbr.gov

Email address:

623 773-6257

Phone number:





12.14.17  
Received  
②

## North-South Corridor Study Tier 1 Environmental Impact Statement

### Cooperating and Participating Agency Corridor Preference

Segment	Alternative	Comment
Segment 1	E1a	This segment comes into Reclamation property on both sides of US 60.
	E1b	The southern end on both crosses Reclamation greenup areas that are mitigation sites for the CAP. <i>Refer not this segment!</i>
	W1a	This segment crosses the CAP at the north end.
	W1b	Both parallel CAP and cross several irrigation and drainage district center lines. These are canals and pipelines.
Segment 2	E2a	No issue
	E2b	No issue E 2 a/b no issue
	W2a	No issue
	W2b	South of the Gila River the proposed route crosses several irrigation and drainage district canals and pipes <i>not preferred</i>
Segment 3	E3a	E3a/c This proposed route crosses into the edge of Reclamation property North of the Gila River. <i>not preferred</i>
	E3b	E 3 b/d No issue
	E3c	E 3 a/b and E 3 c/d
	E3d	Cross some irrigation and drainage ditches and canals.
	W3	Crosses some irrigation district lines (pipe & canals)
Segment 4	E4	An irrigation district line is within the center of the proposed highway and it crosses Reclamation property to the south.
	W4	This proposed segment crosses several irrigation district lines and Reclamation property at E. Shedd Road. <i>mitigation needed - not preferred</i>

Please provide completed forms by December 28, 2017 to:

Aryan Lirange  
Senior Urban Engineer  
Federal Highway Administration  
4000 N. Central Ave., Suite 1500  
Phoenix, Arizona 85012  
(602) 382-8973  
[aryan.lirange@dot.gov](mailto:aryan.lirange@dot.gov)

or Victor Yang  
Project Manager  
Arizona Department of Transportation  
205 S. 17th Ave, MD605E  
Phoenix AZ 85007  
(602) 712-8715  
[VYang@azdot.gov](mailto:VYang@azdot.gov)

*I need to further evaluate wildlife corridors across the CAP where Reclamation has provided crossings.*



November 22, 2017

North-South Corridor Study Team  
c/o Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) Communications  
1655 West Jackson Street, Mail Drop 126F  
Phoenix, Arizona 85007

***Re: North-South Corridor EIS Public Comment***

This letter is in response to ADOT's solicitation of public comment regarding the Tier I Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the North-South Corridor. Phoenix-Mesa Gateway Airport Authority (PMGAA) continues to follow ADOT's North-South Corridor Study process with great interest. PMGAA continues to believe that the planned North-South Corridor combined with the extension of, and connection to, State Route 24 plays a significant role in the continued development of the Phoenix-Mesa Gateway Airport area. Planned transportation connections are a key component for that success.

PMGAA's preference would be for either alignment W1a, or W1b, which would ensure a shorter, and likely more cost-effective, connection needed to tie into the State Route 24 extension.

However, PMGAA believes the development of any of the North-South Corridor alternatives, along with a connection/interchange with the State Route 24 extension, will help with additional connectivity to points south and east, while providing an economic benefit to the Gateway region.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comment on this ongoing study. PMGAA continues to look forward to working with ADOT on this project as an agency stakeholder, as well as other important regional projects.

Sincerely,

Tony Bianchi  
Airport Planner

Cc: Scott Brownlee, Deputy Director, PMGAA  
Bob Draper, Engineering & Facilities Director, PMGAA



### North-South Corridor Study Cooperating and Participating Agency Corridor Preference

We identify the following action corridor alternative(s) as our preferred alternative. We recognize that the North-South Corridor Study Tier 1 Draft Environmental Impact Statement will identify a recommended preferred action corridor alternative, and this form provides us the opportunity to provide our preference to be considered in that process.

We acknowledge that as more information is provided through the National Environmental Policy Act process, we will continue to provide comments throughout the study, and that input will be considered by the study team.

#### Preferred Action Corridor Alternative

The map to the right (or the webmap found at <https://northsouthtier1deis.hdrgateway.com/Home/Map>) identifies all action corridor alternatives by segment under consideration in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Our preference for each segment, based on a continuous corridor (for example, the E1a Alternative in Segment 1 connects only with E2a or W2b in Segment 2), is indicated on the form provided on the 2<sup>nd</sup> page of this form.

Please complete:

Name of agency:

Pinal County - Andy Smith

Agency contact for this study:

Andrew.smith@pinalcountypaz.gov

Email address:

520 - 866-6407

Phone number:



## North-South Corridor Study Tier 1 Environmental Impact Statement

### Cooperating and Participating Agency Corridor Preference

Segment	Alternative	Comment
Segment 1	E1a	
	E1b	
	W1a	
	W1b	Preferred
Segment 2	E2a	Preferred
	E2b	Preferred
	W2a	
	W2b	
Segment 3	E3a	Preferred
	E3b	
	E3c	Preferred
	E3d	
	W3	
Segment 4	E4	No Preference
	W4	No Preference

Please provide completed forms by December 28, 2017 to:

Aryan Lirange  
 Senior Urban Engineer  
 Federal Highway Administration  
 4000 N. Central Ave., Suite 1500  
 Phoenix, Arizona 85012  
 (602) 382-8973  
[aryan.lirange@dot.gov](mailto:aryan.lirange@dot.gov)

or Victor Yang  
 Project Manager  
 Arizona Department of Transportation  
 205 S. 17th Ave, MD605E  
 Phoenix AZ 85007  
 (602) 712-8715  
[VYang@azdot.gov](mailto:VYang@azdot.gov)



## North-South Corridor Study Cooperating and Participating Agency Corridor Preference

We identify the following action corridor alternative(s) as our preferred alternative. We recognize that the North-South Corridor Study Tier 1 Draft Environmental Impact Statement will identify a recommended preferred action corridor alternative, and this form provides us the opportunity to provide our preference to be considered in that process.

We acknowledge that as more information is provided through the National Environmental Policy Act process, we will continue to provide comments throughout the study, and that input will be considered by the study team.

### Preferred Action Corridor Alternative

The map to the right (or the webmap found at <https://northsouthtier1deis.hdrgateway.com/Home/Map>) identifies all action corridor alternatives by segment under consideration in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Our preference for each segment, based on a continuous corridor (for example, the E1a Alternative in Segment 1 connects only with E2a or W2b in Segment 2), is indicated on the form provided on the 2<sup>nd</sup> page of this form.

Please complete:

Name of agency:

**U.S. EPA**

Agency contact for this study:


**Clifton Meek**

Email address:

**meek.clifton@epa.gov**

Phone number:

**415-972-3370**



## Cooperating and Participating Agency Corridor Preference

Segment	Alternative	Comment
Segment 1	E1a	
	E1b	
	W1a	Based upon the information provided to EPA thus far, this segment appears to best minimize direct and indirect impacts to sensitive environmental resources that may result from the proposed project, as well as provide the greatest benefit to existing communities currently lacking north-south mobility options.
	W1b	
Segment 2	E2a	
	E2b	
	W2a	Based upon the information provided to EPA thus far, this segment appears to best minimize direct and indirect impacts to sensitive environmental resources that may result from the proposed project, as well as provide the greatest benefit to existing communities currently lacking north-south mobility options.
	W2b	
Segment 3	E3a	
	E3b	
	E3c	
	E3d	
	W3	Based upon the information provided to EPA thus far, this segment appears to best minimize direct and indirect impacts to sensitive environmental resources that may result from the proposed project, as well as provide the greatest benefit to existing communities currently lacking north-south mobility options.
Segment 4	E4	
	W4	Based upon the information provided to EPA thus far, this segment appears to best minimize direct and indirect impacts to sensitive environmental resources that may result from the proposed project, as well as provide the greatest benefit to existing communities currently lacking north-south mobility options.

Please provide completed forms by December 28, 2017 to:

Aryan Lirange  
 Senior Urban Engineer  
 Federal Highway Administration  
 4000 N. Central Ave., Suite 1500  
 Phoenix, Arizona 85012  
 (602) 382-8973  
[aryan.lirange@dot.gov](mailto:aryan.lirange@dot.gov)

or Victor Yang  
 Project Manager  
 Arizona Department of Transportation  
 205 S.17th Ave, MD605E  
 Phoenix AZ 85007  
 (602) 712-8715  
[VYang@azdot.gov](mailto:VYang@azdot.gov)

# ADOT | North-South Corridor Study

## Alternative Corridor Options - Comment Form

Public comments are an important part of this project and will be reviewed by the project team. **Comments received by December 14, 2017 will be entered into the Corridor Selection Report for this phase of work** (comments are encouraged through all phases of the process). Please comment in the space provided below. You may type or hand-write your comments. Please print clearly.

As so appropriately identified by the Arizona Department of Transportation, it is critical for the North-South Corridor to accommodate anticipated growth in the area and across the region; to improve access to future activity and population centers; and improve regional connectivity. Of the proposed alternative corridor options, the Western Corridor 1a most effectively meets those goals.

### Contact Information (optional\*)

Name: Gail Barney, Mayor

Address: 22358 S. Ellsworth Road

Phone: 480-358-3000

Email Address: jamie.bennett@queencreek.org

☒ Please check this box if you would like to receive email updates on this project.

[Click here to submit form via email](#)

**Thank you for your participation.** Send in completed form by mail by December 14, 2017 to:

ADOT Community Relations, 1655 W. Jackson St., MD 126F, Phoenix, AZ 85007

Submit comments by:  1.855.712.8530 |  northsouth@azdot.gov |  [azdot.gov/NorthSouthCorridorStudy](http://azdot.gov/NorthSouthCorridorStudy)


Completion of this form is completely voluntary and helps the project team keep an accurate record of comments. Under state law, any identifying information provided will become part of the public record and, as such, must be released to any individual upon request.





# ADOT | North-South Corridor Study

## Alternative Corridor Options - Comment Form



The North-South Corridor, spanning 40 miles between US 60 and Interstate 10 in Pinal County, includes several proposed alternative corridors with segment options throughout, along with the no-build alternative.

Please use the front side of this form to comment on the study corridor. The comment period runs for 30 days. All comments received by December 14, 2017 will be entered into the Corridor Selection Report for this phase of work (comments are encouraged through all phases of the process). Comments can also be provided via email, postal mail or by telephone at the contact information provided on the front of this form.

### North-South Tier 1 EIS Process

2010

#### Scoping

- » Define study area
- » Develop project purpose and need

2011–2014

#### Alternatives Development

- » Identify and evaluate initial set of feasible alternatives
- » Recommend alternatives to be carried into EIS

2015–2017

#### Technical Analysis

- » Conduct environmental and transportation studies to evaluate potential effects of alternatives on study area

We are here

2018

#### DEIS

- » Document analysis
- » Identify the Recommended Preferred Corridor
- » Publish DEIS for public comment

2019

#### FEIS/ROD

- » Recommended Preferred Corridor to move forward to Tier 2 studies

EIS – Environmental Impact Statement; DEIS – Draft EIS; FEIS – Final EIS; ROD – Record of Decision

**From:** Victor Yang  
**To:** [LaBianca, Michael](#)  
**Cc:** [ADOT NSCS](#)  
**Subject:** FW: North South Corridor Study H7454 01L/STP 999-A(365)X - Agency Stakeholder Meeting  
**Date:** Tuesday, January 2, 2018 9:02:16 AM  
**Attachments:** [image002.png](#)  
[image003.png](#)  
[image004.png](#)  
[image005.png](#)  
[image006.png](#)  
[Alternative Corridor Preference form v2a.pdf](#)

---

---

**From:** Stephen Brown - FCDX [<mailto:StephenBrown@mail.maricopa.gov>]  
**Sent:** Thursday, December 21, 2017 3:22 PM  
**To:** Victor Yang  
**Cc:** Tom Renckly - FCDX; Don Rerick - FCDX; Patrick Schafer - FCDX; Felicia Terry - FCDX  
**Subject:** RE: North South Corridor Study H7454 01L/STP 999-A(365)X - Agency Stakeholder Meeting

Mr. Yang,

Below you will find feedback from the Flood Control District of Maricopa County. Use of the supplied form was not feasible given our comments, so I have included the pertinent information and comments below:

Agency: Flood Control District of Maricopa County  
P.O.C. Stephen Brown, Senior Geotechnical Engineer, Dam Safety Branch  
Email: [stephenbrown@mail.maricopa.gov](mailto:stephenbrown@mail.maricopa.gov)  
Phone: 602-506-5426

General Comments:

- *The Flood Control District of Maricopa County has flowage easement prior land rights for approximately 6,400 acres at and in the vicinity of the 3 flood control dams in the "Segment 1" area; Powerline FRS, Vineyard Road FRS, and Rittenhouse FRS. A planning study has been completed for the future replacement of Powerline FRS with a flood control channel, Powerline Channel, to be constructed to the east of Powerline FRS with subsequent decommissioning of Powerline FRS and overall rehabilitation of Vineyard Road FRS and Rittenhouse FRS. Design is in progress for the Powerline Channel and Vineyard Rehab Projects. Any future freeway or features thereof must therefore fully accommodate the existing flood control dams and related Project features and future flood control facilities and related features to be constructed within the easement area without adverse impact to the flood control projects or added cost to Flood Control District projects: function, safety, operation, maintenance, environmental issue, land rights, flood impoundment areas and flood surcharge areas, emergency spillway flood discharge areas, drainage channels etc.*
- *The September 2006 Land Settlement Agreement between the District and Arizona*

*State Land Department for this area defines Flood Control District land rights in this area and describes the process for requesting facilities by others to be constructed within this area.*

- The Arizona Department of Water Resources is the jurisdictional agency for all dams managed by the Flood Control District and any/all proposals for future facilities proposed to be located within this area will require ADWR formal application and approval when the facility or use may impact the dams (existing/future) in any way as determined by ADWR to be under their dam safety jurisdiction.*
- The Natural Resources Conservation Service is the federal sponsor for these existing dams and future flood control projects planned within this area as described above. As such any/all proposals for future facilities proposed to be located within this area will require NRCS formal approval when the proposed facility or use may impact the dams (existing/future) in any way as determined by NRCS to be within their oversight responsibilities for the existing and future flood control projects.*
- For purposes of freeway planning it should be generally assumed that flood control impoundments in this area due to extreme flood events can impound flood water to the top of the 3 existing dams and to the top of the future rehabilitated dams (note that the dam crest elevations will be raised by the planned future rehabilitation).*
- You are advised that freeway segments that cross dams and flood pools typically require extensive technical analysis, costly dam safety/dam function design accommodations and can be considerable more expensive to design and build compared to most freeways. Loop 202L at Spook Hill FRS is a case in point. In addition, the ADWR applications process involves extensive design reviews etc. prior to issuance of the ADWR permit to construct and can be very lengthy.*
- An Inter-Government Agreement (IGA) will be required between ADOT and the District for the freeway project if it impacts any existing or proposed future flood control facility managed by the District. An advance Memorandum of Understanding is highly recommended early in the process with such freeway proposals by ADOT to the District.*
- Dam Safety risk management and risk assessments may be required for the proposed freeway depending on specifics.*
- The District advises ADOT to evaluate the potential for increased impacts from emergency spillway discharges (existing and future emergency spillways) associated with freeway plans downstream of the existing and future dams and provide for mitigation measures as may be needed.*

*Comments on Alternatives:*

*Segment 1:*

- E1a: Alignments east (upstream) of Powerline FRS (future Powerline channel), Vineyard FRS, and Rittenhouse FRS must be designed to pass the incoming floods into the flood control dam. This will require bridges and/or elevated sections of freeway*



*with sufficient capacity to allow flows to pass under and into the dams. Diverting flows and building new flood control features may be physically possible, but it is suspected that this option would not be feasible from a cost perspective. The east/west connection to AZ24 associated with alternative E1A appears to run through the emergency spillway of Rittenhouse FRS. This would have to be designed in such a way as to allow the emergency spillway flows to pass under the freeway. The east/west connection may also adversely impact the inundation area of Vineyard FRS emergency spillway flows.*

- *E1b: Comments on E1A apply to the E1B except that the Rittenhouse Emergency Spillway flows may not be impacted. E1b does, however, cross over the Vineyard FRS Embankment and this cross would have to be design such that it does not adversely impact safe functioning of the dam.*
- *W1a: W1a is preferred over W1b as it does not cross over any dams. All western alignments, however, would still have to be designed considering impacts to emergency spillway inundation areas. Overpass openings or designed elevated sections may be needed to avoid adversely concentrating emergency spillway flows to the south toward eastern Coolidge.*
- *W1b: Comments on W1a apply to W1b except that W1b crosses over Vineyard FRS Embankment. While feasible, crossing over the dam adds a level of agency involvement and scrutiny which you may wish to avoid, making W1b potentially less attractive than W1a in that regard.*

*Segment 2-3: Consideration must be given to how the southern segments may concentrate emergency spillway flows towards eastern Coolidge.*

*FCDMC Preferred: FCDMC see pros and cons to both the western and eastern alignments in Segment 1 from a flood control perspective; we will choose not to select a preferred alignment between eastern and western. However, of the two western alignment alternatives in Segment 1, W1a is preferred over W1b, as W1a does not cross the dam but all other potential flood impacts/considerations appear to be similar. FCDMC does not have a preference between the E1a and E1b alignments in Segment 1; both have advantages and disadvantages as noted above (emergency spillway crossing and dam embankment crossing considerations). FCDMC will not comment on a preferred alignment in Segments 2-3; however, see comment above regarding consideration of emergency spillway inundation areas.*

*Thank you,*

**Steve Brown, P.E.**

Senior Geotechnical Engineer



**Flood Control District of Maricopa County**

2801 W Durango St, Phoenix, AZ 85009

(Office) 602-506-5426

[StephenBrown@mail.maricopa.gov](mailto:StephenBrown@mail.maricopa.gov)

[www.fcd.maricopa.gov](http://www.fcd.maricopa.gov)



How are we doing? Click [here](#) to leave your feedback

---

**From:** Victor Yang [<mailto:VYang@azdot.gov>]

**Sent:** Friday, December 15, 2017 11:06 AM

**To:** Sara Allred <[SAllred@azdot.gov](mailto:SAllred@azdot.gov)>; Steve Beasley <[SBeasley@azdot.gov](mailto:SBeasley@azdot.gov)>; Vicki Bever <[VBever@azdot.gov](mailto:VBever@azdot.gov)>; Stephanie Brown <[SBrown@azdot.gov](mailto:SBrown@azdot.gov)>; Katie Rodriguez <[KRodriguez@azdot.gov](mailto:KRodriguez@azdot.gov)>; Brent Cain <[BCain@azdot.gov](mailto:BCain@azdot.gov)>; Laura Douglas <[LDouglas@azdot.gov](mailto:LDouglas@azdot.gov)>; Dave Edwards <[DEdwards2@azdot.gov](mailto:DEdwards2@azdot.gov)>; Charla Glendening <[CGlendening@azdot.gov](mailto:CGlendening@azdot.gov)>; Sayeed Hani <[SHani@azdot.gov](mailto:SHani@azdot.gov)>; Reza Karimvand <[RKarimvand@azdot.gov](mailto:RKarimvand@azdot.gov)>; Keith Killough <[KKillough@azdot.gov](mailto:KKillough@azdot.gov)>; Dianne Kresich <[DKresich@azdot.gov](mailto:DKresich@azdot.gov)>; Roderick F. Lane <[RLane@azdot.gov](mailto:RLane@azdot.gov)>; Gail Lewis <[GLewis2@azdot.gov](mailto:GLewis2@azdot.gov)>; Curtis Litin <[CLitin@azdot.gov](mailto:CLitin@azdot.gov)>; Carlos Lopez <[CLopez@azdot.gov](mailto:CLopez@azdot.gov)>; Kurt Miyamoto <[KMiyamoto@azdot.gov](mailto:KMiyamoto@azdot.gov)>; Kimberly Noetzel <[KNoetzel@azdot.gov](mailto:KNoetzel@azdot.gov)>; Paul O'Brien <[PO'Brien@azdot.gov](mailto:PO'Brien@azdot.gov)>; Edward Ochmann <[EOchmann@azdot.gov](mailto:EOchmann@azdot.gov)>; Chris Page <[CPage@azdot.gov](mailto:CPage@azdot.gov)>; Ashek Rana <[ARana@azdot.gov](mailto:ARana@azdot.gov)>; Joseph Salazar <[JSalazar@azdot.gov](mailto:JSalazar@azdot.gov)>; Xuefan Xu <[XXu@azdot.gov](mailto:XXu@azdot.gov)>; 'rodney.bragg@aeom.com' <[rodney.bragg@aeom.com](mailto:rodney.bragg@aeom.com)>; 'RMiguel@ak-chin.nsn.us' <[RMiguel@ak-chin.nsn.us](mailto:RMiguel@ak-chin.nsn.us)>; 'Sandra.Shade@ak-chin.nsn.us' <[Sandra.Shade@ak-chin.nsn.us](mailto:Sandra.Shade@ak-chin.nsn.us)>; 'cmcwilli@azcorrections.gov' <[cmcwilli@azcorrections.gov](mailto:cmcwilli@azcorrections.gov)>; 'russell.a.carter20.nfg@mail.mil' <[russell.a.carter20.nfg@mail.mil](mailto:russell.a.carter20.nfg@mail.mil)>; 'Dorenda.coleman@fmo.azdema.gov' <[Dorenda.coleman@fmo.azdema.gov](mailto:Dorenda.coleman@fmo.azdema.gov)>; 'Janet.johnson@fmo.azdema.gov' <[Janet.johnson@fmo.azdema.gov](mailto:Janet.johnson@fmo.azdema.gov)>; 'scott.sveinsson@fmo.azdema.gov' <[scott.sveinsson@fmo.azdema.gov](mailto:scott.sveinsson@fmo.azdema.gov)>; 'wl1@azdeq.gov' <[wl1@azdeq.gov](mailto:wl1@azdeq.gov)>; 'SHarrison@AZDPS.GOV' <[SHarrison@AZDPS.GOV](mailto:SHarrison@AZDPS.GOV)>; 'cboucher@azgfd.gov' <[cboucher@azgfd.gov](mailto:cboucher@azgfd.gov)>; 'ssprague@azgfd.gov' <[ssprague@azgfd.gov](mailto:ssprague@azgfd.gov)>; 'kterpening@azgfd.gov' <[kterpening@azgfd.gov](mailto:kterpening@azgfd.gov)>; 'jwindes@azgfd.gov' <[jwindes@azgfd.gov](mailto:jwindes@azgfd.gov)>; 'kwolff-krauter@azgfd.gov' <[kwolff-krauter@azgfd.gov](mailto:kwolff-krauter@azgfd.gov)>; 'djacobs@azstateparks.gov' <[djacobs@azstateparks.gov](mailto:djacobs@azstateparks.gov)>; 'mwalsh@azstateparks.gov' <[mwalsh@azstateparks.gov](mailto:mwalsh@azstateparks.gov)>; 'medelman@azland.gov' <[medelman@azland.gov](mailto:medelman@azland.gov)>; 'mgreen@land.az.gov' <[mgreen@land.az.gov](mailto:mgreen@land.az.gov)>; 'dcollins@azstateparks.gov' <[dcollins@azstateparks.gov](mailto:dcollins@azstateparks.gov)>; 'Will Russell' <[wrussell@azstateparks.gov](mailto:wrussell@azstateparks.gov)>; 'ryoung@azstateparks.gov' <[ryoung@azstateparks.gov](mailto:ryoung@azstateparks.gov)>; 'tashbaugh@cagaz.org' <[tashbaugh@cagaz.org](mailto:tashbaugh@cagaz.org)>; 'mlucero@caagcentral.org' <[mlucero@caagcentral.org](mailto:mlucero@caagcentral.org)>; 'spatro@caagcentral.org' <[spatro@caagcentral.org](mailto:spatro@caagcentral.org)>; 'tfitzgerald@cap-az.com' <[tfitzgerald@cap-az.com](mailto:tfitzgerald@cap-az.com)>; 'pkernan@cap-az.com' <[pkernan@cap-az.com](mailto:pkernan@cap-az.com)>; 'cthompson@cap-az.com' <[cthompson@cap-az.com](mailto:cthompson@cap-az.com)>; 'pzellmer@cap-az.com' <[pzellmer@cap-az.com](mailto:pzellmer@cap-az.com)>; 'mwever@AJCity.Net' <[mwever@AJCity.Net](mailto:mwever@AJCity.Net)>; 'eschmid@ajcity.net' <[eschmid@ajcity.net](mailto:eschmid@ajcity.net)>; 'lkirch@AJCity.Net' <[lkirch@AJCity.Net](mailto:lkirch@AJCity.Net)>; 'deitel@casagrandeaz.gov' <[deitel@casagrandeaz.gov](mailto:deitel@casagrandeaz.gov)>; 'klouis@casagrandeaz.gov' <[klouis@casagrandeaz.gov](mailto:klouis@casagrandeaz.gov)>; 'Amanda\_Grant@casagrandeaz.gov' <[Amanda\\_Grant@casagrandeaz.gov](mailto:Amanda_Grant@casagrandeaz.gov)>; 'glopez@coolidgeaz.com' <[glopez@coolidgeaz.com](mailto:glopez@coolidgeaz.com)>; 'kbrown@eloyaz.gov' <[kbrown@eloyaz.gov](mailto:kbrown@eloyaz.gov)>; 'jvlaming@EloyAZ.gov' <[jvlaming@EloyAZ.gov](mailto:jvlaming@EloyAZ.gov)>; 'james.hash@mesaaz.gov' <[james.hash@mesaaz.gov](mailto:james.hash@mesaaz.gov)>; 'beth.huning@mesaaz.gov'

