Appendix A – Remainder Parcel Site Maps

The shaded area in the parcel site maps represents the remainder parcel area outside of the ROW footprint analyzed in the FEIS/ROD. The scale of the site maps varies based on the size and extent of the parcels.
## Area 1 – I-10 commercial properties

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ADOT Parcel No.</th>
<th>Owner’s Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7-05933</td>
<td>ADOT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-10600</td>
<td>ADOT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-10612</td>
<td>ADOT - Martinez</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-10784</td>
<td>ADOT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-10906</td>
<td>ADOT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-11323</td>
<td>ADC-Ridge at Sun Valley, LLC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-11426</td>
<td>Azejm Land Holdings LLC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-11438</td>
<td>Blue Beacon International Inc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-11459</td>
<td>Copper State Rubber of Arizona</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-11476</td>
<td>Denio’s Roseville Farmers Market and Auction, Inc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-11484</td>
<td>Dolphin Inc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-11500</td>
<td>59 NKW Properties LLC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-11515</td>
<td>Gp Southwest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-11523</td>
<td>Ampj Hospitality Inc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-11542</td>
<td>JGZ Properties I LLC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-11634</td>
<td>JMD Hospitality, LLC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-11669</td>
<td>Ryder Truck Rental Inc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-11691</td>
<td>SJW Land Company</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-11696</td>
<td>Southwest Village Apartments LLC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-11731</td>
<td>West Valley Storage Solutions LLC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-11755</td>
<td>Rimex, Inc., a Nevada corporation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-11756</td>
<td>Southwest Village Investments I, LLC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 3- Site map
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ADOT Parcel 7-10600
ADOT
210 S 57th Dr
Assessors parcels 10404007
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ADOT Parcel 7-10906
ADOT
5727 W Van Buren St
Assessors parcels 10404003
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Figure 3- Site map

ADOT Parcel 7-11426
Azejm Land Holdings LLC
1202 N 54th Ave
Assessors parcel 10327061
Service Layer Credits:
57th Ave
Latham St
10 MP 139

Date:
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Aerial imagery: Landiscor July 2013
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ADOT Parcel 7-11438
Blue Beacon International Inc
1235 N 57th Ave
Assessors parcel 10327062A
Service Layer Credits:
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Date: 6/24/2015
Aerial imagery: Landiscor July 2013
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ADOT Parcel 7-11459
Copper State Rubber of Arizona
740 S 59th Ave
Assessors parcels: 10418004M, 10418008 and 10418009
Date: 6/24/2015
Aerial imagery: Landiscor July 2013
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ADOT Parcel 7-11523
Ampj Hospitality Inc
1242 N 53rd Ave
Assessors parcels 10327028B and 10330289

Figure 3- Site map
Figure 3- Site map

ADOT Parcel 7-11669
Ryder Truck Rental Inc
1239 N 56th Ave
Assessors parcels; 10327018, 10327019, 10327020, 10327017B and 10327021B

Date: 6/23/2015
Aerial imagery: Landiscor July 2013
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ADOT Parcel 7-11691
SJW Land Company
1 N 59th Ave
Assessors parcel 10404015
Date: 5/27/2015
Aerial imagery: Landiscor July 2013
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ADOT Parcel 7-11696
Southwest Village Apartments LLC
777 N 59th Ave
Assessors parcel 10328003K

Figure 3- Site map
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Date: 6/3/2015
Aerial imagery: Landiscor July 2013

Figure 3- Site map
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ADOT Parcel 7-11731
West Valley Storage Solutions LLC
1239 N 54th Ave
Assessors parcel 10327027C
Service Layer Credits:
Van Buren St

Date:
6/3/2015

Aerial imagery:
Landiscor July 2013

Figure 3- Site map
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ADOT Parcel 7-11755
Rimex, Inc., a Nevada corporation
5801 W Van Buren St
Assessors parcel 10404035
## Area 2 – Rio Del Rey residential properties

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ADOT Parcel No.</th>
<th>Owner’s Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7-11516</td>
<td>Granado Luz Adriana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-11522</td>
<td>Felipe N. Oblea and Erika Gallardo De Negrete,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-11532</td>
<td>Hoffman Sandra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-11553</td>
<td>Kenneth C. Kilgore, Jr. and Machele Kilgore,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-11566</td>
<td>Bailey, Colette</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-11582</td>
<td>Lopez Melissa D/Bravo Alan R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-11589</td>
<td>Maricopa Rentals Limited Partnership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-11613</td>
<td>Laura Nava,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-11637</td>
<td>Perez Felipe/Lucia M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-11672</td>
<td>SS 1 Holding -2 LLLP,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 3- Site map
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ADOT Parcel 7-11522
Felipe N. Oblea and Erika Gallardo
De Negrete,
4227 S 61st Ave
Assessors parcel 10457239
Figure 3- Site map