<[beth.huning@mesaaz.gov](mailto:beth.huning@mesaaz.gov)>; 'natalie.lewis@mesaaz.gov' <[natalie.lewis@mesaaz.gov](mailto:natalie.lewis@mesaaz.gov)>;  
'jake.west@mesaaz.gov' <[jake.west@mesaaz.gov](mailto:jake.west@mesaaz.gov)>; 'al.zubi@mesaaz.gov' <[al.zubi@mesaaz.gov](mailto:al.zubi@mesaaz.gov)>;  
'erik.guderian@mesaaz.gov' <[erik.guderian@mesaaz.gov](mailto:erik.guderian@mesaaz.gov)>; 'RJ.Zeder@MesaAZ.gov'  
<[RJ.Zeder@MesaAZ.gov](mailto:RJ.Zeder@MesaAZ.gov)>; Felicia Terry - FCDX <[fet@mail.maricopa.gov](mailto:fet@mail.maricopa.gov)>;  
'Larry.BenallieJr@gric.nsn.us' <[Larry.BenallieJr@gric.nsn.us](mailto:Larry.BenallieJr@gric.nsn.us)>; 'ddejong@gilariver.com'  
<[ddejong@gilariver.com](mailto:ddejong@gilariver.com)>; 'executivemail@gric.nsn.us' <[executivemail@gric.nsn.us](mailto:executivemail@gric.nsn.us)>;  
'Barnaby.Lewis2@gric.nsn.us' <[Barnaby.Lewis2@gric.nsn.us](mailto:Barnaby.Lewis2@gric.nsn.us)>; Gregory McDowell  
<[Gregory.McDowell@gric.nsn.us](mailto:Gregory.McDowell@gric.nsn.us)>; 'timothy.oliver@gric.nsn.us' <[timothy.oliver@gric.nsn.us](mailto:timothy.oliver@gric.nsn.us)>;  
'sasha.pachito@gric.nsn.us' <[sasha.pachito@gric.nsn.us](mailto:sasha.pachito@gric.nsn.us)>; 'david.white@gric.nsn.us'  
<[david.white@gric.nsn.us](mailto:david.white@gric.nsn.us)>; 'michael.labianca@hdrinc.com' <[michael.labianca@hdrinc.com](mailto:michael.labianca@hdrinc.com)>;  
'Cathy.LaFata@hdrinc.com' <[Cathy.LaFata@hdrinc.com](mailto:Cathy.LaFata@hdrinc.com)>; 'hehonianie@hopi.nsn.us'  
<[hehonianie@hopi.nsn.us](mailto:hehonianie@hopi.nsn.us)>; 'brent.crowther@kimley-horn.com' <[brent.crowther@kimley-horn.com](mailto:brent.crowther@kimley-horn.com)>; 'bhazlett@azmag.gov' <[bhazlett@azmag.gov](mailto:bhazlett@azmag.gov)>; M Henry (AzMAG)  
<[mhenry@azmag.gov](mailto:mhenry@azmag.gov)>; 'chill@azmag.gov' <[chill@azmag.gov](mailto:chill@azmag.gov)>; 'npryor@azmag.gov'  
<[npryor@azmag.gov](mailto:npryor@azmag.gov)>; Denise Lacey - MCDOTX <[deniselacey@mail.maricopa.gov](mailto:deniselacey@mail.maricopa.gov)>; Jennifer Toth -  
MCDOTX <[jennifertoth@mail.maricopa.gov](mailto:jennifertoth@mail.maricopa.gov)>; 'Peter.S.Yucupicio@pascuayaqui-nsn.gov'  
<[Peter.S.Yucupicio@pascuayaqui-nsn.gov](mailto:Peter.S.Yucupicio@pascuayaqui-nsn.gov)>; 'tbianchi@gatewayairport.com'  
<[tbianchi@gatewayairport.com](mailto:tbianchi@gatewayairport.com)>; 'bdraper@gatewayairport.com' <[bdraper@gatewayairport.com](mailto:bdraper@gatewayairport.com)>;  
'rsmith@gatewayairport.com' <[rsmith@gatewayairport.com](mailto:rsmith@gatewayairport.com)>; 'andrew.smith@pinalcountyz.gov'  
<[andrew.smith@pinalcountyz.gov](mailto:andrew.smith@pinalcountyz.gov)>; Louis Andersen <[Louis.Andersen@pinalcountyz.gov](mailto:Louis.Andersen@pinalcountyz.gov)>;  
'Scott.Bender@pinalcountyz.gov' <[Scott.Bender@pinalcountyz.gov](mailto:Scott.Bender@pinalcountyz.gov)>;  
'Elise.moore@pinalcountyz.gov' <[Elise.moore@pinalcountyz.gov](mailto:Elise.moore@pinalcountyz.gov)>;  
'brett.burningham@queencreek.org' <[brett.burningham@queencreek.org](mailto:brett.burningham@queencreek.org)>;  
'Mohamed.youssef@queencreek.org' <[Mohamed.youssef@queencreek.org](mailto:Mohamed.youssef@queencreek.org)>;  
'Jennifer.Jack@srpmic-nsn.gov' <[Jennifer.Jack@srpmic-nsn.gov](mailto:Jennifer.Jack@srpmic-nsn.gov)>; 'Rick.McFarlin@srpmic-nsn.gov'  
<[Rick.McFarlin@srpmic-nsn.gov](mailto:Rick.McFarlin@srpmic-nsn.gov)>; 'delbert.ray@srpmic-nsn.gov' <[delbert.ray@srpmic-nsn.gov](mailto:delbert.ray@srpmic-nsn.gov)>;  
'Shane.Anton@srpmic-nsn.gov' <[Shane.Anton@srpmic-nsn.gov](mailto:Shane.Anton@srpmic-nsn.gov)>; 'angela.garcia-lewis@srpmic-nsn.gov'  
<[angela.garcia-lewis@srpmic-nsn.gov](mailto:angela.garcia-lewis@srpmic-nsn.gov)>; 'ryan.earwood@srpnet.com'  
<[ryan.earwood@srpnet.com](mailto:ryan.earwood@srpnet.com)>; 'Floyd.Hardin@srpnet.com' <[Floyd.Hardin@srpnet.com](mailto:Floyd.Hardin@srpnet.com)>;  
'Allen.garrison@srpnet.com' <[Allen.garrison@srpnet.com](mailto:Allen.garrison@srpnet.com)>; 'dan.hawkins@srpnet.com'  
<[dan.hawkins@srpnet.com](mailto:dan.hawkins@srpnet.com)>; 'Elijah.lubandi@srpnet.com' <[Elijah.lubandi@srpnet.com](mailto:Elijah.lubandi@srpnet.com)>;  
'robert.maldonado@srpnet.com' <[robert.maldonado@srpnet.com](mailto:robert.maldonado@srpnet.com)>; 'janeen.rohovit@srpnet.com'  
<[janeen.rohovit@srpnet.com](mailto:janeen.rohovit@srpnet.com)>; 'apachevern@yahoo.com' <[apachevern@yahoo.com](mailto:apachevern@yahoo.com)>; Irene Higgs  
<[ihiggs@scmpo.org](mailto:ihiggs@scmpo.org)>; 'Philip.Hobbs@tonation-nsn.gov' <[Philip.Hobbs@tonation-nsn.gov](mailto:Philip.Hobbs@tonation-nsn.gov)>;  
'Andrew.Korchmaros@tonation-nsn.gov' <[Andrew.Korchmaros@tonation-nsn.gov](mailto:Andrew.Korchmaros@tonation-nsn.gov)>;  
'edwardd.manuel@tonation-nsn.gov' <[edwardd.manuel@tonation-nsn.gov](mailto:edwardd.manuel@tonation-nsn.gov)>;  
'jasper.kinsleyjr@tonation-nsn.gov' <[jasper.kinsleyjr@tonation-nsn.gov](mailto:jasper.kinsleyjr@tonation-nsn.gov)>; 'Steve.tipton@tonation-nsn.gov'  
<[Steve.tipton@tonation-nsn.gov](mailto:Steve.tipton@tonation-nsn.gov)>; 'peter.steere@tonation-nsn.gov'  
<[peter.steere@tonation-nsn.gov](mailto:peter.steere@tonation-nsn.gov)>; 'vburdette@tontoapache.org' <[vburdette@tontoapache.org](mailto:vburdette@tontoapache.org)>;  
'Michelle.Orton@florenceaz.gov' <[Michelle.Orton@florenceaz.gov](mailto:Michelle.Orton@florenceaz.gov)>; 'jess.knudson@florenceaz.gov'  
<[jess.knudson@florenceaz.gov](mailto:jess.knudson@florenceaz.gov)>; 'Jesse.M.Rice@usace.army.mil' <[Jesse.M.Rice@usace.army.mil](mailto:Jesse.M.Rice@usace.army.mil)>;  
'jason.kepler@az.usda.gov' <[jason.kepler@az.usda.gov](mailto:jason.kepler@az.usda.gov)>; 'andrew.burnes@az.usda.gov'  
<[andrew.burnes@az.usda.gov](mailto:andrew.burnes@az.usda.gov)>; 'cheryl.lambert@az.usda.gov' <[cheryl.lambert@az.usda.gov](mailto:cheryl.lambert@az.usda.gov)>;  
'ferris.begay@bia.gov' <[ferris.begay@bia.gov](mailto:ferris.begay@bia.gov)>; 'clarence.begay@bia.gov'  
<[clarence.begay@bia.gov](mailto:clarence.begay@bia.gov)>; 'garry.cantley@bia.gov' <[garry.cantley@bia.gov](mailto:garry.cantley@bia.gov)>; 'arlan.riggs@bia.gov'

<[arlan.riggs@bia.gov](mailto:arlan.riggs@bia.gov)>; 'nina.siquieros@bia.gov' <[nina.siquieros@bia.gov](mailto:nina.siquieros@bia.gov)>;  
'cecilia.martinez@bia.gov' <[cecilia.martinez@bia.gov](mailto:cecilia.martinez@bia.gov)>; 'george.patton@bia.gov'  
<[george.patton@bia.gov](mailto:george.patton@bia.gov)>; 'beau.goldstein@bia.gov' <[beau.goldstein@bia.gov](mailto:beau.goldstein@bia.gov)>;  
'paul.bonar@bia.gov' <[paul.bonar@bia.gov](mailto:paul.bonar@bia.gov)>; 'chip.lewis@bia.gov' <[chip.lewis@bia.gov](mailto:chip.lewis@bia.gov)>;  
'george.martinez@bia.gov' <[george.martinez@bia.gov](mailto:george.martinez@bia.gov)>; 'dave.smith@bia.gov'  
<[dave.smith@bia.gov](mailto:dave.smith@bia.gov)>; 'ekender@blm.gov' <[ekender@blm.gov](mailto:ekender@blm.gov)>; 'mhartney@blm.gov'  
<[mhartney@blm.gov](mailto:mhartney@blm.gov)>; 'luhr@blm.gov' <[luhr@blm.gov](mailto:luhr@blm.gov)>; 'lcowger@blm.gov' <[lcowger@blm.gov](mailto:lcowger@blm.gov)>;  
'caevans@usbr.gov' <[caevans@usbr.gov](mailto:caevans@usbr.gov)>; 'debra\_bills@fws.gov' <[debra\\_bills@fws.gov](mailto:debra_bills@fws.gov)>;  
'Robert\_Lehman@fws.gov' <[Robert\\_Lehman@fws.gov](mailto:Robert_Lehman@fws.gov)>; 'scott\_richardson@fws.gov'  
<[scott\\_richardson@fws.gov](mailto:scott_richardson@fws.gov)>; 'karl\_pierce@nps.gov' <[karl\\_pierce@nps.gov](mailto:karl_pierce@nps.gov)>;  
'Alycia\_Hayes@nps.gov' <[Alycia\\_Hayes@nps.gov](mailto:Alycia_Hayes@nps.gov)>; 'stephanie\_macdonald@nps.gov'  
<[stephanie\\_macdonald@nps.gov](mailto:stephanie_macdonald@nps.gov)>; 'Sherry\_Plowman@nps.gov' <[Sherry\\_Plowman@nps.gov](mailto:Sherry_Plowman@nps.gov)>;  
'mike.n.williams@faa.gov' <[mike.n.williams@faa.gov](mailto:mike.n.williams@faa.gov)>; 'thomas.deitering@fhwa.dot.gov'  
<[thomas.deitering@fhwa.dot.gov](mailto:thomas.deitering@fhwa.dot.gov)>; 'alan.hansen@fhwa.dot.gov' <[alan.hansen@fhwa.dot.gov](mailto:alan.hansen@fhwa.dot.gov)>;  
'aryan.lirange@fhwa.dot.gov' <[aryan.lirange@fhwa.dot.gov](mailto:aryan.lirange@fhwa.dot.gov)>; 'Rebecca.Yedlin@dot.gov'  
<[Rebecca.Yedlin@dot.gov](mailto:Rebecca.Yedlin@dot.gov)>; 'andrea.martin@dot.gov' <[andrea.martin@dot.gov](mailto:andrea.martin@dot.gov)>;  
'leslie.rogers@dot.gov' <[leslie.rogers@dot.gov](mailto:leslie.rogers@dot.gov)>; 'meek.clifton@epa.gov' <[meek.clifton@epa.gov](mailto:meek.clifton@epa.gov)>;  
'ardis@wapa.gov' <[ardis@wapa.gov](mailto:ardis@wapa.gov)>; 'rlupe@wmat.us' <[rlupe@wmat.us](mailto:rlupe@wmat.us)>; 'jrussell-winiecki@yan-  
tribe.org' <[jrussell-winiecki@yan-tribe.org](mailto:jrussell-winiecki@yan-tribe.org)>; 'Martha.martinez@srpmic-nsn.gov'  
<[Martha.martinez@srpmic-nsn.gov](mailto:Martha.martinez@srpmic-nsn.gov)>; Louis Andersen <[Louis.Andersen@pinalcountyaz.gov](mailto:Louis.Andersen@pinalcountyaz.gov)>; Aryan  
Lirange <[Aryan.Lirange@dot.gov](mailto:Aryan.Lirange@dot.gov)>; Thomas Flynn <[TFlynn@azdot.gov](mailto:TFlynn@azdot.gov)>; 'Watzek, Kurt'  
<[Kurt.Watzek@hdrinc.com](mailto:Kurt.Watzek@hdrinc.com)>; 'Chaney Curtis D' <[Curtis.Chaney@srpnet.com](mailto:Curtis.Chaney@srpnet.com)>; 'Hays Donald T (Don)'  
<[Don.Hays@srpnet.com](mailto:Don.Hays@srpnet.com)>; Rick Miller <[rmiller@coolidgeaz.com](mailto:rmiller@coolidgeaz.com)>; Stephen Brown - FCDX  
<[StephenBrown@mail.maricopa.gov](mailto:StephenBrown@mail.maricopa.gov)>; 'Monica Antone' <[Monica.Antone@gric.nsn.us](mailto:Monica.Antone@gric.nsn.us)>; David Madril  
<[David.Madril@tonation-nsn.gov](mailto:David.Madril@tonation-nsn.gov)>; Paul O'Brien <[PO'Brien@azdot.gov](mailto:PO'Brien@azdot.gov)>;  
'rodney.bragg@aecom.com' <[rodney.bragg@aecom.com](mailto:rodney.bragg@aecom.com)>; 'RMiguel@ak-chin.nsn.us' <[RMiguel@ak-chin.nsn.us](mailto:RMiguel@ak-chin.nsn.us)>;  
'Sandra.Shade@ak-chin.nsn.us' <[Sandra.Shade@ak-chin.nsn.us](mailto:Sandra.Shade@ak-chin.nsn.us)>;  
'cmcwilli@azcorrections.gov' <[cmcwilli@azcorrections.gov](mailto:cmcwilli@azcorrections.gov)>; 'russell.a.carter20.nfg@mail.mil'  
<[russell.a.carter20.nfg@mail.mil](mailto:russell.a.carter20.nfg@mail.mil)>; 'Dorenda.coleman@fmo.azdema.gov'  
<[Dorenda.coleman@fmo.azdema.gov](mailto:Dorenda.coleman@fmo.azdema.gov)>; 'Janet.johnson@fmo.azdema.gov'  
<[Janet.johnson@fmo.azdema.gov](mailto:Janet.johnson@fmo.azdema.gov)>; 'scott.sveinsson@fmo.azdema.gov'  
<[scott.sveinsson@fmo.azdema.gov](mailto:scott.sveinsson@fmo.azdema.gov)>; 'wl1@azdeq.gov' <[wl1@azdeq.gov](mailto:wl1@azdeq.gov)>; 'SHarrison@AZDPS.GOV'  
<[SHarrison@AZDPS.GOV](mailto:SHarrison@AZDPS.GOV)>; 'cboucher@azgfd.gov' <[cboucher@azgfd.gov](mailto:cboucher@azgfd.gov)>; 'ssprague@azgfd.gov'  
<[ssprague@azgfd.gov](mailto:ssprague@azgfd.gov)>; 'kterpening@azgfd.gov' <[kterpening@azgfd.gov](mailto:kterpening@azgfd.gov)>; 'jwindes@azgfd.gov'  
<[jwindes@azgfd.gov](mailto:jwindes@azgfd.gov)>; 'kwolff-krauter@azgfd.gov' <[kwolff-krauter@azgfd.gov](mailto:kwolff-krauter@azgfd.gov)>;  
'djacobs@azstateparks.gov' <[djacobs@azstateparks.gov](mailto:djacobs@azstateparks.gov)>; 'mwalsh@azstateparks.gov'  
<[mwalsh@azstateparks.gov](mailto:mwalsh@azstateparks.gov)>; 'medelman@azland.gov' <[medelman@azland.gov](mailto:medelman@azland.gov)>;  
'mgreen@land.az.gov' <[mgreen@land.az.gov](mailto:mgreen@land.az.gov)>; 'dcollins@azstateparks.gov'  
<[dcollins@azstateparks.gov](mailto:dcollins@azstateparks.gov)>; 'Will Russell' <[wrussell@azstateparks.gov](mailto:wrussell@azstateparks.gov)>; 'ryoung@azstateparks.gov'  
<[ryoung@azstateparks.gov](mailto:ryoung@azstateparks.gov)>; 'tashbaugh@cagaz.org' <[tashbaugh@cagaz.org](mailto:tashbaugh@cagaz.org)>;  
'mlucero@caagcentral.org' <[mlucero@caagcentral.org](mailto:mlucero@caagcentral.org)>; 'spatro@caagcentral.org'  
<[spatro@caagcentral.org](mailto:spatro@caagcentral.org)>; 'tfitzgerald@cap-az.com' <[tfitzgerald@cap-az.com](mailto:tfitzgerald@cap-az.com)>; 'pkernan@cap-  
az.com' <[pkernan@cap-az.com](mailto:pkernan@cap-az.com)>; 'cthompson@cap-az.com' <[cthompson@cap-az.com](mailto:cthompson@cap-az.com)>;  
'pzellmer@cap-az.com' <[pzellmer@cap-az.com](mailto:pzellmer@cap-az.com)>; 'mwever@AJCity.Net' <[mwever@AJCity.Net](mailto:mwever@AJCity.Net)>;  
'eschmid@ajcity.net' <[eschmid@ajcity.net](mailto:eschmid@ajcity.net)>; 'lkirch@AJCity.Net' <[lkirch@AJCity.Net](mailto:lkirch@AJCity.Net)>;



'deitel@casagrandeaz.gov' <[deitel@casagrandeaz.gov](mailto:deitel@casagrandeaz.gov)>; 'klouis@casagrandeaz.gov' <[klouis@casagrandeaz.gov](mailto:klouis@casagrandeaz.gov)>; 'Amanda\_Grant@casagrandeaz.gov' <[Amanda\\_Grant@casagrandeaz.gov](mailto:Amanda_Grant@casagrandeaz.gov)>; 'glopez@coolidgeaz.com' <[glopez@coolidgeaz.com](mailto:glopez@coolidgeaz.com)>; 'kbrown@eloyaz.gov' <[kbrown@eloyaz.gov](mailto:kbrown@eloyaz.gov)>; 'jvlaming@EloyAZ.gov' <[jvlaming@EloyAZ.gov](mailto:jvlaming@EloyAZ.gov)>; 'james.hash@mesaaz.gov' <[james.hash@mesaaz.gov](mailto:james.hash@mesaaz.gov)>; 'beth.huning@mesaaz.gov' <[beth.huning@mesaaz.gov](mailto:beth.huning@mesaaz.gov)>; 'natalie.lewis@mesaaz.gov' <[natalie.lewis@mesaaz.gov](mailto:natalie.lewis@mesaaz.gov)>; 'jake.west@mesaaz.gov' <[jake.west@mesaaz.gov](mailto:jake.west@mesaaz.gov)>; 'al.zubi@mesaaz.gov' <[al.zubi@mesaaz.gov](mailto:al.zubi@mesaaz.gov)>; 'erik.guderian@mesaaz.gov' <[erik.guderian@mesaaz.gov](mailto:erik.guderian@mesaaz.gov)>; 'RJ.Zeder@MesaAZ.gov' <[RJ.Zeder@MesaAZ.gov](mailto:RJ.Zeder@MesaAZ.gov)>; Felicia Terry - FCDX <[fet@mail.maricopa.gov](mailto:fet@mail.maricopa.gov)>; 'Larry.BenallieJr@gric.nsn.us' <[Larry.BenallieJr@gric.nsn.us](mailto:Larry.BenallieJr@gric.nsn.us)>; 'ddejong@gilariver.com' <[ddejong@gilariver.com](mailto:ddejong@gilariver.com)>; 'executivemail@gric.nsn.us' <[executivemail@gric.nsn.us](mailto:executivemail@gric.nsn.us)>; 'Barnaby.Lewis2@gric.nsn.us' <[Barnaby.Lewis2@gric.nsn.us](mailto:Barnaby.Lewis2@gric.nsn.us)>; Gregory McDowell <[Gregory.McDowell@gric.nsn.us](mailto:Gregory.McDowell@gric.nsn.us)>; 'timothy.oliver@gric.nsn.us' <[timothy.oliver@gric.nsn.us](mailto:timothy.oliver@gric.nsn.us)>; 'sasha.pachito@gric.nsn.us' <[sasha.pachito@gric.nsn.us](mailto:sasha.pachito@gric.nsn.us)>; 'david.white@gric.nsn.us' <[david.white@gric.nsn.us](mailto:david.white@gric.nsn.us)>; 'michael.labianca@hdrinc.com' <[michael.labianca@hdrinc.com](mailto:michael.labianca@hdrinc.com)>; 'Cathy.LaFata@hdrinc.com' <[Cathy.LaFata@hdrinc.com](mailto:Cathy.LaFata@hdrinc.com)>; 'hehonianie@hopi.nsn.us' <[hehonianie@hopi.nsn.us](mailto:hehonianie@hopi.nsn.us)>; 'brent.crowther@kimley-horn.com' <[brent.crowther@kimley-horn.com](mailto:brent.crowther@kimley-horn.com)>; 'bhazlett@azmag.gov' <[bhazlett@azmag.gov](mailto:bhazlett@azmag.gov)>; M Henry (AzMAG) <[mhenry@azmag.gov](mailto:mhenry@azmag.gov)>; 'chill@azmag.gov' <[chill@azmag.gov](mailto:chill@azmag.gov)>; 'npryor@azmag.gov' <[npryor@azmag.gov](mailto:npryor@azmag.gov)>; Denise Lacey - MCDOTX <[deniselacey@mail.maricopa.gov](mailto:deniselacey@mail.maricopa.gov)>; 'Peter.S.Yucupicio@pascuayaqui-nsn.gov' <[Peter.S.Yucupicio@pascuayaqui-nsn.gov](mailto:Peter.S.Yucupicio@pascuayaqui-nsn.gov)>; 'tbianchi@gatewayairport.com' <[tbianchi@gatewayairport.com](mailto:tbianchi@gatewayairport.com)>; 'bdraper@gatewayairport.com' <[bdraper@gatewayairport.com](mailto:bdraper@gatewayairport.com)>; 'rsmith@gatewayairport.com' <[rsmith@gatewayairport.com](mailto:rsmith@gatewayairport.com)>; 'andrew.smith@pinalcountyaz.gov' <[andrew.smith@pinalcountyaz.gov](mailto:andrew.smith@pinalcountyaz.gov)>; 'Scott.Bender@pinalcountyaz.gov' <[Scott.Bender@pinalcountyaz.gov](mailto:Scott.Bender@pinalcountyaz.gov)>; 'Elise.moore@pinalcountyaz.gov' <[Elise.moore@pinalcountyaz.gov](mailto:Elise.moore@pinalcountyaz.gov)>; 'brett.burningham@queencreek.org' <[brett.burningham@queencreek.org](mailto:brett.burningham@queencreek.org)>; 'Mohamed.youssef@queencreek.org' <[Mohamed.youssef@queencreek.org](mailto:Mohamed.youssef@queencreek.org)>; 'Jennifer.Jack@srpmic-nsn.gov' <[Jennifer.Jack@srpmic-nsn.gov](mailto:Jennifer.Jack@srpmic-nsn.gov)>; 'Rick.McFarlin@srpmic-nsn.gov' <[Rick.McFarlin@srpmic-nsn.gov](mailto:Rick.McFarlin@srpmic-nsn.gov)>; 'delbert.ray@srpmic-nsn.gov' <[delbert.ray@srpmic-nsn.gov](mailto:delbert.ray@srpmic-nsn.gov)>; 'Shane.Anton@srpmic-nsn.gov' <[Shane.Anton@srpmic-nsn.gov](mailto:Shane.Anton@srpmic-nsn.gov)>; 'angela.garcia-lewis@srpmic-nsn.gov' <[angela.garcia-lewis@srpmic-nsn.gov](mailto:angela.garcia-lewis@srpmic-nsn.gov)>; 'ryan.earwood@srpnet.com' <[ryan.earwood@srpnet.com](mailto:ryan.earwood@srpnet.com)>; 'Floyd.Hardin@srpnet.com' <[Floyd.Hardin@srpnet.com](mailto:Floyd.Hardin@srpnet.com)>; 'Allen.garrison@srpnet.com' <[Allen.garrison@srpnet.com](mailto:Allen.garrison@srpnet.com)>; 'dan.hawkins@srpnet.com' <[dan.hawkins@srpnet.com](mailto:dan.hawkins@srpnet.com)>; 'Elijah.lubandi@srpnet.com' <[Elijah.lubandi@srpnet.com](mailto:Elijah.lubandi@srpnet.com)>; 'robert.maldonado@srpnet.com' <[robert.maldonado@srpnet.com](mailto:robert.maldonado@srpnet.com)>; 'janeen.rohovit@srpnet.com' <[janeen.rohovit@srpnet.com](mailto:janeen.rohovit@srpnet.com)>; 'apachevern@yahoo.com' <[apachevern@yahoo.com](mailto:apachevern@yahoo.com)>; Irene Higgs <[ihiggs@scmpo.org](mailto:ihiggs@scmpo.org)>; 'Philip.Hobbs@tonation-nsn.gov' <[Philip.Hobbs@tonation-nsn.gov](mailto:Philip.Hobbs@tonation-nsn.gov)>; 'Andrew.Korchmaros@tonation-nsn.gov' <[Andrew.Korchmaros@tonation-nsn.gov](mailto:Andrew.Korchmaros@tonation-nsn.gov)>; 'edwardd.manuel@tonation-nsn.gov' <[edwardd.manuel@tonation-nsn.gov](mailto:edwardd.manuel@tonation-nsn.gov)>; 'jasper.kinsleyjr@tonation-nsn.gov' <[jasper.kinsleyjr@tonation-nsn.gov](mailto:jasper.kinsleyjr@tonation-nsn.gov)>; 'Steve.tipton@tonation-nsn.gov' <[Steve.tipton@tonation-nsn.gov](mailto:Steve.tipton@tonation-nsn.gov)>; 'peter.steere@tonation-nsn.gov' <[peter.steere@tonation-nsn.gov](mailto:peter.steere@tonation-nsn.gov)>; 'vburdette@tontoapache.org' <[vburdette@tontoapache.org](mailto:vburdette@tontoapache.org)>; 'Michelle.Orton@florenceaz.gov' <[Michelle.Orton@florenceaz.gov](mailto:Michelle.Orton@florenceaz.gov)>; 'jess.knudson@florenceaz.gov' <[jess.knudson@florenceaz.gov](mailto:jess.knudson@florenceaz.gov)>; 'Jesse.M.Rice@usace.army.mil' <[Jesse.M.Rice@usace.army.mil](mailto:Jesse.M.Rice@usace.army.mil)>;

'jason.kepler@az.usda.gov' <[jason.kepler@az.usda.gov](mailto:jason.kepler@az.usda.gov)>; 'andrew.burnes@az.usda.gov' <[andrew.burnes@az.usda.gov](mailto:andrew.burnes@az.usda.gov)>; 'cheryl.lambert@az.usda.gov' <[cheryl.lambert@az.usda.gov](mailto:cheryl.lambert@az.usda.gov)>; 'ferris.begay@bia.gov' <[ferris.begay@bia.gov](mailto:ferris.begay@bia.gov)>; 'clarence.begay@bia.gov' <[clarence.begay@bia.gov](mailto:clarence.begay@bia.gov)>; 'garry.cantley@bia.gov' <[garry.cantley@bia.gov](mailto:garry.cantley@bia.gov)>; 'arlan.riggs@bia.gov' <[arlan.riggs@bia.gov](mailto:arlan.riggs@bia.gov)>; 'nina.siquieros@bia.gov' <[nina.siquieros@bia.gov](mailto:nina.siquieros@bia.gov)>; 'cecilia.martinez@bia.gov' <[cecilia.martinez@bia.gov](mailto:cecilia.martinez@bia.gov)>; 'george.patton@bia.gov' <[george.patton@bia.gov](mailto:george.patton@bia.gov)>; 'beau.goldstein@bia.gov' <[beau.goldstein@bia.gov](mailto:beau.goldstein@bia.gov)>; 'paul.bonar@bia.gov' <[paul.bonar@bia.gov](mailto:paul.bonar@bia.gov)>; 'chip.lewis@bia.gov' <[chip.lewis@bia.gov](mailto:chip.lewis@bia.gov)>; 'george.martinez@bia.gov' <[george.martinez@bia.gov](mailto:george.martinez@bia.gov)>; 'dave.smith@bia.gov' <[dave.smith@bia.gov](mailto:dave.smith@bia.gov)>; 'ekender@blm.gov' <[ekender@blm.gov](mailto:ekender@blm.gov)>; 'mhartney@blm.gov' <[mhartney@blm.gov](mailto:mhartney@blm.gov)>; 'luhr@blm.gov' <[luhr@blm.gov](mailto:luhr@blm.gov)>; 'lcowger@blm.gov' <[lcowger@blm.gov](mailto:lcowger@blm.gov)>; 'caevans@usbr.gov' <[caevans@usbr.gov](mailto:caevans@usbr.gov)>; 'debra\_bills@fws.gov' <[debra\\_bills@fws.gov](mailto:debra_bills@fws.gov)>; 'Robert\_Lehman@fws.gov' <[Robert\\_Lehman@fws.gov](mailto:Robert_Lehman@fws.gov)>; 'scott\_richardson@fws.gov' <[scott\\_richardson@fws.gov](mailto:scott_richardson@fws.gov)>; 'karl\_pierce@nps.gov' <[karl\\_pierce@nps.gov](mailto:karl_pierce@nps.gov)>; 'Alycia\_Hayes@nps.gov' <[Alycia\\_Hayes@nps.gov](mailto:Alycia_Hayes@nps.gov)>; 'stephanie\_macdonald@nps.gov' <[stephanie\\_macdonald@nps.gov](mailto:stephanie_macdonald@nps.gov)>; 'Sherry\_Plowman@nps.gov' <[Sherry\\_Plowman@nps.gov](mailto:Sherry_Plowman@nps.gov)>; 'mike.n.williams@faa.gov' <[mike.n.williams@faa.gov](mailto:mike.n.williams@faa.gov)>; 'thomas.deitering@fhwa.dot.gov' <[thomas.deitering@fhwa.dot.gov](mailto:thomas.deitering@fhwa.dot.gov)>; 'alan.hansen@fhwa.dot.gov' <[alan.hansen@fhwa.dot.gov](mailto:alan.hansen@fhwa.dot.gov)>; 'aryan.lirange@fhwa.dot.gov' <[aryan.lirange@fhwa.dot.gov](mailto:aryan.lirange@fhwa.dot.gov)>; 'Rebecca.Yedlin@dot.gov' <[Rebecca.Yedlin@dot.gov](mailto:Rebecca.Yedlin@dot.gov)>; 'andrea.martin@dot.gov' <[andrea.martin@dot.gov](mailto:andrea.martin@dot.gov)>; 'leslie.rogers@dot.gov' <[leslie.rogers@dot.gov](mailto:leslie.rogers@dot.gov)>; 'meek.clifton@epa.gov' <[meek.clifton@epa.gov](mailto:meek.clifton@epa.gov)>; 'ardis@wapa.gov' <[ardis@wapa.gov](mailto:ardis@wapa.gov)>; 'rlupe@wmat.us' <[rlupe@wmat.us](mailto:rlupe@wmat.us)>; 'jrusell-winiecki@yan-tribe.org' <[jrusell-winiecki@yan-tribe.org](mailto:jrusell-winiecki@yan-tribe.org)>; 'Martha.martinez@srpmic-nsn.gov' <[Martha.martinez@srpmic-nsn.gov](mailto:Martha.martinez@srpmic-nsn.gov)>; Louis Andersen <[Louis.Andersen@pinalcountyaz.gov](mailto:Louis.Andersen@pinalcountyaz.gov)>; Aryan Lirange <[Aryan.Lirange@dot.gov](mailto:Aryan.Lirange@dot.gov)>; 'Watzek, Kurt' <[Kurt.Watzek@hdrinc.com](mailto:Kurt.Watzek@hdrinc.com)>; 'Chaney Curtis D' <[Curtis.Chaney@srpnet.com](mailto:Curtis.Chaney@srpnet.com)>; 'Hays Donald T (Don)' <[Don.Hays@srpnet.com](mailto:Don.Hays@srpnet.com)>; Rick Miller <[rmiller@coolidgeaz.com](mailto:rmiller@coolidgeaz.com)>; Stephen Brown - FCDX <[StephenBrown@mail.maricopa.gov](mailto:StephenBrown@mail.maricopa.gov)>; Monica Antone <[Monica.Antone@gric.nsn.us](mailto:Monica.Antone@gric.nsn.us)>; David Madril <[David.Madril@tonation-nsn.gov](mailto:David.Madril@tonation-nsn.gov)>

**Subject:** RE: North South Corridor Study H7454 01L/STP 999-A(365)X - Agency Stakeholder Meeting

Good Morning,

Thank you for attending yesterday's Stakeholder Agency Meeting.

During the meeting yesterday we discussed about the Cooperating and Participating Agencies Corridor Preference Form. This is one of the attachments that I emailed to all of you on 12/13/2017 (one of the four email attachments of meeting material). I have attached this form in this email again. This form provides another opportunity for all cooperating and participating agencies on this project to submit comments on their preferred corridor alignments. The deadline for submitting is 12/28/2017 (one per agency).

If you have any questions please feel free to contact me.

Happy Holiday!

Victor Yang P.E.

## Major Projects Group Manager

Multimodal Planning Division

205 S.17<sup>th</sup> Ave, MD605E

Phoenix, AZ 85007

Direct (602) 712-8715

Fax (602) 712-8992

[Vyang@azdot.gov](mailto:Vyang@azdot.gov)



---

**From:** Victor Yang

**Sent:** Wednesday, December 13, 2017 4:13 PM

**To:** Sara Allred; Steve Beasley; Vicki Bever; Stephanie Brown; Katie Rodriguez; Brent Cain; Laura Douglas; Dave Edwards; Charla Glendening; Sayeed Hani; Reza Karimvand; Keith Killough; Dianne Kresich; Roderick F. Lane; Gail Lewis; Curtis Litin; Carlos Lopez; Kurt Miyamoto; Kimberly Noetzel; 'pobrien@azdot.gov'; Edward Ochmann; Chris Page; Ashek Rana; Joseph Salazar; Jay Van Echo; Xuefan Xu; 'rodney.bragg@aecom.com'; 'RMiguel@ak-chin.nsn.us'; 'Sandra.Shade@ak-chin.nsn.us'; 'cmcmwilli@azcorrections.gov'; 'russell.a.carter20.nfg@mail.mil'; 'Dorenda.coleman@fmo.azdema.gov'; 'Janet.johnson@fmo.azdema.gov'; 'scott.sveinsson@fmo.azdema.gov'; 'wl1@azdeq.gov'; 'SHarrison@AZDPS.GOV'; 'cboucher@azgfd.gov'; 'ssprague@azgfd.gov'; 'kterpening@azgfd.gov'; 'jwindes@azgfd.gov'; 'kwolff-krauter@azgfd.gov'; 'djacobs@azstateparks.gov'; 'mwalth@azstateparks.gov'; 'medelman@azland.gov'; 'mgreen@land.az.gov'; 'dcollins@azstateparks.gov'; 'Will Russell'; 'ryoung@azstateparks.gov'; 'tashbaugh@cagaz.org'; 'mlucero@caagcentral.org'; 'spatro@caagcentral.org'; 'tfitzgerald@cap-az.com'; 'pkernan@cap-az.com'; 'cthompson@cap-az.com'; 'pzellmer@cap-az.com'; 'mwever@AJCity.Net'; 'eschmid@ajcity.net'; 'lkirch@AJCity.Net'; 'deitel@casagrandeaz.gov'; 'klouis@casagrandeaz.gov'; 'Amanda\_Grant@casagrandeaz.gov'; 'glopez@coolidgeaz.com'; 'kbrown@eloyaz.gov'; 'jvlaming@EloyAZ.gov'; 'james.hash@mesaaz.gov'; 'beth.huning@mesaaz.gov'; 'natalie.lewis@mesaaz.gov'; 'jake.west@mesaaz.gov'; 'al.zubi@mesaaz.gov'; 'erik.guderian@mesaaz.gov'; 'RJ.Zeder@MesaAZ.gov'; 'fet@mail.maricopa.gov'; 'Larry.BenallieJr@gric.nsn.us'; 'ddejong@gilariver.com'; 'executivemail@gric.nsn.us'; 'Barnaby.Lewis2@gric.nsn.us'; Gregory McDowell; 'timothy.oliver@gric.nsn.us'; 'sasha.pachito@gric.nsn.us'; 'david.white@gric.nsn.us'; 'michael.labianca@hdrinc.com'; 'Cathy.LaFata@hdrinc.com'; 'hehonanie@hopi.nsn.us'; 'brent.crowther@kimley-horn.com'; 'bhazlett@azmag.gov'; M Henry (AzMAG); 'chill@azmag.gov'; 'nprior@azmag.gov'; 'deniselacey@mail.maricopa.gov'; Jennifer Toth (Maricopa); 'Peter.S.Yucupicio@pascuayaqui-nsn.gov'; 'tbianchi@gatewayairport.com'; 'bdraper@gatewayairport.com'; 'rsmith@gatewayairport.com'; 'andrew.smith@pinalcountyaz.gov'; Louis Andersen; 'Scott.Bender@pinalcountyaz.gov'; 'Elise.moore@pinalcountyaz.gov'; 'brett.burningham@queencreek.org'; 'Mohamed.youssef@queencreek.org'; 'Jennifer.Jack@srpmic-nsn.gov'; 'Rick.McFarlin@srpmic-nsn.gov'; 'delbert.ray@srpmic-nsn.gov'; 'Shane.Anton@srpmic-nsn.gov'; 'angela.garcia-lewis@srpmic-nsn.gov'; 'ryan.earwood@srpnet.com'; 'Floyd.Hardin@srpnet.com'; 'Allen.garrison@srpnet.com'; 'dan.hawkins@srpnet.com'; 'Elijah.lubandi@srpnet.com'; 'robert.maldonado@srpnet.com'; 'janeen.rohovit@srpnet.com'; 'apachevern@yahoo.com'; Irene Higgs; 'Philip.Hobbs@tonation-nsn.gov'; 'Andrew.Korchmaros@tonation-nsn.gov'; 'edwardd.manuel@tonation-nsn.gov'; 'jasper.kinsleyjr@tonation-nsn.gov'; 'Steve.tipton@tonation-nsn.gov'; 'peter.steere@tonation-nsn.gov'; 'vburdette@tontoapache.org'; 'Michelle.Orton@florenceaz.gov'; 'jess.knudson@florenceaz.gov'; 'Jesse.M.Rice@usace.army.mil'; 'jason.kepler@az.usda.gov'; 'andrew.burnes@az.usda.gov'; 'cheryl.lambert@az.usda.gov'; 'ferris.begay@bia.gov'; 'clarence.begay@bia.gov'; 'garry.cantley@bia.gov'; 'arlan.riggs@bia.gov'; 'nina.siquieros@bia.gov'; 'cecilia.martinez@bia.gov'; 'george.patton@bia.gov'; 'beau.goldstein@bia.gov'; 'paul.bonar@bia.gov'; 'chip.lewis@bia.gov'; 'george.martinez@bia.gov'; 'dave.smith@bia.gov'; 'ekender@blm.gov'; 'mhartney@blm.gov'; 'luhr@blm.gov'; 'lcowger@blm.gov'; 'caevans@usbr.gov'; 'debra\_bills@fws.gov'; 'Robert\_Lehman@fws.gov'; 'scott\_richardson@fws.gov'; 'karl\_pierce@nps.gov'; 'Alycia\_Hayes@nps.gov'; 'stephanie\_macdonald@nps.gov'; 'Sherry\_Plowman@nps.gov'; 'mike.n.williams@faa.gov'; 'thomas.deitering@fhwa.dot.gov';

'alan.hansen@fhwa.dot.gov'; 'aryan.lirange@fhwa.dot.gov'; 'Rebecca.Yedlin@dot.gov';  
'andrea.martin@dot.gov'; 'leslie.rogers@dot.gov'; 'meek.clifton@epa.gov'; 'ardis@wapa.gov';  
'rlupe@wmat.us'; 'jrussell-winiecki@yan-tribe.org'; 'Martha.martinez@srpmic-nsn.gov'; Louis Andersen;  
Aryan Lirange; Thomas Flynn; 'Watzek, Kurt'; 'Chaney Curtis D'; 'Hays Donald T (Don)'; Rick Miller;  
'Stephen Brown - FCDX'; 'Monica Antone'; David Madril; 'pobrien@azdot.gov';  
'rodney.bragg@aecom.com'; 'RMiguel@ak-chin.nsn.us'; 'Sandra.Shade@ak-chin.nsn.us';  
'cmcwilli@azcorrections.gov'; 'russell.a.carter20.nfg@mail.mil'; 'Dorenda.coleman@fmo.azdema.gov';  
'Janet.johnson@fmo.azdema.gov'; 'scott.sveinsson@fmo.azdema.gov'; 'wl1@azdeq.gov';  
'SHarrison@AZDPS.GOV'; 'cboucher@azgfd.gov'; 'ssprague@azgfd.gov'; 'kterpening@azgfd.gov';  
'jwindes@azgfd.gov'; 'kwolff-krauter@azgfd.gov'; 'djacobs@azstateparks.gov';  
'mwash@azstateparks.gov'; 'medelman@azland.gov'; 'mgreen@land.az.gov';  
'dcollins@azstateparks.gov'; 'Will Russell'; 'ryoung@azstateparks.gov'; 'tashbaugh@cagaz.org';  
'mlucero@caagcentral.org'; 'spatro@caagcentral.org'; 'tfitzgerald@cap-az.com'; 'pkernan@cap-az.com';  
'cthompson@cap-az.com'; 'pzellmer@cap-az.com'; 'mwever@AJCity.Net'; 'eschmid@ajcity.net';  
'lkirch@AJCity.Net'; 'deitel@casagrandeaz.gov'; 'klouis@casagrandeaz.gov';  
'Amanda\_Grant@casagrandeaz.gov'; 'glopez@coolidgeaz.com'; 'kbrown@eloyaz.gov';  
'jvlaming@EloyAZ.gov'; 'james.hash@mesaaz.gov'; 'beth.huning@mesaaz.gov';  
'natalie.lewis@mesaaz.gov'; 'jake.west@mesaaz.gov'; 'al.zubi@mesaaz.gov'; 'erik.guderian@mesaaz.gov';  
'RJ.Zeder@MesaAZ.gov'; 'fet@mail.maricopa.gov'; 'Larry.BenallieJr@gric.nsn.us';  
'ddejong@gilariver.com'; 'executivemail@gric.nsn.us'; 'Barnaby.Lewis2@gric.nsn.us';  
'gregory.mcdowell@gric.nsn.us'; 'timothy.oliver@gric.nsn.us'; 'sasha.pachito@gric.nsn.us';  
'david.white@gric.nsn.us'; 'michael.labianca@hdrinc.com'; 'Cathy.LaFata@hdrinc.com';  
'hehonianie@hopi.nsn.us'; 'brent.crowther@kimley-horn.com'; 'bhazlett@azmag.gov';  
'mhenry@azmag.gov'; 'chill@azmag.gov'; 'nprior@azmag.gov'; 'deniselacey@mail.maricopa.gov';  
'Peter.S.Yucupicio@pascuayaqui-nsn.gov'; 'tbianchi@gatewayairport.com';  
'bdraper@gatewayairport.com'; 'rsmith@gatewayairport.com'; 'andrew.smith@pinalcountyyaz.gov';  
'Scott.Bender@pinalcountyyaz.gov'; 'Elise.moore@pinalcountyyaz.gov';  
'brett.burningham@queencreek.org'; 'Mohamed.youssef@queencreek.org'; 'Jennifer.Jack@srpmic-  
nsn.gov'; 'Rick.McFarlin@srpmic-nsn.gov'; 'delbert.ray@srpmic-nsn.gov'; 'Shane.Anton@srpmic-nsn.gov';  
'angela.garcia-lewis@srpmic-nsn.gov'; 'ryan.earwood@srpnet.com'; 'Floyd.Hardin@srpnet.com';  
'Allen.garrison@srpnet.com'; 'dan.hawkins@srpnet.com'; 'Elijah.lubandi@srpnet.com';  
'robert.maldonado@srpnet.com'; 'janeen.rohovit@srpnet.com'; 'apachevern@yahoo.com'; 'Irene Higgs  
([iHiggs@scmpo.org](mailto:iHiggs@scmpo.org))'; 'Philip.Hobbs@tonation-nsn.gov'; 'Andrew.Korchmaros@tonation-nsn.gov';  
'edwardd.manuel@tonation-nsn.gov'; 'jasper.kinsleyjr@tonation-nsn.gov'; 'Steve.tipton@tonation-  
nsn.gov'; 'peter.steere@tonation-nsn.gov'; 'vburdette@tontoapache.org';  
'Michelle.Orton@florenciaaz.gov'; 'jess.knudson@florenciaaz.gov'; 'Jesse.M.Rice@usace.army.mil';  
'jason.kepler@az.usda.gov'; 'andrew.burnes@az.usda.gov'; 'cheryl.lambert@az.usda.gov';  
'ferris.begay@bia.gov'; 'clarence.begay@bia.gov'; 'garry.cantley@bia.gov'; 'arlan.riggs@bia.gov';  
'nina.siquieros@bia.gov'; 'cecilia.martinez@bia.gov'; 'george.patton@bia.gov'; 'beau.goldstein@bia.gov';  
'paul.bonar@bia.gov'; 'chip.lewis@bia.gov'; 'george.martinez@bia.gov'; 'dave.smith@bia.gov';  
'ekender@blm.gov'; 'mhartney@blm.gov'; 'luhr@blm.gov'; 'lcowger@blm.gov'; 'caevans@usbr.gov';  
'debra\_bills@fws.gov'; 'Robert\_Lehman@fws.gov'; 'scott\_richardson@fws.gov'; 'karl\_pierce@nps.gov';  
'Alycia\_Hayes@nps.gov'; 'stephanie\_macdonald@nps.gov'; 'Sherry\_Plowman@nps.gov';  
'mike.n.williams@faa.gov'; 'thomas.deitering@fhwa.dot.gov'; 'alan.hansen@fhwa.dot.gov';  
'aryan.lirange@fhwa.dot.gov'; 'Rebecca.Yedlin@dot.gov'; 'andrea.martin@dot.gov';  
'leslie.rogers@dot.gov'; 'meek.clifton@epa.gov'; 'ardis@wapa.gov'; 'rlupe@wmat.us'; 'jrussell-  
winiecki@yan-tribe.org'; 'Martha.martinez@srpmic-nsn.gov'; 'Louis M. Andersen'; 'Lirange, Aryan  
(FHWA)'; 'Watzek, Kurt'; 'Chaney Curtis D'; 'Hays Donald T (Don)'; 'Rick Miller'; 'Stephen Brown - FCDX';  
'Monica Antone'; 'David Madril'

**Subject:** North South Corridor Study H7454 01L/STP 999-A(365)X - Agency Stakeholder Meeting

Good afternoon,

Attached meeting material for tomorrow Agency Stakeholder meeting. Skype Link and parking direction is included in the meeting invite sent to you earlier. Look forward to seeing you.

Best,



Victor Yang P.E.

**Major Projects Group Manager**

Multimodal Planning Division

205 S.17<sup>th</sup> Ave, MD605E

Phoenix, AZ 85007

Direct (602) 712-8715

Fax (602) 712-8992

[Vyang@azdot.gov](mailto:Vyang@azdot.gov)



---

Confidentiality and Nondisclosure Notice: This email transmission and any attachments are intended for use by the person(s)/entity(ies) named above and may contain confidential/privileged information. Any unauthorized use, disclosure or distribution is strictly prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient, please contact the sender by email, and delete or destroy all copies plus attachments.