ADOT Parcel 7-11613
Laura Nava,
4239 S 61st Ave
Assessors parcel 10457236

Date: 6/1/2015
Aerial imagery: Landiscor July 2013
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Figure 3- Site map

ADOT Parcel 7-11637
Perez Felipe/Lucia M
6206 W Pueblo Ave
Assessors parcel 10457023
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Aerial Imagery: Landiscor July 2013
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ADOT Parcel 7-11672
SS 1 Holding -2 LLLP,
4235 S. 61st Avenue
Assessors parcel 10457237
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Area 3 – Salt River aggregate mining property

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ADOT Parcel No.</th>
<th>Owner's Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7-11716</td>
<td>Union Rock &amp; Materials Group</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Date: 1/12/2016
Aerial imagery: Landiscor July 2013

Figure 3- Site map
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ADOT Parcel 7-11716
Union Rock & Materials Corp
4802 S 59th Ave
Assessors parcels 10465001, 10465004B, 10565002D, 10464004
### Area 4 – Laveen agricultural, residential, and utility corridor properties

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ADOT Parcel No.</th>
<th>Owner’s Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7-11182</td>
<td>ADOT - La Salvia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-11316</td>
<td>ADOT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-11462</td>
<td>Ellis &amp; Williams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-11492</td>
<td>Edwards Paul F/Melanie A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-11494</td>
<td>Erran Gary J/Shai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-11499</td>
<td>Wild Paw Enterprises, LLC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-11502</td>
<td>Michael Foerst</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-11554</td>
<td>Kloeber Family Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-11558</td>
<td>KS LLC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-11575</td>
<td>Lines Brothers Land &amp; Cattle LLC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-11576</td>
<td>Lines (family)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-11610</td>
<td>Moss Michael L/Kathy A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-11611</td>
<td>Moss Michael L/Kathy A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-11704</td>
<td>Taylor Morrison / Arizona, Inc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-11786</td>
<td>Daniel C. Kohn</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Date: 6/4/2015
Aerial imagery: Landiscor July 2013
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Figure 3- Site map

ADOT Parcel 7-11494
Erran Gary J/Shai
10828 S 59th Ave
Assessors parcel 30003016H
Service Layer Credits: South Mountain Ave

Date: 6/4/2015
Aerial imagery: Landiscor July 2013

Figure 3- Site map
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ADOT Parcel 7-11499
Wild Paw Enterprises, Llc
8444 S. 61st Ave
Assessors parcel 30002021F
Figure 3- Site map

ADOT Parcel 7-11554
Kloeber Family Trust
12722 S 51st Ave
Assessors parcel 30003019D

Date: 6/4/2015
Aerial imagery: Landiscor July 2013
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ADOT Parcel 7-11558
KS LLC
Assessors parcel 30003016E

Figure 3- Site map
Date: 6/8/2015
Aerial imagery: Landiscor July 2013

Figure 3- Site map

ADOT Parcel 7-11575
Lines Brothers Land & Cattle LLC
6015 W Vineyard
Assessors parcel 10486002H
Figure 3- Site map

ADOT Parcel 7-11610
Moss Michael L/Kathy A
7221 S 61st Dr
Assessors parcel 10486001R

Date: 6/8/2015
Aerial imagery: Landisco July 2013
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Figure 3- Site map
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Elliot Rd

Date: 5/27/2015
Aerial imagery: Landiscor July 2013

Figure 3- Site map

ADOT Parcel 7-11786
Daniel C. Kohn
5919 West Elliot Road
Assessors parcel 30003016F
**Area 5 – Dusty Lane residential and utility corridor properties**