## North-South Corridor Study Cooperating and Participating Agency Corridor Preference

We identify the following action corridor alternative(s) as our preferred alternative. We recognize that the North-South Corridor Study Tier 1 Draft Environmental Impact Statement will identify a recommended preferred action corridor alternative, and this form provides us the opportunity to provide our preference to be considered in that process.

We acknowledge that as more information is provided through the National Environmental Policy Act process, we will continue to provide comments throughout the study, and that input will be considered by the study team.

### Preferred Action Corridor Alternative

The map to the right (or the webmap found at <https://northsouthtier1deis.hdrgateway.com/Home/Map>) identifies all action corridor alternatives by segment under consideration in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Our preference for each segment, based on a continuous corridor (for example, the E1a Alternative in Segment 1 connects only with E2a or W2b in Segment 2), is indicated on the form provided on the 2<sup>nd</sup> page of this form.


Please complete:

Name of agency:

Agency contact for this study:

Email address:

Phone number:



## Cooperating and Participating Agency Corridor Preference

Segment	Alternative	Comment
Segment 1	E1a	
	E1b	
	W1a	
	W1b	
Segment 2	E2a	
	E2b	
	W2a	
	W2b	
Segment 3	E3a	
	E3b	
	E3c	
	E3d	
	W3	
Segment 4	E4	
	W4	

Please provide completed forms by December 28, 2017 to:

Aryan Lirange  
 Senior Urban Engineer  
 Federal Highway Administration  
 4000 N. Central Ave., Suite 1500  
 Phoenix, Arizona 85012  
 (602) 382-8973  
[aryan.lirange@dot.gov](mailto:aryan.lirange@dot.gov)

or Victor Yang  
 Project Manager  
 Arizona Department of Transportation  
 205 S.17th Ave, MD605E  
 Phoenix AZ 85007  
 (602) 712-8715  
[VYang@azdot.gov](mailto:VYang@azdot.gov)



## North-South Corridor Study Cooperating and Participating Agency Corridor Preference

We identify the following action corridor alternative(s) as our preferred alternative. We recognize that the North-South Corridor Study Tier 1 Draft Environmental Impact Statement will identify a recommended preferred action corridor alternative, and this form provides us the opportunity to provide our preference to be considered in that process.

We acknowledge that as more information is provided through the National Environmental Policy Act process, we will continue to provide comments throughout the study, and that input will be considered by the study team.

### Preferred Action Corridor Alternative

The map to the right (or the webmap found at <https://northsouthtier1deis.hdrgateway.com/Home/Map>) identifies all action corridor alternatives by segment under consideration in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Our preference for each segment, based on a continuous corridor (for example, the E1a Alternative in Segment 1 connects only with E2a or W2b in Segment 2), is indicated on the form provided on the 2<sup>nd</sup> page of this form.

Please complete:

Name of agency:

CITY OF ELOY

Agency contact for this study:

KEITH BROWN

Email address:

KBROWN@ELOYAZ.GOV

Phone number:

520.466.3082



## Cooperating and Participating Agency Corridor Preference

Segment	Alternative	Comment
Segment 1	E1a	
	E1b	
	W1a	
	W1b	
Segment 2	E2a	
	E2b	
	W2a	
	W2b	
Segment 3	E3a	
	E3b	
	E3c	
	E3d	
	W3	
Segment 4	E4	
	W4	THE CITY COUNCIL ADOPTED RESOLUTION 15-1343 SUPPORTING SEGMENT 2/AD (W4) ON MARCH 23, 2015.

Please provide completed forms by December 28, 2017 to:

Aryan Lirange  
 Senior Urban Engineer  
 Federal Highway Administration  
 4000 N. Central Ave., Suite 1500  
 Phoenix, Arizona 85012  
 (602) 382-8973  
[aryan.lirange@dot.gov](mailto:aryan.lirange@dot.gov)

or Victor Yang  
 Project Manager  
 Arizona Department of Transportation  
 205 S.17th Ave, MD605E  
 Phoenix AZ 85007  
 (602) 712-8715  
[VYang@azdot.gov](mailto:VYang@azdot.gov)



**RESOLUTION NO. 15-1343**

**A RESOLUTION OF THE MAYOR AND CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF ELOY SUPPORTING AND ENDORSING SEGMENT "Z/AA" AS IDENTIFIED IN THE NORTH-SOUTH CORRIDOR STUDY AS THE CITY OF ELOY PREFERRED ROUTE ALTERNATIVE IN THE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STUDY BEING PREPARED BY THE ARIZONA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION.**

**WHEREAS**, the Arizona Department of Transportation ("ADOT") has completed initial engineering and environmental studies analyzing potential alignment segments, for a proposed freeway connecting Interstate 10 with US Highway 60 ("North-South Freeway") within the central portion of Pinal County; and,

**WHEREAS**, ADOT has conducted extensive public outreach to provide information to, and receive feedback from, the City of Eloy (the "City"), its residents, and the surrounding communities that will integrate the North-South Freeway into its transportation network and land use pattern, benefitting both city-wide and regional mobility; and,

**WHEREAS**, changes in the boundaries of adjacent communities and their respective planning areas have caused the City of Eloy to reevaluate and change its support to the Z/AA Segment rather than the Fast Track Road alignment to preserve economic development efforts of the City as well as increase mobility opportunities for its residents; and,

**WHEREAS**, the alignment of the Z/AA Segment will provide opportunities for the enhancement of the economy of the City; and,

**WHEREAS**, ADOT is preparing the Draft Environmental Impact Statement to assess Segment Z/AA and the other remaining segment of the North-South Freeway; and,

**WHEREAS**, Segment Z/AA utilizes the existing right-of-way of State Route 87, requiring only a portion of new right-of-way, making it more cost effective than the other segment; and,

**WHEREAS**, the utilization of Segment Z/AA significantly diminishes the presence of environmental (i.e. fissures, drainage, etc.) impediments that exist with the other alternative, allowing for a more cost effective North-South Freeway; and,

**WHEREAS**, the location of Segment Z/AA allows for the future freeway to capture vehicle trips to the east and west of SR 87 within the City, rather than the alignment to the east; and,

**WHEREAS**, the utilization of Segment Z/AA places the freeway closer to downtown Eloy, providing opportunities to capture economic development opportunities and patronage, as well as transit access-rather than the alternative segment, which will function as a by-pass; and,

**WHEREAS**, the utilization of Segment Z/AA allows for the potential southerly extension of the freeway to serve the southern portion of the City's planning area in the future.


**NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE MAYOR AND CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF ELOY, ARIZONA AS FOLLOWS:**

That the City of Eloy supports and endorses Segment Z/AA as the preferred route alternative for the North-South Corridor Freeway in the Environmental Impact Study being prepared by the Arizona Department of Transportation.


**APPROVED** this 23rd day of March, 2015.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Joel G. Belloc, Mayor

**ATTEST:**

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Mary Myers, City Clerk

**APPROVED AS TO FORM:**

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Stephen R. Cooper, City Attorney



THE STATE OF ARIZONA  
**GAME AND FISH DEPARTMENT**

5000 W. CAREFREE HIGHWAY  
PHOENIX, AZ 85086-5000  
(602) 942-3000 • WWW.AZGFD.GOV

**GOVERNOR**

DOUGLAS A. DUCEY

**COMMISSIONERS**

CHAIRMAN, JAMES R. AMMONS, YUMA  
JAMES S. ZIELER, ST. JOHNS  
ERIC S. SPARKS, TUCSON  
KURT R. DAVIS, PHOENIX  
EDWARD "PAT" MADDEN, FLAGSTAFF

**DIRECTOR**

TY E. GRAY

**DEPUTY DIRECTOR**

TOM P. FINLEY



December 26, 2017

Mr. Victor Yang  
Arizona Department of Transportation  
205 South 17<sup>th</sup> Avenue  
MD 605E  
Phoenix, AZ 85007

Re: AGFD Comments on the North-South Corridor Tier 1 EIS Alternatives

Dear Mr. Yang:

The Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) and Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) are preparing a Tier 1 Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the proposed 45-mile-long transportation corridor between U.S. Route 60 in Apache Junction and Interstate 10 near Eloy and Picacho, referred to as the North-South Corridor (Corridor). The purpose of the Corridor is to identify and evaluate a possible route to provide a connection between north and south Pinal County. This Corridor would also provide multi-modal transportation potential for the Phoenix to Tucson passenger rail, and would provide an east west option for the State Route 24.

The Arizona Game and Fish Department (Department) appreciates this opportunity to submit comments on the alternative routes that were published for public comment on November 14, 2017, or discussed during the December 14, 2017 Cooperating Agency meeting. In addition to identifying potential impacts to sensitive resources along the corridor alternatives, the Department has identified data needs and mitigation opportunities along these alternative routes to be captured within the Tier 1 EIS.

**PRELIMINARY RANKING OF ALTERNATIVES**

The Department previously recommended using five categories to rank Wildlife and Wildlife Habitat evaluation criteria in order to account for the nuanced differences of resources within the Corridor. Based on the brief overview of the preliminary rankings discussed during the December 14, 2017 Cooperating Agency meeting, the Department believes that the way the criteria for Wildlife and Wildlife Habitat was analyzed will not be informative to the overall alternative evaluation process. Calibration should be on a segment-by-segment basis instead of across the entire Corridor. For example, W1a should be ranked relative to W1b, E1a and E1b, in order to effectively compare and contrast the different alternatives.



## EVALUATION OF ALTERNATIVES

In general, the western-most alternatives would result in fewer impacts to wildlife, habitat, and wildlife resources, than the alternatives to the east.

- Segment 1- Alternative W1a is situated west of the CAP canal, which is an existing constraint to east-west wildlife movement in the area. When compared to Alternatives W1b, E1a, and E1b, which are situated east of the CAP canal, the alternative to the west would result in fewer impacts to terrestrial wildlife movement through the area, and less overall habitat fragmentation. Additionally, the eastern Alternatives (W1b, E1a, and E1b) contain a greater amount of native desert habitat for key species of concern such as kit fox (*Vulpes macrotis*), Tucson shovel-nosed snake (*Chionactis occipitalis klauberi*), and the Sonoran desert tortoise (*Gopherus morafkai*). This segment also has significant drainages and should be evaluated for the impacts on the drainages and on the drainage structures currently in place.
- Segment 2- E2d and W2a would guide the route from W1a to either of the western alignments over the Gila River. Use of Alternatives E2a and E2c result in the alignment using Alternative E3c, which would likely have more impacts to wildlife movement and wildlife habitat within the Gila River.
- Segment 3- Given the presence of the new Anthem Community development and at least two north-south running canals, the potential for wildlife movement north of the Gila River is limited, making the Gila River even more important as a corridor for wildlife movement. Although Alternatives E3b/E3d would likely impact slightly less native habitat than W3, their effects to habitat fragmentation and connectivity would likely be similar. Alternatives E3a/E3c would have significantly more impact to the Gila River, given that it is situated within or immediately adjacent to the river for over 1.5 miles; E3a/E3c would have substantially more adverse effects to wildlife using and moving through the Gila River corridor than the two western alignments. In addition, the open areas between E3b/d and E3a/c, including E3b/d to the south, are used by small game hunters.
- Segment 4- As the corridor progresses south to Interstate 10, the western Alternative, W4, is expected to have fewer overall impacts to wildlife and wildlife resources. Much of Alternative W4 would expand along the existing State Route 87, whereas agricultural lands with small dirt farm roads comprise the eastern route of E4. The eastern Alternative is closer to the native habitats and open spaces to the east of the corridor, including the Picacho Reservoir; there is a higher likelihood the eastern route would indirectly affect the adjacent open space through noise, lighting, and air quality, etc., as well as limiting opportunities for recreationists to access the open space.

## CONSIDERATIONS

### Agricultural Lands

Almost all of the vegetation/land cover types found within the Corridor and its Alternatives provide valuable habitat to different wildlife species. A very small percentage of the Alternatives contain developed land (residential or industrial development); agricultural cropland and native desert scrub vegetation comprise the majority of the land cover within the Corridor. The value of agricultural lands should not be discounted as there are many species utilizing these areas, due to the irrigation, ponding and other water hold overs common to these areas. Agricultural croplands

often provide unique habitat for migratory birds, especially shorebirds, waterfowl and raptors. In addition, other avian species may utilize these habitats year-round, including during the breeding season. These species may include the western burrowing owl (*Athene cunicularia hypugaea*), and game species such as mourning dove (*Zenaida macroura*) and Gambel's quail (*Callipepla gambelii*).

#### Picacho Reservoir

The Department owns and manages a portion of the Picacho Reservoir lands along with the Bureau of Land Management (BLM), and the Arizona State Land Department (ASLD). The Reservoir is located within Segment 4 of the Corridor. Historically, this reservoir has provided excellent habitat for wildlife, including waterfowl. It has been a popular destination for birding, fishing, and hunting. This should be considered a 4(f) property, and any indirect effects to wildlife within the Reservoir must be considered and analyzed.

#### **CUMULATIVE IMPACTS**

In 2011, Pinal County amended the Comprehensive Plan to include the vision for Superstition Vistas, a large development in an undisturbed landscape. This amendment includes the conversion and loss of lands designated for conservation and recreation to moderate low density residential (1-1.3 du/ac) and residential (1du/ac) north of Highway 60 and east of Highway 79, south to Florence.

Maricopa County Flood Control District's flood-control structures are also found in the vicinity of the Corridor. The mesquite bosque vegetation associated with these flood-control structures provides high quality habitat and year round water sources for wildlife. The planning of these structures includes 80% mitigation for mesquite vegetation due to impacts from the movement and modification of these structures. This mitigation should not be further impacted by these alternatives and should be analyzed. These structures are also adjacent to the Central Arizona Projects (CAP), which also presents a barrier to wildlife movement. The proposed regional CAP trail would also traverse the flood control structures, further fragmenting and impacting the permeability of the habitat along the CAP. The Corridor encompasses the CAP and flood control structures, and transverses the CAP in some locations. Cumulatively, habitat loss, habitat fragmentation, construction of new movement barriers, loss of movement corridors, and access to recreation in this area could have significant impacts to wildlife resources and the Department's ability to manage them.

- It is important that ADOT consider cumulative impacts to wildlife habitat and recreation opportunities in the vicinity of the North-South Corridor.

Should the Arizona Passenger Rail Corridor Study-Tucson to Phoenix (Passenger Rail) be constructed in the vicinity of the Corridor, the potential cumulative impacts of these two barriers to wildlife movement should be examined. According to Forman et al., "Road density appears to affect many species of large animal...and many other ecological patterns can be related to road density" (2003). Additionally, the Handbook of Road Ecology identifies that "The density and configuration of the road network across the landscape are important drivers of the scale and intensity of road impacts on wildlife" (van der Ree et al. 2015).

- It is especially imperative that ADOT consider cumulative impacts to wildlife movement. If additional information/data/studies are needed from the Department for ADOT's cumulative impacts analysis, we request further coordination with ADOT.

#### **DATA NEEDS**

Tucson shovel-nosed snake, kit fox, and Sonoran desert tortoise have been recorded within the native desert lands east of the Corridor (Grandmaison et al 2010; Jones 2016; Grimsley et al. 2015; Hoffman and Leavitt 2015). In order to fully evaluate project effects to the local populations of these species, as well as movement issues and needs, more information is needed about their current distribution and movement patterns across the proposed routes. These data are critical to establishing meaningful and effective mitigation to minimize impacts to Tucson shovel-nosed snake and Sonoran desert tortoise along the chosen route.

A greater understanding is needed of the current movement of larger mammals, such as mule deer, across Alternatives W1a, W1b, E1b, E1a, W3, E3d, and E3c. These areas have been identified as potentially important habitat for key species; however, more detailed information about movement patterns and species' use is necessary to identify appropriate mitigation for the additional barrier effects that the Corridor would cause to larger species in the region.

- The Department recommends collection of movement data for target species at least two year prior to design and Tier 2 NEPA, as well as during, and for at least four years following construction. The Department considers this an essential component of any mitigation strategy regardless of which route is selected. An evaluation with accompanying pre- and post-construction data is also imperative for the application of any and all mitigation components.

#### **MITIGATION OPPORTUNITIES**

##### Wildlife Movement

Transportation infrastructure compromises the natural movement of mammals, amphibians, reptiles, and some birds. The barrier effect on wildlife results from a combination of disturbance and avoidance effects, physical hindrances, and traffic mortality that all reduce the number of movements across the barrier. The Corridor is part of a larger transportation network contributing to overall statewide fragmentation, degradation, isolation, mortality, and barrier effects on wildlife and habitats. Therefore, individual infrastructure projects should be evaluated at a landscape scale, considering their contributions to the cumulative impacts of a larger infrastructure network. Additionally, ensuring the safe and effective movement of wildlife through the Corridor also improves the safety of the roadway itself, by reducing the likelihood of wildlife-vehicle interactions and accidents.

Potential mitigation opportunities include, but are not limited to:

- Improve connectivity over the CAP canal, which presents an existing barrier to wildlife movement. Improved connectivity would connect habitat blocks on either side of the CAP.
- Improve and maintain connectivity between the Picacho Mountains and San Tan Mountains. The Gila River is a prime corridor in this area, but other connectivity opportunities, if present, should be identified.
- A network of crossing structures including overpasses, underpass, culverts, funnel fencing, and other components should be included from the initial design stages. Specific locations

and extents can be refined by execution of the surveys and movement studies indicated in the data needs section above.

- Mitigation features along the Corridor need to align with corresponding mitigation features in adjacent barriers (such as the CAP wildlife crossings). Additionally, while mitigation features in existing barriers should be considered in the location of mitigation features in the Corridor, an absence of existing wildlife movement features is not a valid reason for omitting movement features in new barriers. In fact, mitigation could be in the form of upgrades to wildlife movement features along the existing barriers, as opportunities are identified.

#### Impacts to Wildlife

Arizona's State Wildlife Action Plan (SWAP) provides a comprehensive vision for managing Arizona's fish, wildlife and wildlife habitats. The SWAP identifies the Species of Greatest Conservation Need (SGCN) and Species of Economic and Recreation Importance (SERI) for the State of Arizona.

- The Department recommends that potential impacts to, as well as appropriate avoidance and minimization measure for, all state trust species be addressed in the upcoming NEPA analysis. The first table of Attachment 1 details known occurrences of special status species in the project vicinity. The second and third tables in Attachment 1 identify SGCN and SERI predicted within the project vicinity based on range prediction models.

#### Impacts to Habitat

It is the Department's policy to seek compensation at a 100% level, when feasible, for actual or potential habitat losses resulting from land and water projects (Department Policy I2.3).

- The Department recommends that all impacts to habitat be mitigated in-kind (i.e. impacts to Sonoran Desert scrub habitat should be mitigated with Sonoran Desert scrub habitat), through a combination of on-site impact avoidance and/or minimization when feasible, and preservation, creation, or compensation.

#### Recreation/Open Space Access

The Department recommends examining the potential effects of the Corridor to economically important recreation opportunities. It is the policy of the Department to place high priority on preserving existing access to public and State trust lands for hunting and to place high priority on improving access to such lands in areas of the State where access to such lands is currently difficult or nonexistent. Many of the alternatives cross roadways that currently provide access to recreation opportunities within, or east of, the Corridor; some of the alternatives are in areas where no access currently exists; some of these access concerns are identified below:

- Recreationists access the open space east and west of Alternative W1a for small game hunting. A parking or pullout area for hunters would be a great addition, as no parking is currently present.
- Alternatives W4 and E4 cross Selma Highway access point into Picacho Reservoir. Regardless of which route is chosen, this access to the Picacho Reservoir should be maintained.
- Recreationists access the Desert Wells Multiuse Area and hunting opportunities using Ocotillo Rd and E. Skyline Drive. Maintaining recreation access is important through Alternatives W1b, E1a, and E1b for small and big game hunting.



- Recreationists access open space east and west of Alternatives E1a, and E1b for small and big game hunting and OHV activities. Installation of a parking area or pullout is recommended for recreationists accessing open space.
- A gas-line dirt road through Alternatives E3b/E3d and E3a/E3c provides very popular walking access for recreationists. Maintaining access is recommended.
- Houser Road, which runs east-west through Alternatives W4 and E4, provides critical access from Highway 87 to the northern end of the Picacho Mountains. Regardless of which route is chosen, access to the adjacent open space should be maintained via Houser Road.


Indirect Effects

In addition to the typical effects to wildlife movement discussed above, pollution by toxins, nutrients, and noise from the transportation corridor can create edge effects on adjacent hydrology and microclimate, reducing the suitability of the remaining habitats. These indirect effects spread into the surrounding landscape and may contribute far more to the overall loss and degradation of natural habitat than the road body itself. The indirect effects are influenced by road and traffic characteristics, landscape topography and hydrology, wind, and vegetation. In addition, the consequent impacts on wildlife and ecosystems also depend on the sensitivity of the species in the vicinity.

- Opportunities to minimize new edge effects include: constructing the road corridor along existing infrastructure, such as the alternatives in the "Expanded" categories, instead of creating new infrastructure corridors; develop and implement adequate weed abatement and habitat restoration programs that monitor adjacent habitats; and adaptively address effects such as toxins, invasive species, and habitat conversion.

The Department hopes this evaluation of the North-South Corridor Study will aid ADOT in upcoming alternative selection and evaluation, and provide information on future data needs and mitigation opportunities as the study progresses. We continue to look forward to partnering with ADOT on this important transportation project. If you have further questions or wish to further discuss our evaluation, please contact Cheri Bouch r, the Department's Project Evaluation Program transportation coordinator, at [cboucher@azgfd.gov](mailto:cboucher@azgfd.gov) (623-236-7615).

Sincerely,



Joyce Francis, PhD  
Habitat, Evaluation, and Lands Branch Chief

cc: Joshua Fife, ADOT  
Kurt Watzek, HDR

M17-12183736

## REFERENCES CITED

Forman, R.T., D. Sperling, et al. 2003. Road Ecology: Science and Solutions. Island Press, Washington D.C.

Grandmaison, D.D., M.F. Ingraldi, and F.R. Peck. 2010. Desert Tortoise Microhabitat Selection on the Florence Military Reservation, South-Central Arizona. *Journal of Herpetology*, 44(4):581-580).

A. A. Grimsley, H. A. Hoffman, and D. J. Leavitt. 2015. Surveys for Tucson shovel-nosed snake (*Chionactis occipitalis klauberi*) on the Arizona Army National Guard Florence Military Reservation. Final Report. Arizona Game and Fish Department, Phoenix, Arizona, USA.

Hoffman, H.A. and D. J. Leavitt. 2015. Tucson Shovel-nosed Snake (*Chionactis annulata klauberi*) surveys at the Arizona Army National Guard Florence Military Reservation: 2014 Report. Final Report. Arizona Game and Fish Department, Phoenix, Arizona, USA.

Jones, A. S. (2016). An evaluation of the impacts of off-highway vehicle use on kit fox space use. Manuscript in Preparation.

Van der Ree, R., D. J. Smith, and C. Frilo. 2015. Handbook of Road Ecology. Wiley-Blackwell.

**Attachment 1**  
**Arizona Environmental Online Review Tool Report**

# Arizona Environmental Online Review Tool Report



## *Arizona Game and Fish Department Mission*

*To conserve Arizona's diverse wildlife resources and manage for safe, compatible outdoor recreation opportunities for current and future generations.*

**Project Name:**

North South Corridor

**Project Description:**

AGFD Hexagon Analysis

**Project Type:**

Transportation & Infrastructure, Road construction (including staging areas), Realignment/new roads

**Contact Person:**

Cheri Boucher

**Organization:**

Arizona Game and Fish Department

**On Behalf Of:**

AZGFD

**Project ID:**

HGIS-02567

***Please review the entire report for project type and/or species recommendations for the location information entered. Please retain a copy for future reference.***



**Disclaimer:**

1. This Environmental Review is based on the project study area that was entered. The report must be updated if the project study area, location, or the type of project changes.
2. This is a preliminary environmental screening tool. It is not a substitute for the potential knowledge gained by having a biologist conduct a field survey of the project area. This review is also not intended to replace environmental consultation (including federal consultation under the Endangered Species Act), land use permitting, or the Departments review of site-specific projects.
3. The Departments Heritage Data Management System (HDMS) data is not intended to include potential distribution of special status species. Arizona is large and diverse with plants, animals, and environmental conditions that are ever changing. Consequently, many areas may contain species that biologists do not know about or species previously noted in a particular area may no longer occur there. HDMS data contains information about species occurrences that have actually been reported to the Department. Not all of Arizona has been surveyed for special status species, and surveys that have been conducted have varied greatly in scope and intensity. Such surveys may reveal previously undocumented population of species of special concern.
4. HabiMap Arizona data, specifically Species of Greatest Conservation Need (SGCN) under our State Wildlife Action Plan (SWAP) and Species of Economic and Recreational Importance (SERI), represent potential species distribution models for the State of Arizona which are subject to ongoing change, modification and refinement. The status of a wildlife resource can change quickly, and the availability of new data will necessitate a refined assessment.

**Locations Accuracy Disclaimer:**

Project locations are assumed to be both precise and accurate for the purposes of environmental review. The creator/owner of the Project Review Report is solely responsible for the project location and thus the correctness of the Project Review Report content.

**Recommendations Disclaimer:**

1. The Department is interested in the conservation of all fish and wildlife resources, including those species listed in this report and those that may have not been documented within the project vicinity as well as other game and nongame wildlife.
2. Recommendations have been made by the Department, under authority of Arizona Revised Statutes Title 5 (Amusements and Sports), 17 (Game and Fish), and 28 (Transportation).
3. Potential impacts to fish and wildlife resources may be minimized or avoided by the recommendations generated from information submitted for your proposed project. These recommendations are preliminary in scope, designed to provide early considerations on all species of wildlife.
4. Making this information directly available does not substitute for the Department's review of project proposals, and should not decrease our opportunity to review and evaluate additional project information and/or new project proposals.
5. Further coordination with the Department requires the submittal of this Environmental Review Report with a cover letter and project plans or documentation that includes project narrative, acreage to be impacted, how construction or project activity(s) are to be accomplished, and project locality information (including site map). Once AGFD had received the information, please allow 30 days for completion of project reviews. Send requests to:  
**Project Evaluation Program, Habitat Branch**  
**Arizona Game and Fish Department**  
**5000 West Carefree Highway**  
**Phoenix, Arizona 85086-5000**  
**Phone Number: (623) 236-7600**  
**Fax Number: (623) 236-7366**  
**Or**  
[PEP@azgfd.gov](mailto:PEP@azgfd.gov)
6. Coordination may also be necessary under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and/or Endangered Species Act (ESA). Site specific recommendations may be proposed during further NEPA/ESA analysis or through coordination with affected agencies



## North South Corridor Aerial Image Basemap With Locator Map



- Project Boundary
- Buffered Project Boundary

Project Size (acres): 23,256.51

Lat/Long (DD): 32.9795 / -111.4338

County(s): Pinal

AGFD Region(s): Mesa; Tucson

Township/Range(s): T1N, R8E; T1S, R8E; T1S, R9E +

USGS Quad(s): APACHE JUNCTION; DESERT WELL +


Service Layer Credits: Sources: Esri, HERE, DeLorme, Intermap, increment P Corp., GEBCO, USGS, FAO, NPS, NRCAN, GeoBase, IGN, Kadaster NL, Ordnance Survey, Esri Japan, METI, Esri China (Hong Kong), swisstopo,









## North South Corridor

### Web Map As Submitted By User



-  Project Boundary
-  Buffered Project Boundary
-  High Value
-  Low Value

Project Size (acres): 23,256.51

Lat/Long (DD): 32.9795 / -111.4338

County(s): Pinal

AGFD Region(s): Mesa; Tucson


Township/Range(s): T1N, R8E; T1S, R8E; T1S, R9E +

USGS Quad(s): APACHE JUNCTION; DESERT WELL +

Sources: Esri, HERE, DeLorme, Intermap, increment P Corp., GEBCO, USGS, FAO, NPS, NRCAN, GeoBase, IGN, Kadaster NL, Ordnance Survey, Esri Japan, METI, Esri China (Hong Kong), swisstopo, MapmyIndia, © OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS User Community  
Arizona Game and Fish Department

## North South Corridor

### Topo Basemap With Township/Ranges and Land Ownership



Project Boundary	Military	<b>Project Size (acres):</b> 23,256.51 <b>Lat/Long (DD):</b> 32.9795 / -111.4338 <b>County(s):</b> Pinal <b>AGFD Region(s):</b> Mesa; Tucson <b>Township/Range(s):</b> T1N, R8E; T1S, R8E; T1S, R9E + <b>USGS Quad(s):</b> APACHE JUNCTION; DESERT WELL +
Buffered Project Boundary	Mixed/Other	
Township/Ranges	National Park/Mon.	
<b>Land Ownership</b>	Private	
AZ Game and Fish Dept.	State and Regional Parks	<b>Sources:</b> Esri, HERE, DeLorme, Intermap, increment P Corp., GEBCO, USGS, FAO, NPS, NRCAN, GeoBase, IGN, Kadaster NL, Ordnance Survey, Esri Japan, METI, Esri China (Hong Kong), swisstopo, MapmyIndia, © OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS User Community
BLM	State Trust	
BOR	US Forest Service	
Indian Res.	Wildlife Area/Refuge	



**Special Status Species and Special Areas Documented within 3 Miles of Project Vicinity**

Scientific Name	Common Name	FWS	USFS	BLM	NPL	SGCN
Agosia chrysogaster chrysogaster	Gila Longfin Dace	SC		S		1B
Antilocapra americana sonoriensis	10J area for Sonoran Pronghorn	LE,XN				
Athene cunicularia hypugaea	Western Burrowing Owl	SC	S	S		1B
Canis lupus baileyi	10J area Zone 2 for Mexican Wolf	LE,XN				
Catostomus clarkii	Desert Sucker	SC	S	S		1B
Catostomus insignis	Sonora Sucker	SC	S	S		1B
Chionactis occipitalis klauberi	Tucson Shovel-nosed Snake	SC				1A
Coccyzus americanus	Yellow-billed Cuckoo (Western DPS)	LT	S			1A
Empidonax traillii extimus	Southwestern Willow Flycatcher	LE				1A
Gila River Indian Reservation	Gila River Indian Reservation					
Gopherus morafkai	Sonoran Desert Tortoise	CCA	S	S		1A
Heloderma suspectum	Gila Monster					1A
Ironwood - Picacho Linkage Design	Wildlife Corridor					
Leopardus pardalis	Ocelot Area of Possible Occurrence	LE				1A
Lepus alleni	Antelope Jackrabbit					1B
Nyctinomops femorosaccus	Pocketed Free-tailed Bat					1B
PCH for Coccyzus americanus	Yellow-billed Cuckoo Proposed Critical Habitat					
Phyllorhynchus browni	Saddled Leaf-nosed Snake					1B
Rallus obsoletus yumanensis	Yuma Ridgway's Rail	LE				1A

Note: Status code definitions can be found at <https://www.azgfd.com/wildlife/planning/wildlifeguidelines/statusdefinitions/>

**Species of Greatest Conservation Need  
Predicted within 3 Miles of Project Vicinity based on Predicted Range Models**

Scientific Name	Common Name	FWS	USFS	BLM	NPL	SGCN
Agosia chrysogaster	Longfin Dace	SC		S		1B
Aix sponsa	Wood Duck					1B
Ammodramus savannarum perpallidus	Western Grasshopper Sparrow					1B
Ammospermophilus harrisii	Harris' Antelope Squirrel					1B
Anaxyrus retiformis	Sonoran Green Toad			S		1B
Anthus spragueii	Sprague's Pipit	SC				1A
Aquila chrysaetos	Golden Eagle	BGA		S		1B
Athene cunicularia hypugaea	Western Burrowing Owl	SC	S	S		1B
Botaurus lentiginosus	American Bittern					1B
Buteo regalis	Ferruginous Hawk	SC		S		1B
Catostomus clarkii	Desert Sucker	SC	S	S		1B
Catostomus insignis	Sonora Sucker	SC	S	S		1B
Charadrius montanus	Mountain Plover	SC				1B

**Species of Greatest Conservation Need  
Predicted within 3 Miles of Project Vicinity based on Predicted Range Models**

Scientific Name	Common Name	FWS	USFS	BLM	NPL	SGCN
Chilomeniscus stramineus	Variable Sandsnake					1B
Chionactis occipitalis klauberi	Tucson Shovel-nosed Snake	SC				1A
Colaptes chrysoides	Gilded Flicker			S		1B
Coluber bilineatus	Sonoran Whipsnake					1B
Corynorhinus townsendii pallescens	Pale Townsend's Big-eared Bat	SC	S	S		1B
Crotalus tigris	Tiger Rattlesnake					1B
Cynanthus latirostris	Broad-billed Hummingbird		S			1B
Cyprinodon macularius	Desert Pupfish	LE				1A
Dipodomys spectabilis	Banner-tailed Kangaroo Rat			S		1B
Euderma maculatum	Spotted Bat	SC	S	S		1B
Eumops perotis californicus	Greater Western Bonneted Bat	SC		S		1B
Falco peregrinus anatum	American Peregrine Falcon	SC	S	S		1A
Glaucidium brasilianum cactorum	Cactus Ferruginous Pygmy-owl	SC	S	S		1B
Gopherus morafkai	Sonoran Desert Tortoise	CCA	S	S		1A
Haliaeetus leucocephalus	Bald Eagle	SC,BG A	S	S		1A
Heloderma suspectum	Gila Monster					1A
Incilius alvarius	Sonoran Desert Toad					1B
Kinosternon sonoriense sonoriense	Desert Mud Turtle			S		1B
Lasiurus blossevillei	Western Red Bat		S			1B
Lasiurus xanthinus	Western Yellow Bat		S			1B
Leopardus pardalis	Ocelot	LE				1A
Leptonycteris curasoae yerbabuenae	Lesser Long-nosed Bat	LE				1A
Lepus alleni	Antelope Jackrabbit					1B
Macrotus californicus	California Leaf-nosed Bat	SC		S		1B
Melanerpes uropygialis	Gila Woodpecker					1B
Melospiza lincolni	Lincoln's Sparrow					1B
Melospiza aberti	Abert's Towhee		S			1B
Micruroides euryxanthus	Sonoran Coralsnake					1B
Myotis occultus	Arizona Myotis	SC		S		1B
Myotis velifer	Cave Myotis	SC		S		1B
Myotis yumanensis	Yuma Myotis	SC				1B
Nyctinomops femorosaccus	Pocketed Free-tailed Bat					1B
Odocoileus virginianus	White-tailed Deer					1B
Ovis canadensis mexicana	Mexican Desert Bighorn Sheep					1B
Panthera onca	Jaguar	LE				1A
Passerculus sandwichensis	Savannah Sparrow					1B
Perognathus amplus	Arizona Pocket Mouse					1B

**Species of Greatest Conservation Need  
Predicted within 3 Miles of Project Vicinity based on Predicted Range Models**

Scientific Name	Common Name	FWS	USFS	BLM	NPL	SGCN
Perognathus longimembris	Little Pocket Mouse	No Status				1B
Peucaea carpalis	Rufous-winged Sparrow					1B
Phrynosoma goodei	Goode's Horned Lizard					1B
Phrynosoma solare	Regal Horned Lizard					1B
Phyllorhynchus browni	Saddled Leaf-nosed Snake					1B
Progne subis hesperia	Desert Purple Martin			S		1B
Rallus obsoletus yumanensis	Yuma Ridgeway's Rail	LE				1A
Setophaga petechia	Yellow Warbler					1B
Tadarida brasiliensis	Brazilian Free-tailed Bat					1B
Toxostoma lecontei	LeConte's Thrasher			S		1B
Troglodytes pacificus	Pacific Wren					1B
Vireo bellii arizonae	Arizona Bell's Vireo					1B
Vulpes macrotis	Kit Fox	No Status				1B
Xantusia bezyi	Bezy's Night Lizard		S			1B

**Species of Economic and Recreation Importance Predicted within 3 Miles of Project Vicinity**

Scientific Name	Common Name	FWS	USFS	BLM	NPL	SGCN
Callipepla gambelii	Gambel's Quail					
Odocoileus hemionus	Mule Deer					
Ovis canadensis mexicana	Mexicana Desert Bighorn Sheep					1B
Pecari tajacu	Javelina					
Puma concolor	Mountain Lion					
Zenaida asiatica	White-winged Dove					
Zenaida macroura	Mourning Dove					



**Project Type: Transportation & Infrastructure, Road construction (including staging areas), Realignment/new roads**

**Project Type Recommendations:**

**Bridge Maintenance/Construction**

Identify whether wildlife species use the structure for roosting or nesting during anticipated maintenance/construction period. Plan the timing of maintenance/construction to minimize impacts to wildlife species. In addition to the species list generated by the Arizona's On-line Environmental Review Tool, the Department recommends that surveys be conducted at the bridge and in the vicinity of the bridge to identify additional or currently undocumented bat, bird, or aquatic species in the project area. To minimize impacts to birds and bats, as well as aquatic species, consider conducting maintenance and construction activities outside the breeding/maternity season (breeding seasons for birds and bats usually occur spring - summer). Examining the crevices for the presence of bats prior to pouring new paving materials or that the top of those crevices be sealed to prevent material from dripping or falling through the cracks and potentially onto bats. If bats are present, maintenance and construction (including paving and milling) activities should be conducted during nighttime hours, if possible, when the fewest number of bats will be roosting. Minimize impacts to the vegetation community. Unavoidable impacts to vegetation should be mitigated on-site whenever possible. A revegetation plan should be developed to replace impacted communities.

Consider design structures and construction plans that minimize impacts to channel geometry (i.e., width/depth ratio, sinuosity, allow overflow channels), to avoid alteration of hydrological function. Consider incorporating roosting sites for bats into bridge designs. During construction, erosion control structures and drainage features should be used to prevent introduction of sediment laden runoff into the waterway. Minimize instream construction activity. If culverts are planned, use wildlife friendly designs to mitigate impacts to wildlife and fish movement. Guidelines for bridge designs to facilitate wildlife passage can be found on our Wildlife Friendly Guidelines web page under the Wildlife Planning button, at <https://www.azgfd.com/wildlife/planning/wildlifeguidelines/>.

Fence recommendations will be dependant upon the goals of the fence project and the wildlife species expected to be impacted by the project. General guidelines for ensuring wildlife-friendly fences include: barbless wire on the top and bottom with the maximum fence height 42", minimum height for bottom 16". Modifications to this design may be considered for fencing anticipated to be routinely encountered by elk, bighorn sheep or pronghorn (e.g., Pronghorn fencing would require 18" minimum height on the bottom). Please refer to the Department's Fencing Guidelines located on Wildlife Friendly Guidelines page, which is part of the Wildlife Planning button at <https://www.azgfd.com/wildlife/planning/wildlifeguidelines/>.

During the planning stages of your project, please consider the local or regional needs of wildlife in regards to movement, connectivity, and access to habitat needs. Loss of this permeability prevents wildlife from accessing resources, finding mates, reduces gene flow, prevents wildlife from re-colonizing areas where local extirpations may have occurred, and ultimately prevents wildlife from contributing to ecosystem functions, such as pollination, seed dispersal, control of prey numbers, and resistance to invasive species. In many cases, streams and washes provide natural movement corridors for wildlife and should be maintained in their natural state. Uplands also support a large diversity of species, and should be contained within important wildlife movement corridors. In addition, maintaining biodiversity and ecosystem functions can be facilitated through improving designs of structures, fences, roadways, and culverts to promote passage for a variety of wildlife. Guidelines for many of these can be found at: <https://www.azgfd.com/wildlife/planning/wildlifeguidelines/>.

Consider impacts of outdoor lighting on wildlife and develop measures or alternatives that can be taken to increase human safety while minimizing potential impacts to wildlife. Conduct wildlife surveys to determine species within project area, and evaluate proposed activities based on species biology and natural history to determine if artificial lighting may disrupt behavior patterns or habitat use. Use only the minimum amount of light needed for safety. Narrow spectrum bulbs should be used as often as possible to lower the range of species affected by lighting. All lighting should be shielded, canted, or cut to ensure that light reaches only areas needing illumination.

Minimize potential introduction or spread of exotic invasive species. Invasive species can be plants, animals (exotic snails), and other organisms (e.g., microbes), which may cause alteration to ecological functions or compete with or prey upon native species and can cause social impacts (e.g., livestock forage reduction, increase wildfire risk). The terms noxious weed or invasive plants are often used interchangeably. Precautions should be taken to wash all equipment utilized in the project activities before leaving the site. Arizona has noxious weed regulations (Arizona Revised Statutes, Rules R3-4-244 and R3-4-245). See Arizona Department of Agriculture website for restricted plants, <https://agriculture.az.gov/>. Additionally, the U.S. Department of Agriculture has information regarding pest and invasive plant control methods including: pesticide, herbicide, biological control agents, and mechanical control, <http://www.usda.gov/wps/portal/usdahome>. The Department regulates the importation, purchasing, and transportation of wildlife and fish (Restricted Live Wildlife), please refer to the hunting regulations for further information <https://www.azgfd.com/hunting/regulations>.

Minimization and mitigation of impacts to wildlife and fish species due to changes in water quality, quantity, chemistry, temperature, and alteration to flow regimes (timing, magnitude, duration, and frequency of floods) should be evaluated. Minimize impacts to springs, in-stream flow, and consider irrigation improvements to decrease water use. If dredging is a project component, consider timing of the project in order to minimize impacts to spawning fish and other aquatic species (include spawning seasons), and to reduce spread of exotic invasive species. We recommend early direct coordination with Project Evaluation Program for projects that could impact water resources, wetlands, streams, springs, and/or riparian habitats.

The Department recommends that wildlife surveys are conducted to determine if noise-sensitive species occur within the project area. Avoidance or minimization measures could include conducting project activities outside of breeding seasons.

Based on the project type entered, coordination with State Historic Preservation Office may be required (<http://azstateparks.com/SHPO/index.html>).

Trenches should be covered or back-filled as soon as possible. Incorporate escape ramps in ditches or fencing along the perimeter to deter small mammals and herptefauna (snakes, lizards, tortoise) from entering ditches.

Design culverts to minimize impacts to channel geometry, or design channel geometry (low flow, overbank, floodplains) and substrates to carry expected discharge using local drainages of appropriate size as templates. Reduce/minimize barriers to allow movement of amphibians or fish (e.g., eliminate falls). Also for terrestrial wildlife, washes and stream corridors often provide important corridors for movement. Overall culvert width, height, and length should be optimized for movement of the greatest number and diversity of species expected to utilize the passage. Culvert designs should consider moisture, light, and noise, while providing clear views at both ends to maximize utilization. For many species, fencing is an important design feature that can be utilized with culverts to funnel wildlife into these areas and minimize the potential for roadway collisions. Guidelines for culvert designs to facilitate wildlife passage can be found on the home page of this application at <https://www.azgfd.com/wildlife/planning/wildlifeguidelines/>.

Based on the project type entered, coordination with Arizona Department of Environmental Quality may be required (<http://www.azdeq.gov/>).

Based on the project type entered, coordination with U.S. Army Corps of Engineers may be required (<http://www.usace.army.mil/>)

Based on the project type entered, coordination with County Flood Control district(s) may be required.

Vegetation restoration projects (including treatments of invasive or exotic species) should have a completed site-evaluation plan (identifying environmental conditions necessary to re-establish native vegetation), a revegetation plan (species, density, method of establishment), a short and long-term monitoring plan, including adaptive management guidelines to address needs for replacement vegetation.

**The Department requests further coordination to provide project/species specific recommendations, please contact Project Evaluation Program directly. [PEP@azgfd.gov](mailto:PEP@azgfd.gov)**

**Project Location and/or Species Recommendations:**

Your project site is within one or more defined Areas of Capture Concern. Please follow Department protocols while working within an Area of Capture Concern at U:\Agency Directives\JaguarOcelot Directives 17AUG10.pdf.

HDMS records indicate that one or more listed, proposed, or candidate species or Critical Habitat (Designated or Proposed) have been documented in the vicinity of your project. The Endangered Species Act (ESA) gives the US Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) regulatory authority over all federally listed species. Please contact USFWS Ecological Services Offices at <http://www.fws.gov/southwest/es/arizona/> or:

**Phoenix Main Office**

2321 W. Royal Palm Rd, Suite 103  
Phoenix, AZ 85021  
Phone: 602-242-0210  
Fax: 602-242-2513

**Tucson Sub-Office**

201 N. Bonita Suite 141  
Tucson, AZ 85745  
Phone: 520-670-6144  
Fax: 520-670-6155

**Flagstaff Sub-Office**

SW Forest Science Complex  
2500 S. Pine Knoll Dr.  
Flagstaff, AZ 86001  
Phone: 928-556-2157  
Fax: 928-556-2121

HDMS records indicate that Western Burrowing Owls have been documented within the vicinity of your project area. Please review the western burrowing owl resource page at:

<https://www.azgfd.com/wildlife/speciesofgreatestconservneed/burrowingowlmanagement/>.

HDMS records indicate that Sonoran Desert Tortoise have been documented within the vicinity of your project area. Please review the Tortoise Handling Guidelines found at: <https://www.azgfd.com/wildlife/nongamemanagement/tortoise/>

Tribal Lands are within the vicinity of your project area and may require further coordination. Please contact:

Gila River Indian Community  
PO Box 97  
Sacaton, AZ 85247  
(520) 562-6000  
(520) 562-6010 (fax)

Analysis indicates that your project is located in the vicinity of an identified wildlife habitat linkage corridor. Project planning and implementation efforts should focus on maintaining adequate opportunities for wildlife permeability. For information pertaining to the linkage assessment and wildlife species that may be affected, please refer to: <http://www.corridordesign.org/arizona>. Please contact your local Arizona Game and Fish Department Regional Office for specific project recommendations: <https://www.azgfd.com/Agency/Offices>.

**From:** Victor Yang  
**To:** [LaBianca, Michael](#); [ADOT NSCS](#); [Katie Rodriguez](#)  
**Subject:** FW: NSCS H7454 01L/STP 999-A(365)X - Agency Corridor Preference form for City of Apache Junction  
**Date:** Tuesday, January 2, 2018 11:04:20 AM  
**Attachments:** [2017-12-28\\_AJ\\_Prefered\\_Corridors.pdf](#)

---

---

**From:** Emile Schmid [mailto:[eschmid@AJCity.Net](mailto:eschmid@AJCity.Net)]  
**Sent:** Thursday, December 28, 2017 12:12 PM  
**To:** Victor Yang; Aryan Lirange  
**Subject:** NSCS H7454 01L/STP 999-A(365)X - Agency Corridor Preference form for City of Apache Junction

Victor,

Attached please find the Agency Corridor Preference form completed by the City of Apache Junction.

One item I would like to bring to your attention. During the NSCS meeting held 12/14/2017, it was mentioned that the W1a alignment had the worst rating in terms of impact to existing community facilities. A few moments later however, it was mentioned that the E1a alignment and its impacts to Silly Mountain Park are worse than the W1a impacts to the community facilities. City staff disagrees, and the reason is that by moving the 400-foot E1a Alternate Route within the E1a 1500-foot Avoidance Area we can avoid any impacts to the current Silly Mountain Park as well as future plans for park expansions on the south side of US 60. If I misheard or misunderstood these comments during the meeting, please let me know, but I wanted you to be aware of what Apache Junction city staff felt about the W1a and E1a impacts to our city.

Thanks for the opportunity to provide input to corridor preferences. If there are any questions or comments on what I explained above, please let me know.

Thanks-

Emile Schmid

\* \* \* \* \*

Emile Schmid, P.E.  
City Engineer

***City of Apache Junction***  
***Public Works Department***  
575 E. Baseline Ave.  
Apache Junction, Arizona 85119  
tel 480.474.8515  
fax 480.983.8582  
email: [eschmid@ajcity.net](mailto:eschmid@ajcity.net)  
***Service Over and Above the Rest***

**Monday – Thursday, 7:00am – 6:00pm**

[Public Works Opinion Poll](#)

This message and the information within is intended for the recipient. If you received this email in error, please notify the sender and then delete the email. Emails generated by council members or City staff pertaining to City business are public records and are preserved according to the City's records retention schedule. To ensure compliance with the Open Meeting Law, members of the City Council should not forward email correspondence to other members of the Council. Members of the Council and other public bodies may reply to this message, but should not copy other members of the public body.

---

Confidentiality and Nondisclosure Notice: This email transmission and any attachments are intended for use by the person(s)/entity(ies) named above and may contain confidential/privileged information. Any unauthorized use, disclosure or distribution is strictly prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient, please contact the sender by email, and delete or destroy all copies plus attachments.



## North-South Corridor Study Cooperating and Participating Agency Corridor Preference

We identify the following action corridor alternative(s) as our preferred alternative. We recognize that the North-South Corridor Study Tier 1 Draft Environmental Impact Statement will identify a recommended preferred action corridor alternative, and this form provides us the opportunity to provide our preference to be considered in that process.

We acknowledge that as more information is provided through the National Environmental Policy Act process, we will continue to provide comments throughout the study, and that input will be considered by the study team.

### Preferred Action Corridor Alternative

The map to the right (or the webmap found at <https://northsouthtier1deis.hdrgateway.com/Home/Map>) identifies all action corridor alternatives by segment under consideration in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Our preference for each segment, based on a continuous corridor (for example, the E1a Alternative in Segment 1 connects only with E2a or W2b in Segment 2), is indicated on the form provided on the 2<sup>nd</sup> page of this form.

Please complete:

Name of agency:

CITY OF APACHE JUNCTION

Agency contact for this study:


EMILE SCHMID, P.E.

Email address:

eschmid@ajcity.net

Phone number:

480-474-8515



Cooperating and Participating Agency Corridor Preference

Segment	Alternative	Comment
Segment 1	E1a	IMPACTS POTENTIAL PASSIVE USE AREA
	★ E1b	PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE
	W1a	TOO CLOSE TO CAP
	W1b	TOO CLOSE TO CAP
Segment 2	★ E2a	PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE
	E2b	
	W2a	
	W2b	
Segment 3	★ E3a	PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE
	E3b	
	E3c	
	E3d	
	W3	
Segment 4	E4	> NO PREFERENCE
	W4	

Please provide completed forms by December 28, 2017 to:

Aryan Lirange  
 Senior Urban Engineer  
 Federal Highway Administration  
 4000 N. Central Ave., Suite 1500  
 Phoenix, Arizona 85012  
 (602) 382-8973  
[aryan.lirange@dot.gov](mailto:aryan.lirange@dot.gov)

or Victor Yang  
 Project Manager  
 Arizona Department of Transportation  
 205 S. 17th Ave, MD605E  
 Phoenix AZ 85007  
 (602) 712-8715  
[VYang@azdot.gov](mailto:VYang@azdot.gov)



## North-South Corridor Study Cooperating and Participating Agency Corridor Preference

We identify the following action corridor alternative(s) as our preferred alternative. We recognize that the North-South Corridor Study Tier 1 Draft Environmental Impact Statement will identify a recommended preferred action corridor alternative, and this form provides us the opportunity to provide our preference to be considered in that process.

We acknowledge that as more information is provided through the National Environmental Policy Act process, we will continue to provide comments throughout the study, and that input will be considered by the study team.

### Preferred Action Corridor Alternative

The map to the right (or the webmap found at <https://northsouthtier1deis.hdrgateway.com/Home/Map>) identifies all action corridor alternatives by segment under consideration in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Our preference for each segment, based on a continuous corridor (for example, the E1a Alternative in Segment 1 connects only with E2a or W2b in Segment 2), is indicated on the form provided on the 2<sup>nd</sup> page of this form.


Please complete:

Name of agency: Arizona State Land Department

Agency contact for this study: Michelle Green

Email address: mgreen@azland.gov

Phone number: 602-364-2502





## Cooperating and Participating Agency Corridor Preference

Segment	Alternative	Comment
Segment 1	E1a	Not Preferred
	E1b	Preferred, this alternative is most consistent with the Supersition Vistas Conceptual Plan. It also improves mobility by adding a roadway and capacity instead of using the exisiting Ironwood Road alignment. It also provides better access and opportunities for economic development. Other alternatives are challenged by their proximity to the CAP canal.
	W1a	Not Preferred
	W1b	Not Preferred
Segment 2	E2a	
	E2b	
	W2a	
	W2b	
Segment 3	E3a	
	E3b	Preferred
	E3c	
	E3d	
	W3	
Segment 4	E4	Preferred, this alignment provided additional capacity by not using an existing roadway alignment.
	W4	

Please provide completed forms by December 28, 2017 to:

Aryan Lirange  
 Senior Urban Engineer  
 Federal Highway Administration  
 4000 N. Central Ave., Suite 1500  
 Phoenix, Arizona 85012  
 (602) 382-8973  
[aryan.lirange@dot.gov](mailto:aryan.lirange@dot.gov)

or Victor Yang  
 Project Manager  
 Arizona Department of Transportation  
 205 S.17th Ave, MD605E  
 Phoenix AZ 85007  
 (602) 712-8715  
[VYang@azdot.gov](mailto:VYang@azdot.gov)

## North-South Corridor Study Tier 1 Environmental Impact Statement

### North-South Corridor Study Cooperating and Participating Agency Corridor Preference

We identify the following action corridor alternative(s) as our preferred alternative. We recognize that the North-South Corridor Study Tier 1 Draft Environmental Impact Statement will identify a recommended preferred action corridor alternative, and this form provides us the opportunity to provide our preference to be considered in that process.

We acknowledge that as more information is provided through the National Environmental Policy Act process, we will continue to provide comments throughout the study, and that input will be considered by the study team.

#### Preferred Action Corridor Alternative

The map to the right (or the webmap found at <https://northsouthtier1deis.hdrgateway.com/Home/Map>) identifies all action corridor alternatives by segment under consideration in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Our preference for each segment, based on a continuous corridor (for example, the E1a Alternative in Segment 1 connects only with E2a or W2b in Segment 2), is indicated on the form provided on the 2<sup>nd</sup> page of this form.

Please complete:

Name of agency:

City of Mesa

Agency contact for this study:


R.J. Zeder

Email address:

rj.zeder@mesaz.gov

Phone number:

480-644-3121





## North-South Corridor Study Tier 1 Environmental Impact Statement

### Cooperating and Participating Agency Corridor Preference

Segment	Alternative	Comment
Segment 1	E1a	
	E1b	
	W1a	Support this route to provide nearer connection for Mesa residents. Mesa supports the connection to SR 24 at Ironwood.
	W1b	
Segment 2	E2a	
	E2b	
	W2a	
	W2b	
Segment 3	E3a	
	E3b	
	E3c	
	E3d	
	W3	
Segment 4	E4	
	W4	

Please provide completed forms by December 28, 2017 to:

Aryan Lirange  
 Senior Urban Engineer  
 Federal Highway Administration  
 4000 N. Central Ave., Suite 1500  
 Phoenix, Arizona 85012  
 (602) 382-8973  
[aryan.lirange@dot.gov](mailto:aryan.lirange@dot.gov)

or Victor Yang  
 Project Manager  
 Arizona Department of Transportation  
 205 S. 17th Ave, MD605E  
 Phoenix AZ 85007  
 (602) 712-8715  
[VYang@azdot.gov](mailto:VYang@azdot.gov)

## North-South Corridor Study Cooperating and Participating Agency Corridor Preference

We identify the following action corridor alternative(s) as our preferred alternative. We recognize that the North-South Corridor Study Tier 1 Draft Environmental Impact Statement will identify a recommended preferred action corridor alternative, and this form provides us the opportunity to provide our preference to be considered in that process.

We acknowledge that as more information is provided through the National Environmental Policy Act process, we will continue to provide comments throughout the study, and that input will be considered by the study team.

### Preferred Action Corridor Alternative

The map to the right (or the webmap found at <https://northsouthtier1deis.hdrgateway.com/Home/Map>) identifies all action corridor alternatives by segment under consideration in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Our preference for each segment, based on a continuous corridor (for example, the E1a Alternative in Segment 1 connects only with E2a or W2b in Segment 2), is indicated on the form provided on the 2<sup>nd</sup> page of this form.

Please complete:

Name of agency:

SRP

Agency contact for this study:


Janeen Rohovit

Email address:

janeen.rohovit@srpnet.com

Phone number:

602.236.2679





Cooperating and Participating Agency Corridor Preference

Segment	Alternative	Comment
Segment 1	<del>E1a</del> oppose	conflicts with transmission
	E1b support	shift N/S alignment slightly west to avoid 500kV transmission line F-O-W
	<del>W1a</del> oppose	multiple conflicts with transmission and substations
	<del>W1b</del> support	multiple conflicts with transmission and substations
Segment 2	E2a support	no conflicts + connects with E1b
	<del>E2b</del>	conflicts w/in segment 1
	<del>W2a</del>	Conflicts due to issues in segment 1
	W2b neutral	Note: ADOT would facilitate 2 EAV transmission line crossings
Segment 3	E3a support	minimal impact to electric infrastructure
	<del>E3b</del> oppose	conflicts in north portion of this segment
	E3c support	minimal impact to electric infrastructure
	<del>E3d</del> oppose	conflicts in north portion of this segment
	W3 neutral	
Segment 4	E4 neutral	
	W4 neutral	

Please provide completed forms by December 28, 2017 to:

Aryan Lirange  
Senior Urban Engineer  
Federal Highway Administration  
4000 N. Central Ave., Suite 1500  
Phoenix, Arizona 85012  
(602) 382-8973  
[aryan.lirange@dot.gov](mailto:aryan.lirange@dot.gov)

or Victor Yang  
Project Manager  
Arizona Department of Transportation  
205 S. 17th Ave, MD605E  
Phoenix AZ 85007  
(602) 712-8715  
[VYang@azdot.gov](mailto:VYang@azdot.gov)

*This page is intentionally left blank.*



No.	Topic	CommentText	General Support	Overall	Overall	Segment 1				Segment 2				Segment 3				Segment 4		
				Overall East	Overall West	E1a	E1b	W1a	W1b	E2a	E2b	W2a	W2b	E3a	E3b	E3c	E3d	W3	E4	W4
1	Property Impacts	Will ADOT still be the lead and owner of the N- S corridor freeway including maintenance after completion or will this freeway become the responsibility of Pinal County? The reason for this question is that ADOT is now taking input for it's environmental study to finalize the final paths of the freeway. We are opposed to the alignment from AZ Farms Rd South along Felix Rd since it passes too close to our existing homes. We favor moving the freeway many miles to the east to preserve our health and welfare.								N	N				N		N			
2	Property Impacts Environmental	Crestfield Manor (started in 2005) and Wildhorse Estates (started in 2000 and completed in 2006) subdivisions were here first. There is plenty of open space 5 miles east of us to build a freeway. Move the freeway east of Felix Rd at least 5 miles and don't give us the noise and pollution from the freeway. We all moved here to get away from noise and pollution so leave us that way. Your study needs to look at the environmental impacts impacts to actual people who have been living here for years. Stop just worrying about critters that may or may not be impacted. Humans should come first. Humans will definitely be negatively impacted by the proposed freeway proximity to our homes. No to segments P & Q. Yes to segments V & X.								N	N				N		N			
3	Property Impacts Property Impacts	I am submitting an email with concerns for the placement for the North-South Corridor. While the far southeast metro-Phoenix does indeed need more roads for transportation, the location has been altered quite a bit since the story first began. To quote the information: "Since 2014, some of the proposed alternative corridors have been modified to avoid sensitive resources..." The sensitive resources I'm writing about are homes. Laredo Ranch lies extremely close to this proposed road. It has suffered greater than other areas during the housing slump that started in 2006. It has taken years to come back up to par and to gain equity for those who purchased in 2006 and 2007. To add the proposed roadway too close to Laredo Ranch would cause that area's housing market to suffer greatly...again. Please - it needs to be as far West of Laredo Ranch as possible! Thank you for your time.						N	N											
4	General	I believe the best alternative to accommodate future growth in the southeast valley would be as follows: -> W1b to W2a to W3 to W4 Additionally, I am hoping a System Interchange with SR 24 is a part of this project. Thanks for the opportunity to comment.							Y			Y						Y		Y
5	General	Thank you! After reviewing the Maps I would prefer the western route for the north south Corredor when they decide to build it. It appears that it would cost less money as it's a straighter more direct route. [REDACTED] Robson Ranch						Y	Y			Y	Y					Y		Y
6	Roadway Design	Hello, My preference would be using Ironwood Rd. Expand the exit ramps with more lanes to alleviate the congestion and back up on US 60 that still persists even with the Meridian Rd exit. It makes sense to me to use an existing interchange and improve it. Thank you,	Y			N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N



No.	Topic	CommentText	General Support	Overall	Overall	Segment 1				Segment 2				Segment 3				Segment 4		
				Overall East	Overall West	E1a	E1b	W1a	W1b	E2a	E2b	W2a	W2b	E3a	E3b	E3c	E3d	W3	E4	W4
7	Property Impacts Environmental	I DO NOT favor the Western Corridor option of this plan. I am a current resident of the Laredo Ranch community in San Tan Valley, Arizona. I believe the EAST CORRIDOR option is the best one to pursue. As it stands, it is less interruptive to established structures and could provide a means to build around easier than following through with the Western Corridor option. The Western Corridor is not preferred due to the detriment it will cause to the two communities it'll negatively impact. These communities were already established for years prior to the development of this plan. Individuals, such as myself, have moved as far out as we have to escape the busy highways and pollution that comes with it. Please consider the Eastern Corridor option.						N	N			N	N					N		N
8	Property Impacts	To whomever it may concern, I highly suggest putting the new corridor on the Eastern side rather than on the west due to the fact that it would be directly behind the Loredo Ranch community which none of it's members want. Thank you,						N	N			N	N					N		N
9	Property Impacts Property Impacts Traffic Congestion	Looking at the map and Google Maps...the W1a is NOT the right path. There is a retirement community south of the US60 and the High School to the North. Horrible idea to use Ironwood as a route. These retirement centers provide tax money in the winter through Snowbirds. This would not help at all. I would recommend the E1b, to the E2a, then the E3b to the E3a, and then the E4 route with maybe the W4 part as the option. I would also suggest you tie in the State 24 in there somehow. But don't stop there....you need to find a way around Gold Canyon. You need to reroute the US 60 around that town. Those stop lights...horrible. Especially the Renaissance traffic. US 60 needs to be 3 lanes in both directions from Signal Butte all the way out past Peralta Trail road. Or you need to redirect traffice around that section.																		
10	Connectivity	The North- South Corridor is the most important project since the construction of I-10. Connecting Phoenix and the east valley to Tucson will benefit the economy of both regions. A small side benefit may be relieving congestion on I-10 thereby creating capacity for interstate freight. There is no funding identified for this project. Expansion of Arizona's road system will take second place to maintenance and modernization of existing roads. The recent 1/2 cent sales tax in Pinal County designates the majority of funding for the construction of the North South Corridor between 60 and Coolidge. Since there is no State funds designated for this project, the alignment between 60 and Florence should be the priority. Future planning and engineering should focus on the northern segments taking into account the connectivity and future growth between US 60 and AZ24 to Florence. The Superstition Vista Plan approved by Pinal County Supervisors is the foundation for this corridor plan. Therefore, the alignment chosen should minimize costs by using vacant land, adhere to a 30 year growth scenario and connect regional activity center - Gateway, Florence, and NE Mesa. Designing a corridor for existing development would be mistake and use all the funds available for the next 20 years. While the region needs new roads, planning should not be done in a vacuum ignoring other alternatives. Will Tesla change the future of transportation? It already has.	Y																	
11	General	W3 is too far from Florence. It makes no sense for the North-South Corridor in Pinal to ignore the County seat. I prefer E4. It is further south on I-10 so should save on mileage and gas, both good environmental considerations. By contrast W4 uses existing AZ-87 which adds to build complexity and will unnecessarily add lots of delays during construction.				Y	Y	N											Y	N



No.	Topic	CommentText	General Support	Overall	Overall	Segment 1				Segment 2				Segment 3				Segment 4		
				Overall East	Overall West	E1a	E1b	W1a	W1b	E2a	E2b	W2a	W2b	E3a	E3b	E3c	E3d	W3	E4	W4
12	Property Impacts	I am not sure that this matters much, but both of these routes break my heart. One (the one in purple) cuts directly through the home in which my husbands grandmother raised 11 children. It's still owned by the family today. The Kemptons had a prominent AZ dairy and that home has been there for decades and decades. That route also cuts through her sons farm and Morning Star farms across the road...a community staple and cotton farm owned and operated by her daughter, and a major family gathering point. If it were over just a little more east it would not have to destroy places I consider a haven...it would go through fields. The other route (the one in yellow) goes directly through a beloved uncle's property and home. Another cotton farmer and someone also vital to the local community. I understand it has to go somewhere (even if I get down to Coolidge just fine with other routes, i get the entire universe is now impatient to get where they are going), better planning could have kept community members in their home and continuing to help provide this state with his famous 5C's.				N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
13	Traffic Congestion	Sirs or Madams: I'm a resident within the study area. I've only owned here since 2011, so I don't have a long history of difficult access in or out, but I've certainly observed the traffic nightmare during the morning and evening commutes. I'm not an "expert" but I did spend 35 years in police work, including several years in the Traffic Division. As such I'm all for the addition of a limited-access beltway along the east side of this area. If I were to pick an option, it would be 1A because it's further away from the CAP canal. The corridor should be placed so it has a "buffer" from existing occupied property, and in several places, the canal and other choices are rather close by. This will give any future development some space to grow on both sides of the freeway and develop noise abatement as necessary, which IMHO is preferable to trying to "retrofit" existing neighborhoods to cope with the inevitable noise and traffic. Thank you for the opportunity to comment.				Y														
14	Property Impacts	Hello, My name is Aaron Trimmer and I live along the canal just east of Schnepf Rd on Combs. I for one do not want to have to look at or listen to a freeway at my quiet home. It looks as there is a possible route running right past my neighborhood. The map you have posted doesn't even show our neighborhood there. I'm speaking of alt # 2a,2b labeled E1 and E2. Please tell me that will not happen! Thanks						N	N											
15	General	This should be paid for by the developers. This will have NO benefit to the residents. Another pipe dream by those who smoke medical marijuana.	N																	
16	General	Where is the N/S going from Skyline and Felix rd																		
17	General	If this stops some of the fatalities happening on the San Tan Valley roads die the increased irresponsible driving I'm all for it. But we also need have focus on the roads the fatalities are happening.	Y																	
18	General	Regarding the north/south corridor, it seems that it would get the most usage from the western-most routes. The majority of the traffic will be to and from the metro area so I would be in favor of the western routes.	Y		Y															
19	Economic Development	██████ would like to see the corridor run north of Florence and west of State Route 79 in order to foster development in the area. (per conversation with L. Douglas)	Y	Y										Y	Y					
20	Connectivity	I would like to see the N-S corridor line up with the rail line going north and south, as it turns to I-10. This would make a great transportation hub, combining express ways and railroad transportation. Specifically, in Segment 2 between Arizona Farms Road and Magma Road.																		
21	General	Good afternoon, I recommend the following route below, please confirm you have received my entry. Thank you for your time. W1A; W1A, W1B; E2B; E2A, E2B; E3B, E3D; E3A, E3B; E4.	Y					Y	Y	Y	Y			Y	Y		Y		Y	
22	Connectivity	As so appropriately identified by the Arizona Department of Transportation, it is critical for the North-South Corridor to accommodate anticipated growth in the area and across the region; to improve access to future activity and population centers; and improve regional connectivity. Of the proposed alternative corridor options, the Wester Corridor 1a most effectively meets those needs.	Y					Y												



No.	Topic	CommentText	General Support	Overall	Overall	Segment 1				Segment 2				Segment 3				Segment 4		
				Overall East	Overall West	E1a	E1b	W1a	W1b	E2a	E2b	W2a	W2b	E3a	E3b	E3c	E3d	W3	E4	W4
23	General	Coolidge Chamber of Commerce is in support of the route located closest to Coolidge attached you will find a map and we are in favor of the W3 Alignment consideration. The reasons for our decision as per history the further away from the City a freeway goes the more damage it does (someimes even death) to currnt local businesses. We thank you for this consideration.																		
24	General	Please consider the following routes in setting the North/South Freeway: W1a W1b, E2b, E2a, E2b, E3a, E3c, E3a, E3b, E4						Y	Y	Y	Y			Y	Y	Y			Y	
25	General	Dear Sir/Madam: Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the "North South Corridor Study" ("Study"). While we generally support greater regional connectivity and the need to address transportation needs in Pinal County, we have serious concerns with one of the proposed routes identified in the Study because it could negatively impact our commercial operations both on private land and on State Trust Land. Florence Copper is a fully permitted active mineral extraction facility located northwest of downtown Florence. The facility represents a significant private-sector financial investment in the region and is a critical source of jobs and economic development in a historically economically depressed area. Proposed Study route "E3b/E3d" is especially problematic because it appears to directly cross our primary ore body. Any route that crosses our ore body could prevent a significant portion of our extraction efforts from occurring, thereby substantially reduces the financial value of our property and that of the State Trust Land. Additionally, the Town of Florence has identified this general area for a future planned waste water treatment facility - a route in this area could prevent the construction of a much-needed infrastructure project for the Town's residents. And finally, there are significant known cultural resources in this area, including a sensitive "Criteria A National Historic Preservation Act" site. For each of these reasons, we respectfully request that you remove route "E3b/E3d" from consideration in your Study. I've attached a map that shows the Florence Copper facility location in relation to the proposed route. Please contact me if you have any questions.																	Y	
26	Environmental	Concerned with the Environmental Impact, where are the studies ??																		
27	Environmental	Isn't this area already having problems with the water quality? What are you doing to mitigate dust and potential collapse of the aquifer? What will be done to protect the saguaro cactus along that route? What about all the pollutants from the new route? How will the addition of all those petrochemicals and runoff from car fluids affect the ability of local water treatment plants to keep water quality at safe levels?																		
28	Property Impacts	This is way too close to the community.			N	N														
29	General	This map is horrible. You cannot see major street names and worst, the current freeway system. What is the matter with you people. Your supposed to be a dept of transportation..wanting input...and you can't even have a GIS map that shows major roadways to use as a reference?																		
30	Property Impacts	This is a much better option than running it through the backyards of people's homes.	Y																	
31	Connectivity	It is best to position the highway half way between Coolidge and Florence. It would serve the needs of both communities better. I am not as keen on the western, 'gold,' alternative as it would add more road noise to the Coolidge community.									Y									
32	General	Why don't you fix the gridlock and failing segments of the freeway system first before spending money on a new segment in the middle of nowhere??? This proposed project must be motivated by a special interest! This 'expansion' would benefit NO ONE expect the few percentage of residents who live in Queen Creek, Florence and Coolidge. It will NOT help alleviate any traffic issues experienced by the majority of drivers in and around downtown or Hwy 51 or I-17 or 101. The majority of folks who pay the taxes that will be used to pay for this remote expansion location will not benefit from this EVER.																		
33	Connectivity	It sure would be forward thinking to have a road between Florence and Kearny that is not dirt. It would open this side of the state for more development.																		
34	Economic Development	Getting close to the airport is a good idea. The Coolidge airport has all kinds of potential. A new road close to the airport will probably spur development in that area for all kinds of industries. The Coolidge airport could be easily expanded as there is lots of desert area there. This area could also be home to a number of light industries and businesses. This area is basically not developed at all.									Y	Y								



No.	Topic	CommentText	General Support	Overall	Overall	Segment 1				Segment 2				Segment 3				Segment 4		
				Overall East	Overall West	E1a	E1b	W1a	W1b	E2a	E2b	W2a	W2b	E3a	E3b	E3c	E3d	W3	E4	W4
35	Connectivity	I favor this location due to traffic not having to travel further east to then travel south out to the san tan area. The vast majority of the citizens live on the west side of both of these routes so the less traveling the better. The further east also puts the freeway further out into State Land (only developable when the state chooses to take the land to market). If the other route is chosen, my opinion would be that the state then needs to bring all that land to market so that the freeway is not being built in and around all vacant land.			Y															
36	General	I think this map is extremely outdated and doesn't reflect the current status of the development in and around this entire quadrant of the valley. Unless you are a developer ( I am) I would suspect that most people will not understand what the actual current status is of development. This map is at least 10-12 years old.																		
37	Traffic congestion	Ease the already overloaded Ironwood Drive at US 60 intersection by moving E1a intersection to Idaho Road and US 60. There is an existing exit, and a straight southern route to the proposed merging point with W1a. This relieves Ironwood Drive load and allows E1a traffic to flow past the Ironwood Drive exit. This will eliminate a need to expand US 60 at a later date to 3 lanes to accommodate both Ironwood and E1a traffic. Trust land extends across both areas and south.																		
38	Traffic Congestion	I understand the need to plan for growth, which is sometimes tough to sell today. However, it is hard to support such planning when the main Phoenix highways are so congested and it does not appear that this plan will help prevent those issues. It seems there really needs to be a plan to divert traffic from having to travel past the downtown area, as this is the major issue we all deal with. Is this proposed project motivated by a special interest in some way? Is this really for expansion to help us? The more people who move outwards, the more they continue to congest the roads leading back to the downtown corridor. For support from taxpayers, more focus should be made on providing information on the true nature of this expansion and what it would mean for everyday road travel in areas that are no where near this area. We need to know how this will help us in the future. The majority of folks who will be asked to pay taxes that will be used to pay for this remote expansion location need to know how this is going to benefit them. Thanks for communicating																		
39	Connectivity	I really prefer the route down Ironwood. I like it's connection to Hwy 60 much better than the more easterly route.			Y															
40	General	I do not like this route as it comes off Hwy 60. The turn may be too sharp and you go easy to turn back west. The Ironwood location would be shorter.	N		Y															
41	General	I do not like this segment. You are going back west after traveling east on Hwy 60.				N														
42	General	I like this yellow alignment. The best and shortest route is to come off Hwy 60 at Ironwood and essentially go directly south.			Y															
43	Environmental General Discontent	The noise pollution, vehicle pollution, and light within a mile of my personal home is the exact opposite of why I moved out there in 2002. Also by placing the road on the west side of the CAP canal will reduce flood control costs and I fear if it's on the east side of the CAP canal would cause flooding where I leave.																		
44	General	The purple/blue line is far superior.																		
45	General	You need to look at the long term. Don't be influenced too much by the population in Johnson Ranch/San Tan region. The long term need will be for a corridor more to the east. The blue/purple corridor is far superior to the one closer to the current population! Please plan for the future and not for the existing people! !																		
46	Economic Development	Superstition Vista will be the MOST important region for urban development in all of Arizona. Past planning resulted in Pinal County approval for over 1 million residents, commercial, industrial, transportation corridors and open space. The North- South Corridor must acknowledge this plan and its potential.																		
47	Connectivity	The Pinal County Comprehensive Plan shows a north south parkway from Florence south to I-10. This leg should be considered and evaluated. If ADOT knew 40 years ago about where growth would occur, would our transportation system have been different from what we drive on today? Time to think about the future, not just the present or past.																		



No.	Topic	CommentText	General Support	Overall	Overall	Segment 1				Segment 2				Segment 3				Segment 4		
				East	West	E1a	E1b	W1a	W1b	E2a	E2b	W2a	W2b	E3a	E3b	E3c	E3d	W3	E4	W4
48	Economic Development	I do not favor this alignment. The N/S Corridor should provide access to the future developed area which will include land further east of the Hunt HWY.													N					
49	General	I would support an alignment that is located further east of this segment and align will the segment that crosses the Gila River east of Poston Butte.	N																	
50	Connectivity	I would support the construction of a 4 lane limited access roadway that connects with the planned and funded interchange of I-10 and 87.Since there is no funding for the North South Corridor and there is funding for the I-10 interchange, the focus should be on improvement to 87 from I-10 to Coolidge.															y			
51	Environmental	Not in favor of this alignment. Earth fissures and land subsidence, resulting from dewatering the aquifer will result in additional construction and maintenance costs. Improvements to 87 will provide capacity for new private development east of 87.														N	y			
52	General	I would support this alignment if it were located adjacent to Poston Butte.									Y		y							
53	General	I would support this alignment if it continued on a southeasterly direction to pass east of Poston Butte.		Y							Y		y							
54	General	I do not favor this segment.			y						Y		y							
55	General	I favor this segment.		Y																
56	General	I do not favor this segment.	N																	
57	General	I do not favor this segment.				N														
58	General	I favor this alignment.	Y	y																
59	General	I do not favor this segment.										N		n						
60	Connectivity	I support an alignment that connects Florence to I-10 at Marana. An alignment east of the Pichaco Mtns. would relieve I-10 and expedite freight between Tucson and the east valley.																		
61	General	Past descriptions of the North South Corridor have included an additional right of way for passenger rail of 300 ft. This is the time to set aside additional right of way for rail, driverless, trucks, driverless buses or hyper loop. Would our infrastructure be different if 40 years ago ADOT knew the impact alternative fuel vehicles would have on revenues?																		
62	General	I would favor this alignment if it were located adjacent to the CAP canal.					Y				y		y							
63	General	I do not favor this alignment.			N	n														
64	General	We prefer the Eastern route. The closer to highway 79 and 60 the better. We use this route to go to the White Mountains. Thank you. [REDACTED]									Y		y							
65	Connectivity	Ea would give us the closest access to 79 and 60. Thank you.									Y		y							
66	Connectivity	We prefer E1a. If SR 24 connects on to the SR 60, we would like for it to be at the junction of 60 and 79. From the 60 we could access the North South and I 10 through the SR 24. Thank you	Y																	
67	General	I favor rebuilding the Pinal Air Park Interchange crossing UPRR to connect to 287 at Florence.																		
68	General	Does this connect to SR24?																		
69	Connectivity	I choose this route as it is the shortest connection between US60 and I-10			Y															
70	Property Impacts	I moved out here to be away from traffic and nosie that the W1b W1a would have on my house. Move it more to the East away from where we live and want to enjoy the feel of the country.	Y	Y	n	n														
71	Property Impacts	Just bought a new home right in front of this spot (next to the water tank pictured). We thought Long and hard before purchasing because of the NS corridor and did as much research as possible to make sure it the proposed corridor would NOT be near our new home. If the corridor runs this close to all of the custom homes just built on Sierra Vista Drive, we, as homeowners, will lose the value in our home/investment. I support the NS corridor but NOT running through my front yard. It needs to be set back further east from Sierra Vista Drive and Combs.			N	N														
72	General	As a resident of Laredo ranch I would prefer this option.	Y	Y																
73	General	Prefer alternative W1b				y														
74	General	W1b				y														
75	General	W1a/b			Y	y														
76	General	Prefer W1a/b			Y	y														
77	General	Prefer W 1a/b			Y	y														
78	General	Prefer 3 a/c					y				Y		Y							
79	General	Prefer 3 a/c									Y		Y							



No.	Topic	CommentText	General Support	Overall	Overall	Segment 1				Segment 2				Segment 3				Segment 4			
				Overall East	Overall West	E1a	E1b	W1a	W1b	E2a	E2b	W2a	W2b	E3a	E3b	E3c	E3d	W3	E4	W4	
80	General	Prefer 3 a/b									Y	Y									
81	General	Prefer 3 a/b									Y	Y									
82	General	Prefer E4														Y					
83	General	Thank you for the opportunity to provide input in this critical corridor for the Pinal County cities, towns, residents and other stakeholders.																			
84	General	Why aren't these proposals using more of the existing roads. This would cut down on environmental impacts, reduce the cost and time of acquiring the additional ROW that will be needed, reduce the cost of engineering and construction, and ultimately reduce the amount of time that it will take to actually construct this project.																			
85	Connectivity	I prefer the west route because it it more accessible for San tan valley. it should also be a shorter and more direct route to and from the 60 to the 10. it makes no sense to run through Florence directly considering how few live there compared to San tan valley. the eastern route is largely useless to most STV residents																			
86	General	If we have input, we would like to see the E1a plan in affect. Thank you, [REDACTED]	Y																		
87	Property Impacts	W1a appears to go right through my kitchen so I hope that is not the alternative selected.			N																
88	General	would like to see the West freeway. Being closer to San Tan Valley and having a more direct route to Phoenix would greatly help us down here!																			
89	Property Impacts	Please use the Eastern option, to avoid as many current homes as possible. We live on the eastern edge of Laredo Ranch, and the western option will run pretty much directly behind our home. This will destroy our night skies, our peace and quiet, our cattle / farmland views, and our property values.																			
90	Environmental	The West Bound Corridor needs to be moved East. When moving here we wanted to be away from the light, noises and air polution that a road like this brings. We perfer the night sky and be able to see the stars. With a corridor like the West Bound Corridor all that goes away. Move it more to the east away from those that are already here.																			
91	Property Impacts	This is directly behind our house we just purchased and are fixing up. We bought this house in hopes of growing our family but if this highway goes in in this location we'll be forced to move due to noise pollution and probably lose a chunk of our equity. Please please please do not choose this route, there is plenty of land east of the canal.			N	N															
92	Property Impacts	I live in Laredo Ranch and I do NOT want the west but prefer the east proposed plan. It is calm and peaceful out here now. I like sitting in my backyard and seeing the stars and moon rise. A freeway would kill our neighborhood ! Please consider the request of the residents who live here. I invite you to come visit our community and see how it will affect us, Thank you.																			
93	Property Impacts	I prefer the eastern option. My wife and I moved to the eastern side of the Laredo Ranch subdivision in 2013. We purchased a home there with the intention of living out our retirement years in the peacefulness, quiteness, and darkness of this subdivision. The western option brings the proposed roadway very close to our subdivision which would significantly adversely alter the noise and light level for those residents living on the eastern side of our subdivision. Therefore I prefer the western option. Thank you.																			
94	Property Impacts	This W1B W1a is right in our backyard at Laredo Ranch. If it's the major thoroughfare you are envisioning, we will be subject to much noise and traffic. Obviously my vote is for 1A and 1B.	Y	Y	N	N															
95	Property Impacts	Please choose the EAST option as you come down through behind Castlegate and Laredo Ranch. It is a much better option and leaves the communities alone.																			
96	Property Impacts	I live in Laredo Ranch, the subdivision that one of the highlighted routes would run directly behind. I would object to that route and would much prefer the route that pushes it farther east. We moved to San Tan Valley for the dark night skies and rural atmosphere and general tranquility. Having an interstate behind us negates all of those things, and additionally will likely have a negative impact on our home's value. I appreciate being able to give my input on this matter. [REDACTED]																			
97	Property Impacts	We live within this community and do not want all the hustle and bustle. We moved here for peace and quiet .. KEEP the FREEWAY FAR away!			N	N															



No.	Topic	CommentText	General Support	Overall	Overall	Segment 1				Segment 2				Segment 3				Segment 4		
				Overall East	Overall West	E1a	E1b	W1a	W1b	E2a	E2b	W2a	W2b	E3a	E3b	E3c	E3d	W3	E4	W4
98	General	I am a resident of San Tan Valley and would like to request to that you use the Eastern Corridor in the 202 expansion project.	Y	Y																
99	General	I am a resident of San Tan Valley and would like to request to that you use the Eastern Corridor in the 202 expansion project.	Y	Y																
100	General	I am a resident of San Tan Valley and would like to request to that you use the Eastern Corridor in the 202 expansion project.	Y	Y																
101	General	I am a resident of San Tan Valley and would like to request to that you use the Eastern Corridor in the 202 expansion project.	Y	Y																
102	General	Use ALL EASTBOUND routes and NO NO NO West bound routes!!!	Y	Y	N	N				N					N		N			
103	General	Use existing interchange for connection to I-10														Y				
104	Connectivity	Prefer yellow alignment overall as it is more of a direct line to US 60. Less curves.														Y				
105	General	Prefer this alignment											Y	Y						
106	Connectivity	Prefer this alignment. Better access to Anthem neighborhood and better access to San Tan													Y					
107	General	Prefer yellow alignment. The purple alignment gets too close to the Florence highway.			Y	Y			y						y					
108	General	Prefer w1b alignment. Less right of way take along US60 and closer to Gold Canyon.				Y														
109	Property Impacts	Please consider the east corridor. We moved out here for the peace and quite and do not like the thoughts of having a freeway in our backyard!!																		
110	Property Impacts	this is too close to residential neighborhoods. it needs to be the purple in order to keep the noise further away from neighborhoods like Castlegate and Laredo Ranch. to be honest the eastern option is still to close. I should be moved further east at least a mile.		y	N	N														
111	Property Impacts	too close too castlegate subdivision. needs to be further east by 3 miles or more		y			y													
112	Property Impacts	I live in Laredo Ranch and I am appalled that this would be considered as an appropriate location. the primary focus should be on expanding Ironwood rd and opening Germann as a 4 lane expressway with turning lanes between Ellsworth and Ironwood rd			N	N														
113	Property Impacts	I don't not favor the west corridor option because it would butt right up and behind our neighborhood in Laredo Ranch. We moved out here to get away from all the noise and cars. By using the western option it defeats that. Please use the eastern option.		y																
114	Property Impacts	I am in favor of the eastern option as the western one butts right up and behind our homes. The noise and traffic would defeat the purpose of being rural. Please consider all the homeowners who bought rural and want rural and use the eastern corridor option.		y																
115	Traffic congestion Connectivity	I favor the west option/alignment because it would relieve a tremendous amount of congestion on Hunt Highway which is still a disaster despite the improvements. Lots of people who travel each day from down here connect at Sossaman or Rittenhouse going to/from work and the West alternative is by far the better choice and is supported by the areas of current/future growth the west alternate traverses.			Y	Y														
116	Traffic Congestion	The east alternates are all too far from developed communities to relieve any daily commuter traffic which is a problem right now. The east alternate is too long, ie miles, thus an eastern plan increases travel time and basically misses the areas that need relief. @ 40 Mil a mile for construction, it doesn't seem cost effective either.									N	N	N	N						
117	Economic Development	I favor the west route because looking at the large map, it just seems to make more sense. It appears to be more direct, goes through or closer to areas of population that you would want a road of this type to serve, and would bring traffic i.e. business and growth to those areas. It would foster growth in a more compact manner rather than encouraging 'urban sprawl' communities far to the east with vast expanses of land in between. People do not want to have to drive east to get on to a new road to drive north and then come back west again to drive into the valley. We already have Highway 79 for that from my area.																		
118	General	I prefer the East corridor over the West.																		
119	Property Impacts	I do NOT favor this plan that you want to put behind my neighborhood. Eastern corridor needs to be picked. You all need to really consider families and livestock etc. EASTERN CORRIDOR.																		
120	Traffic Congestion	As a resident of STV living in the Schepft and Ocotillo roads. this freeway would alleviate the horrible traffic situation we currently have and it would also benefit from future growth. i think the reason not many businesses are coming to stv is due to the road issues.																		



No.	Topic	CommentText	General Support	Overall	Overall	Segment 1				Segment 2				Segment 3				Segment 4		
				Overall East	Overall West	E1a	E1b	W1a	W1b	E2a	E2b	W2a	W2b	E3a	E3b	E3c	E3d	W3	E4	W4
121	General	Utilize the new TI Connection being constructed next year instead of creating a new TI further south on I-10.															y			
122	General	Utilize the new TI Connection being constructed next year instead of creating a new TI a few miles south on I-10.															y			
123	General	Utilize the new TI Connection being constructed next year instead of creating a new TI a few miles south on I-10.															y			
124	Property Impacts	This whole area on either side of Pima road is a very rural, agricultural residential area and is unlikely to change. That means there are lots of livestock and dogs in the area that get loose frequently. If Pima is connected to the freeway here, it will likely be widened into a larger roadway, drawing more traffic. This will increase the likelihood of serious accidents involving livestock and dogs. For that reason, I advocate for the E1b route, since that is the only one presented here that moves the freeway further to the east where it will be less likely to create traffic in this area.		Y																
125	Property Impacts	This proposal will come too close to many developments/subdivisions/housing for hundreds of full time residents. The more western route would be more desirable.	N	N																
126	Property Impacts	This route would be less impactful to the overall Superstition Mountain area and all of the existing residents, both full and part time, than the other proposed route.			Y															
127	Connectivity	I love the idea of having a freeway that will take traffic away from Ironwood Drive. I live in the Castlegate Community and think that a freeway entrance would be amazing to the east of us. It will definitely bring more people to the area and raise home values if it takes less time to get to us.			Y															
128	Connectivity	Im not sure if this is in the plans to connect to the 24, however I am in favor of this area connecting to the 24 which would allow access to the Chandler area and take traffic off of Ellsworth Rd to weave around to get to the housing developments over in this area. Connecting San Tan Valley to the 24 is something I believe needs to happen.																		
129	Connectivity	As a driver using I10 and using the SR 60 the easterly E3C E3A and the E1A and E1B would be the most advantageous. thank you	Y	Y			y				Y		Y							
130	Roadway Design	I favor this option because it keeps traffic more in a straight line.														Y				
131	Roadway Design	I like this because it is more of a straight line to the 60													Y					
132	Roadway Design	I like this route because it is more of a straight line			y															
133	Traffic congestion	I like this route to stay away from the Renaissance fair traffic.			Y															
134	Roadway Design	I would like this option if it were improved to ensure that there is adequate on/off ramps to be convenient for STV (Johnson Ranch/Copper Basin area specifically)																		
135	Roadway Design	I am all for keeping the road in as straight a line as possible. I used to live in Mesa and during the extension of the 202 Red Mountain Freeway across north Mesa the planners for some reason put in back to back "s" curves just east of Country Club Drive. All these do is cause considerable back ups on the freeway as drivers insist on slowing down 10 - 15 MPH in order to navigate these curves. Had they gone straight across and placed adequate connections to the 101 the traffic would flow much smoother through the area.															Y			
136	Roadway Design	This is a much better place to have the interchange with the US-60. Allows for better access (more lanes of on/off ramp) due to openness around the interchange site.	Y	y		y														
137	Connectivity	Why not continue this out farther east toward Florence Junction and then turn south and run the freeway to the east of Florence and the mountains to the south connecting with the 10 around Red Rock (almost following the red dotted line marking the survey site)? Seems like a more open path with less developed land to acquire meaning less costly. Also can potentially have wider initial Right of Way for future expansion.																		
138	Connectivity Traffic congestion	This seems like a silly detour just to come closer to Florence. As I stated elsewhere, keep the road as straight as possible in order to minimize traffic slowing and the associated congestion.									n		N							
139	General	If having to choose between the 2 options presented I would certainly favor the West option as it seems the more direct N-S route while choosing to intersect with the 60 farther East. One thing that would really be beneficial would be to include the proposed interchanges along the way. This would make a great difference in how the pathways are viewed.																		



No.	Topic	CommentText	General Support	Overall	Overall	Segment 1				Segment 2				Segment 3				Segment 4		
				Overall East	Overall West	E1a	E1b	W1a	W1b	E2a	E2b	W2a	W2b	E3a	E3b	E3c	E3d	W3	E4	W4
140	Environmental Property Impacts	This is WAY too close to Laredo Ranch! It would bring too much noise & light pollution! It's a totally unreasonable location. The road should be farther away from existing homes!			N	N														
141	Economic Development Connectivity	I prefer EB1 alternative to provide a better connection to the EW future developments in the northern parts of the community		Y																
142	General	The outline of purple seems to be on the state lands pieces more than anything and is enough distance from any residential areas. The orange lines seem in close proximity to the existing loop 202																		
143	Property Impacts	This is too close to homes. Please do not put the freeway here, so many brand new homes just built and it would cause a lot of noise, destruction and decrease home values. Please use the Eastern route instead. Give people a chance to choose if they live next to a freeway or not.			N	N														
144	Property Impacts	Too close to homes. Please use the purple route and keep property values in tact.			N	N														
145	Connectivity	It would be nice to have access from STV to Gold Canyon.	Y	Y																
146	General	I prefer this route - western segment 4															y			
147	General	At one time, ADOT had plans to relocate Hyw 60 farther south of Gold Canyon to handle the renaissance festival traffic. I even remember seeing some engineered plans from some past environmental studies. It seems to me that this North South DEIS should include that work in some fashion so they both are at least coordinated. Thank you.																		
148	Connectivity Economic Development	I favor this option because it would give us all another way to head towards the PHX area. currently, we are dealing with two outlets. Ironwood and other side roads. This could also bring more businesses to STV.			y	y														
149	Connectivity	I favor this option because it will connect with the SR24 to the 202. we just need more ways to leave STV for our commutes to Mesa, Gilbert, PHX, Chandler.																		
150	General	Connect e Bella Vista to orange highway. San Tan Valley is growing very fast and closet highway is the 60. This would make it faster to get in/out of town, attract more businesses and residents to up and coming towns.	Y																	
151	General	Why not just convert hwy 79 into the corridor, and have 24 meet somewhere north of the communities. Keep that Fwy far away from my house! E1b if you have to.		Y																
152	Property Impacts	As a resident of the Castlegate Community near Ocotillo and Schnepf Rd, I would prefer NOT to have a freeway, parkway, or any other giant road, right on top of my neighbors' back yards. I do not want to smell, hear or see it every time I walk outside. Noise and light pollution are things I do NOT miss about living closer to Phoenix. Please go with the purple route, NOT the yellow.																		
153	Connectivity Traffic congestion	I would like to recommend a connecting road going east from this point to connect with HWY 60 at Peralta Trail. The road would improve traffic flow through Gold Canyon allowing for an alternative route to HWY60. Traffic on HWY 60 has become increasingly congested. This has been especially important for medical emergencies. Especially now with the additional traffic from the new Peralta Trail communities in development and the annual special event, there will be more frequent bottlenecks due to HWY 60 being the only east/ west bound access.	y	y	y															
154	Economic Development Traffic Congestion Connectivity	I'm concerned with how far east both of these options are. The vast majority of San Tan Valley lives between Ellsworth and the Johnson Ranch area just south of Ganzels end point. A freeway 5 miles east won't help the majority of people, yea it helps to develop the further south area that hasn't been developed because of that, but it doesn't relieve the traffic issues that current residents have. A freeway down Ironwood/Ganzel then tailing out towards the Anthem area would be helpful to everyone.			Y															
155	Environmental Property Impacts	Please keep this away from our homes, we are in Crestfield Manor and would like to think that the committee that decides the route will take in to consideration that we do not need to be breathing fumes and experience more dirt and dust from this corridor. Environmental studies should include quality of life for humans.									Y		Y							
156	General	W1a to W2a to W3 to E4 Gold Canyon is too far out of the way. Make sure Hwy 24 comes all of the way east from the 202.			Y				Y						Y		Y			



No.	Topic	CommentText	General Support	Overall	Overall	Segment 1				Segment 2				Segment 3				Segment 4		
				Overall East	Overall West	E1a	E1b	W1a	W1b	E2a	E2b	W2a	W2b	E3a	E3b	E3c	E3d	W3	E4	W4
157	Property Impacts	The west corridor as it moves south from this point runs adjacent to existing rural properties. This is bound to cause issues for folks with livestock. I think it's generally a far better move to keep the corridor in state trust land where there hasn't been development yet to minimize its impact on existing property owners. Keep this corridor as far east as feasible. If the intent is to connect to 24, the most northerly "purple" path (E1b?) would be the one with the least impact.		Y																
158	Property Impacts	Route W1a and W1b displace several existing homes. There are also new homes being built in this neighborhood. E1a and E1b would be a better choice for this reason.	Y	Y	N	N														
159	Property Impacts Economic development	I feel that this route impacts the least amount of residences and farmland. It also provides the opportunity for commercial property around the freeways and hopefully to help keep too much additional traffic from entering private non county maintained residential roads.									Y	Y	Y	Y						
160	General	going with e1b,E1a and then E2a,E3d3b on down through E3dE3band E3aE3c is the best route for the flow of traffic and the least damaging to property owners.	Y	Y			Y				Y	Y	Y	Y						
161	Property Impacts	This is going to take away already existing homes and be to close to the homes in this area. I moved to this area to get away from the city and freeways I do not want this in my backyard. I'm all for helping with traffic but keep it away from homes. We are in the country for a reason. I truly don't understand this freeway at this time there are other areas of concern such as ironwood and we need more east west bound streets off of ironwood drive. Please take into consideration the reason we bought homes with acreage away from the city don't bring the city to me with freeways come population and unwanted traffic and crime.																		
162	Property Impacts	The W proposed route appears to encroach upon existing homes and housing. We made the choice to move to a rural area away from the traffic and issues of freeways and similar thoroughfares. This route brings these exact issues into or back yard. There are options that should be explored without encroaching on existing homes and living areas. Please consider other options of traffic control. I am not in favor of either of these routes as currently presented																		
163	General	For starters...I'd like to see the proposed new roads on a CURRENT MAP. You say this proposed map is from 2014...Eastmark and all the other new communities are not showing current. That might help us with our comments.																		
164	Property Impacts	It would be ingenious to move this part about a mile east so that the value of the 3 houses of which I live in one and others are income don't loose value. The home I am in is still upside down from the rest of the world of greedy idiots and downfall of economy. The part I talk of is Ocitillo and Schnepfs area showing west of CAP next to the Castlegate homes. There is room east of CAP and more intellegant to do that. Thank you so much. Your participating TAX paying house owner who gives a damn that people think and use their brains and abilities to do right, sure engineers can figure it out they are smart too. Please use your intellegance to do same all through project to keep a mile or more from established houses that people work so hard for. The big walls help but not that well. Used to live in Scottsdale when 101 went in uggggh. Thanks again TAX paying house owner. [REDACTED]			N	N														
165	Property Impacts	The proximity of this option will damage property values and the rural setting of neighboring homes. Locating the highway East of the CAP canal would allow the surrounding land to develop with the knowledge ore existence of a highway vs dropping it on existing homes. Will it is of benefit to the region i think that this option comes at the expense of those forced to be extremely close to the highway.			N	N														
166	Property Impacts	This is the areas preferred route by the people in this area. There is no need to place it by houses when it can be here. Building on quail run is to close to existing homes. Build in the vacant area!	Y	Y																
167	General	My preference would be the most westerly route as it comes closest to the most geographically populated areas and also it stays away from the mountains and the foothills.																		
168	Traffic congestion	New to San Tan Valley this year and I love the grow and the area, but the biggest downer has been the traffic in and out. We are in need of highways and more roads. It makes our friends and family not want to deal with it as well, please build more roads:)																		
169	General	I like this route it seems the most direct and impact on existing residences and businesses seems acceptable.													Y					
170	General	I don't favor this route because it cuts through planned future growth of the Town of Florence.									N		N							



No.	Topic	CommentText	General Support	Overall	Overall	Segment 1				Segment 2				Segment 3				Segment 4		
				Overall East	Overall West	E1a	E1b	W1a	W1b	E2a	E2b	W2a	W2b	E3a	E3b	E3c	E3d	W3	E4	W4
171	Connectivity	I favor this route because it is the least invasive to planned future growth of Florence yet still gives good access to residents of both the downtown area and Anthem areas of Florence. It is also the most direct route to US 60.										Y		Y						
172	General	It would be really nice to see an extension off of W1a/b into STV. Might alleviate much of the commute traffic thru QC.			Y	Y														
173	Connectivity	I want us to establish a major transportation HUB Just north of Arizona Farms road where the rail takes a turn south to Tucson or north to Phoenix. Linking the North-South with the rail line from Tucson to Phoenix, would show great vision to all the people needs. Once in our life we can make a great move forward.			Y	Y														
174	General	I like w1a & w1b. Keep the road close to the canal and the future city of San Tan Valley			Y	Y														
175	Property Impacts	Many of these houses are new builds, we moved out here for the rural feel PLEASE DO NOT build the freeway here. Please put it on the other side of the CAP canal where there are no houses.			N	N														
176	Property Impacts	Many of these homes are new builds and we moved out here to enjoy the rural feel and peaceful surroundings. PLEASE DO NOT build the freeway here removing all these homes. Please put it on the other side of the CAP canal where it won't affects homes and families.			N	N														
177	Property Impacts	In looking at your map I find that the Yellow track is not an appropriate place for a freeway. The purple track although not perfect and could probably be improved would have less impact on homes and communities. Even the connections into Apache Junction are less intrusive on the purple one. I think community support will be much higher with the purple placement. The Yellow route will cause unnecessary expense to fight the communities that will oppose this.			N	N														
178	Property Impacts	I feel that the yellow route doesn't make sense for the benefit of the San Tan Valley community. It negatively affects many communities and will displace families. The purple route makes more sense and doesn't remove as many houses.			N	N														
179	Property Impacts	I don't understand why you need to put the freeway so close to neighborhoods and houses when there is so much empty desert land near by. Please consider placing the freeway in the empty desert areas so that there will be room for commercial property and proper city amenities.																		
180	Traffic congestion	don't see what the lines mean--ie--dotted red line--purple line etc--my main concern will the route impact Gold Canyon--will it help relieve the congestion that exists now and will get worse with the 700 new homes in Peralta Canyon--does the plan include a bypass around Gold Canyon--thanks [REDACTED]																		
181	General	I select the PURPLE route. I don't live in DanTan yet but my fiancé does and we will both be affected by this.																		
182	Traffic congestion	I prefer this route because of Ironwood Rd. is already there and a high traffic artery for the Queen Creek/San Tan Valley area.			Y															
183	Traffic congestion Connectivity	the E1a route for SR24 would make the biggest impact on reducing traffic and give more access to the freeway for those in the Queen Creek/San Tan Valley area.	Y																	
184	General	The W1a & W1b route here makes the bigger positive impact for accessibility to those who would use it.			Y	Y														
185	General	W2a will be the better route to continue on from W1a & W1b			Y	Y			Y											
186	General	W3 is a more direct route to the I-10, therefore the preferable route.													Y					
187	General	W4 should be the route because of the existing highway that should be easily converted to allow for more traffic.															Y			
188	General	I am glad that there will be a North South Corridor but I would prefer it to be more east of our area. Can you please send more information.	Y	Y	N	N														
189	General	better route not too close to home	Y																	
190	Property Impacts	right on my back yard ,way to close would take the rural setting away			N	N														



No.	Topic	CommentText	General Support	Overall	Overall	Segment 1				Segment 2				Segment 3				Segment 4		
				Overall East	Overall West	E1a	E1b	W1a	W1b	E2a	E2b	W2a	W2b	E3a	E3b	E3c	E3d	W3	E4	W4
191	Connectivity	I prefer the W1/W1a, W2a, W3, W4 route. It seems like the quickest and most convenient route for connecting the east valley to the I10. Sidetracking to Florence and Gold Canyon is too far out of the way for most people trying to get to the I10 from QC, S.T.V, East Mesa, Etc and vice versa.			Y				Y						Y		Y			
192	General	Please explain the red dotted line running through San Tan Valley. This is the only N/S corridor that I see that will benefit residence in the 85142-85143 zips.																		
193	Property Impacts Environmental	Please consider using the E1a/b route. Many of us moved out to East San Tan Valley to avoid light pollution and traffic noise. Both will increase if the W1a/b route is chosen. Many of the residents in the area also have livestock which will be negatively impacted by the auto emissions. The E1a/b route will alleviate this problem and utilize the undeveloped land. Thank you for your consideration!	Y	Y		N	N													
194	Property Impacts	Please don't build the freeway along the "yellow" route. It veers so close to established neighborhoods. The "purple" route provides the crucial north/south route without less encroaching on the existing community.																		
195	Property Impacts	I am not in favor of option W1b,w1a. I live right where this would go through. I don't want to be forced to look at or listen to a freeway from my home. I don't want my property value to suffer. Please don't ruin my quiet neighborhood.				N	N													
196	Property Impacts	I oppose the W1b and W1a location as this would turn my silent, relaxing country home into a polluted and noisy house. I enjoy coming home to silence and hearing the relaxing sound of frogs and crickets summer nights as I stargaze. This freeway would destroy my lifestyle. Please reconsider moving this freeway further east.				N	N													
197	Property Impacts	I favor the purple route. I think it would benefit the meat by communities and not decrease property values. I dont like the yellow route, it is way too close to homes which would decrease property values and displace families.																		
198	Property Impacts	I would like it if at this juncture the proposed roadway be as far to the east as possible. The west most proposed route is far too close to my back door for my liking.	Y	Y	N	N														
199	Property Impacts	I'm concerned with the proximity this has to the neighborhood here and to the north. I believe the option that is a bit to the east would still benefit everyone and give the existing neighborhoods the space they are asking for .	N			N	N													
200	Environmental	The noise and light pollution will be terrible if it is this close to my house. Honestly, having the highway on the otherside of the canal, or really just going with the option in purple, would make a world if difference for my property value, my peace of mind with traffic and safety, and all the pollution. Everyone bought houses out here to be away from living next door to a highway. Yes it is needed, not not on the west side of the canal! Build the eastern route that is purple!				N	N													
201	Property Impacts	I do not favor this option due to its proximity to my home. Our home value will decrease and the noise, sound and air pollution is detrimental to our neighborhood and our children.				N	N													
202	Property Impacts	I would not like the freeway here. I would like it better if it was on the east side of the CAP. I moved out this far in order to get away from traffic. I know things change but there are a lot less hous s on the east side				N	N													
203	Connectivity	I feel that this route will be able to connect to the 202. I would prefer this route over the other																		
204	General	I do not prefer this route as it seems more indirect with the southern heading nature and goal of the project.		N																
205	General	I didnt vote cuz couldnt read the map,but i think you should do the further east proposal,for it would be further from my residence,thanks do not use sierra vista,i ride my horse that way.																		
206	General	I favor this because we don't have to go east and south to Florence			Y	Y			Y											
207	General	Please consider moving farther east of san tan valley with the project to bring a freeway closer to florence/coolidge																		
208	Property Impacts	YES! This where you are not disturbing current communities from the day to day life.		Y																
209	Property Impacts	I am not in favor of proposed route W1 a or W2b. It is way too close to existing housing developments. I would rather see E1 as an option. Still close enough to access, but far enough so noise, pollution and excess traffic near a family oriented neighborhood can be lessened	Y		N	N														



No.	Topic	CommentText	General Support	Overall	Overall	Segment 1				Segment 2				Segment 3				Segment 4		
				Overall East	Overall West	E1a	E1b	W1a	W1b	E2a	E2b	W2a	W2b	E3a	E3b	E3c	E3d	W3	E4	W4
210	Property Impacts	I am all in for more highways and freeways in the area. I am just hoping that they don't get built anywhere near houses. We don't want freeways/highways in our backyards a mile or two away is just fine																		
211	Property Impacts	I would like to see any freeway go to the East side of the CAP out into empty desert as far as possible so that there is not freeway right in our backyards. Thank you!																		
212	Traffic Congestion	there needs to be some kind of freeway connection over to this area to be able to safely get around and not have to deal with the crazy traffic in this area caused by the mass amount of homes built with no major connections to any freeway. currently your only options are ironwood or Ellsworth rd. which both are a ways away from each other.																		
213	Property Impacts	Please as Far East as we can. I moved away from the freeway 12 yrs ago for a reason.																		
214	General	use corridor e1a	Y																	
215	General	Preferred Route-W1A, (W1A,W1B), E2B, (E2A, E2B), (E3A, E3C), (E3A, E3B), E4			Y	Y	Y	Y			Y	Y	Y			Y				
216	Property Impacts Environmental	I, along with many community members, disapprove of the yellow map displayed on the map (w1a and w1b). I am very disheartened to see that there is a potential highway planned so close to an equestrian lifestyle neighborhood. 1. Most of us live out here because we want to stay out of the hustle and bustle of the city. 2. We like our peace and quiet. 3. This highway will significantly upset our equestrian lifestyle we live. 4. The noise and traffic will disrupt and stress our animals. 5. We want to keep the neighborhood with a rural lifestyle feel to it. The community is outraged with seeing the audacity of even considering a highway so close to our equestrian neighborhoods. Please DO NOT even consider it!!!			N	N														
217	Property Impacts	I 100% disapprove this highway route!!!! It is significantly close to neighborhoods and homes that value their peace and quiet. We also value our lifestyle that we live with animals. This area is inhabited by individuals that not happy about having a highway so close to our farms. We want to be left out of the chaos of the masses and wish to maintain our farm and equestrian lifestyles.			N	N														
218	Property Impacts	I think the option of the E (more Eastern route) is crucial. It keeps the road away from the homes that have already been built in what has been a more rural area. There is nothing but desert for the eastern route but puts it right behind neighborhoods, including our own. We already have Ironwood running north and south close enough in that area. Move the traffic to the east and it will flow much better!																		
219	General	The yellow line looks like the best route to me.																		
220	General	To be honest, I'll be incredibly happy with any of the alignments in section 1. I live off of Ocotillo in San Tan Valley, and we are in serious need of alternate North/South commuter routes. I think the easternmost option might create the least amount of criticism, but I think that further west would be better for the growth and development of the community overall due to the increase of commercial and business development that a corridor would bring.	Y	Y	Y	Y														
221	General	Great idea! It cuts down on the commute time by getting you to the freeway earlier.			Y															
222	Connectivity	I think that this Western option is the most direct and ultimately best for the community as a whole. I lived in copper basin subdivision for 10 years before moving up to Ocotillo, and this would be good for commutes and for the local economy.			Y	Y														
223	Property Impacts	This proposed route will have a negative impact on the adjacent properties of Laredo Ranch and Castlegate committees. The "E" route would be better as it is in undeveloped b desert.			N	N														
224	General	From north to south I propose the route should follow the following path: W1A; W1A, W1B; E2B; E2A, E2B; E3A, E3C; E3A, E3B; E4			Y	Y	Y	Y			Y	Y	Y			Y				
225	General	my choices would be: W1A; W1A, WAB; E2B; E2A, E2B; E3A, E3C; E3A, E3B; E4 TO MY PERSONAL OPINION THIS CONFIGURATION WOULD CREATE THE BEST FLOW OF TRAFFIC, WHILE KEEPING CURRENT INFRASTRUCTURE USABLE AND HAVE THE WIDEST "FEED" INTO THIS FREEWAY.			Y	Y		Y			Y	Y	Y			Y				
226	Traffic Congestion Connectivity	This placement would benefit the traffic laden community of San Tan Valley. The population of over 100,000 has not benefited from any major road improvements for decades. There are working people that need quicker access to multi-lane highways and freeways. Please listen to the voice of the people that need their voice heard.	Y	Y																



			Overall	Overall	Segment 1				Segment 2				Segment 3				Segment 4			
No.	Topic	CommentText	General Support	Overall East	Overall West	E1a	E1b	W1a	W1b	E2a	E2b	W2a	W2b	E3a	E3b	E3c	E3d	W3	E4	W4
227	General	Preferred Placement			Y	Y														
228	General	Route W1a would help this area far more than E1a. The tie in to the 24 would allow easier access to the valley.			Y															
229	General	Staying with W1a here will probably take a huge burden off of Ironwood travelers that clog that street every day.			Y	Y														
230	Environmental Property Impacts	With my home right here, how will The the noise from the traffic be handled?																		
231	Property Impacts	I am absolutely against the West corridor. There are many new homes and various communities (Laredo Ranch and Castlegate) that will be negatively affected by going with the West option. Please go with the East corridor option!			N	N			N	N					N		N			
232	General	Segment 1 completely bypasses San Tan Valley which has sever traffic problems and has the largest population of any part of the study area. It renders this freeway useless to over 100,000 people that it could have helped if a more western alignment had been chosen from the original options. The people of San Tan Valley are being under served for the sole benefit of Florence a town of roughly 30,000 people. It is taxation without representation! You can do better than let corrupt politicians guide your decisions for their personal gain and not help improve the lives of the most tax payers as possible; which, AZDOT is supposed to serve.																		
233	Connectivity	This route is best at this location. It will become the corridor that connects the state through the east valley, but does not create a traffic issue by going over the top of Ironwood Rd. and will allow for freeway on and off ramps that connect to the blossoming community of San Tan Valley. The other route does not allow for that option at this time, because the CAP canal is a natural barrier to the wonderful corridor.				Y														
234	General	The proposed N/S Corridor should then follow this route, as to not break up the communities of Anthem, Magic Ranch, Wildhorse Estates and Crestfield Manor any further.										Y		Y						
235	Property Impacts	Too close to homes!!! Property values may drop dramatically from having the freeway right in the back yard of most of these homes! Not far enough away!			N	N														
236	Property Impacts	Please do not consider placing your north/south corridor so close to Laredo Ranch! There is empty land further east that would serve the same purpose without the disruption of noise, light, and pollution directly next to our homes.			N	N														
237	Property Impacts	My husband and I prefer the option to the far right. It is away from present housing developments and would lessen the noise that will surely be generated by the freeway.																		
238	General	I prefer the west route because it is more direct and will have less interchanges. The east route seems to gerrymander to create unnecessary interchanges, incentivize speculative rezoning, leading to increased arterial road (local) traffic congestion.																		
239	General	Would like to see an easy exit/access for county employees working at the old county courthouse complex (off Butte, between Pinal & Florence roads).									Y		Y							
240	General	Would like to see an easy exit/access for those of us living in these developments (i.e. Castlegate) and often traveling through Florence & Coolidge.			Y	Y														
241	General	Pulling the corridor out this far East seems unnecessary.		N																
242	General	Pulling the corridor out this far East seems unnecessary.		N																
243	General	sorry - comment placed off roadway in error.																		
244	General	This path is useless. A lot of commuters would benefit more from the other path that goes closer into Florence.										N		N						
245	General	This path makes more sense.			Y															
246	General	This path makes good sense for Coolidge traffic only.													Y					
247	General	This path makes good sense for Florence traffic only.																		
248	General	Can 2 paths be made? One goes to Florence and the other to Coolidge?																		
249	General	Is this the connection to the 24?																		



No.	Topic	CommentText	General Support	Overall	Overall	Segment 1				Segment 2				Segment 3				Segment 4		
				Overall East	Overall West	E1a	E1b	W1a	W1b	E2a	E2b	W2a	W2b	E3a	E3b	E3c	E3d	W3	E4	W4
250	Traffic Congestion	the intersection of Ironwood and I-60 is already a nightmare. There are three lanes exiting heading east. When traveling south on Ironwood, the two right lanes should be designated RIGHT TURN ONLY since 90% of exiting traffic is heading south. Only one lane is needed to head north. MANY times the south bound traffic is backed up on the 60 and is dangerous. If you are using Ironwood as a connection for the southbound freeway to the I-10 south of Coolidge, the present lanes are too few to handle the already existing traffic trying to get on the 60 to head westbound. I've seen traffic backed up to Guadalupe with traffic trying to get in the turning lane (a single lane) to head west on the 60. A new bridge was built to head to the 60 on Ironwood but is already not wide enough and a minimum of two lanes turning left is needed. This is 90% of the traffic. It might be better if this new freeway crossed on a 45 degree NW angle before it gets to the 60 and make a connection. The intersection should be on ramp going westbound and off ramp going east bound only.																		
251	Traffic Congestion	I favor this starting location near Goldfield Road because it helps alleviate the flow around Gold Canyon to avoid the traffic lights and other slow downs that were installed in this area	Y	Y		Y														
252	Property Impacts	I do not favor this location because it is right next to my house.			N	N														
253	Connectivity	I like this alignment because it sets up connection US60 and AZ79 junction nicely.		Y																
254	Roadway Design	The interchange here would be best. Then it should follow the E3b & d route.					Y					Y		Y						
255	General	The freeway should go through San Tan Valley. That way people can get on and off of it at different points on their journey. If it is out in the desert, then it won't be the the desired thoroughfare to Tucson through the east valley that you desire.				Y														
256	Environmental Property Impacts	The more eastern route is better. I prefer the one that loops away from the rural areas as iy will leave more room on each side for business etc as a buffer for noise.	Y																	
257	Economic Development	Prefer this route cause need to route to the other side of the canal out there. The farther east of the canal also allows for growth on both sides of the freeway.		y																
258	General	Staying easy is best.	y	y																
259	Property Impacts	You need to run this north/south bullshit as far away from community homes/farms as possible. This is SUCH a travesty! Shame on you Pinal!																		
260	Environmental Property Impacts	I'd prefer to have the roadway as far as possible from the housing developments. It's a selling point that things are quiet here, let's not ruin it with road noise and pollution. Living closer to major roadways increases health risks.		Y																
261	Property Impacts	I favor E1b over W1b and W1a because it keeps the road farther away from neighborhoods. Nobody wants to live next to a highway. It's not clear if the orange and purple routes are alternatives to each other.		Y	N	N														
262	Property Impacts	Option W1a is preferable as it stays further east of the housing areas.			Y															
263	Connectivity	The Easterly routes are also preferable because they would allow access from Ironwood, which would better serve the area.																		
264	Property Impacts	I favor this option because it will not go directly behind the back yard of my home!	Y	Y																
265	Property Impacts	I prefer the Eastern route for the North-South corridor because it will not depreciate the value of many homes directly next to the path of the proposed Western route of the Corridor. There is no need to build this roadway directly next to established neighborhoods and homes that have been there years before this roadway. The proposed Eastern route will increase the value of many homes, whereas the proposed western route will depreciate the value of many homes. That in turn will hurt the economy of the area of San Tan Valley.																		
266	Property Impacts	I do NOT favor this option because it is way too close to homes.			N	N														
267	Property Impacts	I do NOT favor this option because there is no need to build the roadway right over a neighborhood and gold club.			N															
268	Property Impacts	I prefer this option because it is a much better route since it is not built over a neighborhood and gold club.	Y	Y		Y														
269	General	I recommend route: W1A; W1A, W1B; E2B; 2A, E2B; E3B, E3D; E3A, E3B; E4; Thanks!			Y	Y	Y	Y			Y	Y		Y		Y				



No.	Topic	CommentText	General Support	Overall	Overall	Segment 1				Segment 2				Segment 3				Segment 4		
				Overall East	Overall West	E1a	E1b	W1a	W1b	E2a	E2b	W2a	W2b	E3a	E3b	E3c	E3d	W3	E4	W4
270	General	The route that my family and I would like to see is: W1A; W1A,W1B; E2B; E2A,E2B; E3B,E3D; E3A,E3B; E4			Y	Y	Y	Y			Y	Y		Y		Y				
271	General	This will be an amazing addition to our community, can't wait for the this road to built. I think the best route for our community will be. w1a; w1a,w1b; e2b; e2a,e2b; e3b,e3d; e3a,e3b; e4. I hope this information makes since.... thanks!			Y	Y	Y	Y			Y	Y		Y						
272	General	All i have heard about this area is complaining from these people, who would prefer to annexed into Queen Creek. Instead of being part of STV if they want that let them don't seem to care about anything or anybody else.																		
273	General	It seems that there is a lot of back stabbing or pushing of one type to not get this on the ballot for next year. Like trying to throw a wrench into the works by saying thing that haven't been proven true in any shape or form. Some it seems was trying to stop both groups working towards the final end of incorporation.																		
274																				
275	General	This way					Y	Y												
276	General	My family and I would like to see the route as follows W1A / W1A, W1B / E2B / E2A, E2B / E3B, E3D / E3A, E3B / E4 Thank you.			Y	Y	Y	Y				Y		Y		Y				
277	Economic Development Connectivity	As so appropriately identified by the Arizona Department of Transportation, it is critical for the North-South Corridor to accommodate anticipated growth in the area and across the region; to improve access to future activity and population centers; and improve regional connectivity. Of the proposed alternative corridor options, the Western Corridor 1a most effectively meets those goals.			Y	Y														
278	Property Impacts Traffic Congestion	I understand the need for a better flow of traffic in these areas, hopefully with something in place it will lessen some of the traffic that I have to fight today for Johnson ranch, magic ranch. My concern is the impact to my property value, and the impact to my quality of life which includes horses and the ability to ride my horses. My hope is that all of that is taken into consideration so that we are not impacted as there really is no place for us to go and move to....																		
279	General	Below please find my preferred route for the North-South Corridor: W1A; W1A, W1B; E2B; E2A, E2B; E3A, E3C; E3A, E3B; E4 Thank you for your consideration. Josh Bagley			Y	Y	Y	Y			Y	Y	Y			Y				
280	General	From North to South I recommend this route: W1A; W1A, W1B; E2B; E2A, E2B; E3B, E3D; E3A, E3B; E4 The sooner the better! It is much needed!			Y	Y	Y	Y			Y	Y		Y		Y				
281	property impacts	Adamantly Opposed ----- I moved my family to this area in 1999 for the sole purpose of getting away from the traffic, housing, and commotion. We have spent a great deal of time, money, and resources to overcome the added commutes for work, school, and play. It is infuriating that a roadway of this scale is now proposed to be placed literally in my back yard. I get that nobody wants something like this near them, but to the east of my property is wide open state land, better yet improve 79, this proposal is not wanted, not necessary, and poorly planned, please redirect and at the very least keep the neighborhood informed on any movement well in advance so we have the opportunity to weigh in and be involved.	N	N																
282	Property Impacts	Farther east is better. I don't want a freeway in the backyard of my rural community.	Y	Y																
283	Property Impacts	We do not want this with it being this close to our rural community.	N	N	N	N														
284	General	I would like to recommend the following route for the new North-South Corridor: W1A; W1A, W1B; E2B; E2A, E2B; E3B, E3D; E3A, E3B; E4 Thank you!! - [REDACTED]			Y	Y	Y	Y			Y	Y		Y		Y				
285	General	Here's my route input for the North-South Corridor Study. I recommend route: W1A; W1A, W1B; E1A; E1B, E1A; E3B, E3D; E3A, E3B; E4.	Y	Y	Y	Y					Y	Y		Y		Y				
286	General	I'd prefer the W3 route as it is closer to the larger populated areas of STV and Coolidge.													Y					



No.	Topic	CommentText	General Support	Overall	Overall	Segment 1				Segment 2				Segment 3				Segment 4		
				Overall East	Overall West	E1a	E1b	W1a	W1b	E2a	E2b	W2a	W2b	E3a	E3b	E3c	E3d	W3	E4	W4
287	Property Impacts Economic development	I favor a route as far east as possible. Over time development could fill in and the eastern route could be part of a circular traffic plan around the eventual community. Furthermore, if further east you would not unnecessarily disrupt the life style of current residents with property closer to Ironwood.									Y		Y							
288	Environmental	Segment W1a is situated west of the CAP canal, which is an existing constraint to east-west wildlife movement in the area. When compared to Segments W1b, E1a, and E1b, which are situated east of the CAP canal, the segment to the west would result in fewer impacts to terrestrial wildlife movement through the area, and less overall habitat fragmentation.			Y															
289	Environmental	The western segment, W4, is expected to have fewer overall impacts to wildlife and wildlife resources. Much of Segment W4 would expand the existing State Route 87, whereas agricultural lands with small dirt farm roads comprise the eastern route E4. The eastern segment is closer to the native habitats and open spaces to the east of the corridor, including the Picacho Reservoir; there is a higher likelihood that the eastern route would indirectly affect the adjacent open space through noise, lighting, and air quality, etc., as well as limiting opportunities for recreationists to access the open space															Y			
290	Environmental	The Arizona Game and Fish Department owns and manages a portion of the Picacho Reservoir lands along with the Bureau of Land Management (BLM), and the Arizona State Land Department (ASLD). Historically, this reservoir has provided excellent habitat for wildlife, including waterfowl. It has been a popular destination for birding, fishing, and hunting. This should be considered a 4(f) property, and indirect effects to wildlife within the Reservoir must be considered.																		
291	Traffic Congestion	Would like to see the exit off the 60 more to the East to avoid adding more traffic to Ironwood which is already congested																		
292	Economic Development	Moving traffic to the East would allow accessibility to growth in the area and usability by the growing community																		
293	Economic Development	Moving traffic to the East would allow accessibility to growth in the area and usability by the growing community																		
294	General	Map is difficult to read and understand relationship to the existing roads, but I would like to see it moved to the East as this would be a better route.																		
295	General	Growth is moving into the area. Traffic is already heavy. I would like to see traffic Planning that takes into account for future traffic needs.																		
296	Environmental	I am against any North-South Corridor that will be routed through "high value habitat" as identified by AZGFD.  As long as they won't impact any "high value habitat" as defined by AZGFD, I am for: Segment 1: W1b Segment 2: W2a Segment 3: W3 Segment 4: E4 as they create the most direct route.				y			y						y	y				
297	Connectivity Roadway Design	I favor the eastern route because it provides a new roadway, with existing state hwy 87 carrying local traffic and acting as an alternative in the event of accidents on the North South Corridor. It also saves money by not requiring a grade separation over the existing railroad.														Y				
298	Economic Development	I prefer this location because of the planned Westcor Mall project that includes a \$30 million development agreement to fund the connecting overpasses and related public infrastructure.									y	y								
299	Economic Development	I prefer this route because the local property owners have been planning for the freeway and will provide resources to help develop this portion of the corridor.									y	y	y	y						
300	Property Impacts	This route will not impact the existing single family home that are adjacent to the western route.														y				
301	Economic Development	I prefer this eastern route because it will provide many jobs through the planned inland port, and not negatively impact the existing prisons located on the western route, and their access to existing AZ hwy 87.														Y				
302	Property Impacts	I prefer the easternmost route because it provides the most benefit to Coolidge and has the least negative impact to existing houses and planned subdivisions.																		



No.	Topic	CommentText	General Support	Overall	Overall	Segment 1				Segment 2				Segment 3				Segment 4		
				Overall East	Overall West	E1a	E1b	W1a	W1b	E2a	E2b	W2a	W2b	E3a	E3b	E3c	E3d	W3	E4	W4
303	General	I am in support of the furthest west route closest to Coolidge. It is the most direct route.																		
304	General	I would support the route closest to Coolidge.																		
305	General	Go as close to Coolidge as possible																		

*This page is intentionally left blank.*