**Area 5A – Dusty Lane vacant land in utility corridor**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ADOT Parcel No.</th>
<th>Owner’s Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7-11481</td>
<td>Robert &amp; Candice Diaz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-11565</td>
<td>Walter Lay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-11616</td>
<td>Nathan Family Trust / Stephen &amp; Martha Nathan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-11619A</td>
<td>Arthur &amp; Carmina Nephew (Parcel 1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-11619B</td>
<td>Arthur &amp; Carmina Nephew (Parcel 2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-11640</td>
<td>City of Phoenix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-11650</td>
<td>Eleazar &amp; Guadalupe Ramirez; Ernesto Ramirez</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-11702</td>
<td>ADOT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-11724</td>
<td>Richard &amp; Teresa Villa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-11740</td>
<td>David Olivarez &amp; Jack Strong. Jack Strong Revocable Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-11913</td>
<td>City of Phoenix</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Date: 5/29/2015
Aerial imagery: Landiscor July 2013
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ADOT Parcel 7-11481
Robert & Candice Diaz
4543 W Ivanhoe St
Assessors parcel 30004051
Figure 3- Site map
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ADOT Parcel 7-11619A
Arthur & Carmina Nephew (Parcel 1)
15004 S 43rd Ave
Assessors parcel 30004028J
**Service Layer Credits:**
- Choppo Rd
- 43rd Ave

**Date:** 6/1/2015

**Aerial imagery:** Landiscor July 2013

**Figure 3 - Site map**

**ADOT Parcel 7-11619B**
- Arthur & Carmina Nephew (Parcel 2)
- 15004 S 43rd Ave
- Assessors parcel 30004028K
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Date: 6/3/2015
Aerial imagery: Landiscor July 2013

ADOT Parcel 7-11640
City of Phoenix
4847 W Dusty Ln
Assessors parcel 30007003L
Date: 10/26/2015
Aerial imagery: Landiscor July 2013

Figure 3 - Site map
Figure 3- Site map

Date: 8/26/2015
Aerial imagery: Landiscor July 2013

ADOT Parcel 7-11724
Richard & Teresa Villa
14600 S. Dusty Lane
Assessors parcel 30004053
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Date: 5/18/2015
Aerial imagery: Landiscor July 2013
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Figure 3- Site map

ADOT Parcel 7-11740
David Olivarez & Jack Strong
Jack Strong Revocable Trust
Assessors parcel 30007003R
Service Layer Credits:
Galveston St
Dusty Ln
45th Ave

Date: 6/1/2015
Aerial imagery: Landiscor July 2013

Figure 3- Site map
E:\Projects\AZ\ADOT\SouthMtn\FEIS\map_docs\mxd\ParcelCE\7_11913_SiteMap.mxd

202L MA 000 H8827 01D
RAM 202-D-(200)
South Mountain Transportation Corridor

ADOT Parcel 7-11913
Assessors parcels 30004050, 30004017V
A-64
## Area 5B– Dusty Lane SFR or vacant land (non-utility corridor)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ADOT Parcel No.</th>
<th>Owner's Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7-11437</td>
<td>Dennis Berube</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-11450</td>
<td>Marcelino Corona Sanchez &amp; Micaela Vasquez</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-11460</td>
<td>Tomas &amp; Maria Cortez</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-11463</td>
<td>Robert &amp; Maia Crawley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-11490</td>
<td>Vivian Durazo; Gregorio Robles; Maria Martinez</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-11520</td>
<td>Charlie Hamilton &amp; Debora Pinkham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-11556</td>
<td>Troy Koile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-11580</td>
<td>Brian &amp; Ellen Loehnis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-11591</td>
<td>Desiderio &amp; Kathryn Marquez</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-11618</td>
<td>Harold &amp; Crystal Nelson, Trustees of the Harold &amp; Crystal Nelson Revocable Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-11620</td>
<td>Roy New Successor Trustee of the New Family Irrevocable Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-11636</td>
<td>Enrique Pena</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-11676</td>
<td>Harry Sanaski</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-11735</td>
<td>Stephen &amp; Ellen Zalecki</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Date: 5/29/2015
Aerial imagery: Landiscor July 2013

ADOT Parcel 7-11437
Dennis Berube
4418 W Galveston St
Assessors parcel 30004017X

Figure 3 - Site map
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Aerial imagery: Landiscor July 2013
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ADOT Parcel 7-11460
Tomas & Maria Cortez
4544 W Ivanhoe St
Assessors parcel 30004021E
Service Layer Credits:
Sandy Ln

Date: 5/29/2015
Aerial imagery: Landisocor July 2013

Figure 3- Site map
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Figure 3- Site map

ADOT Parcel 7-11520
Charlie Hamilton & Debora Pinkham
4607 W Sandy Rd
Assessors parcel 30004021G
Date: 6/3/2015
Aerial imagery: Landiscor July 2013
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Figure 3- Site map

ADOT Parcel 7-11556
Troy Koile
14405 S 45th Ave
Assessors parcel 30004002B
ADOT Parcel 7-11620
Roy New Successor Trustee
of the New Family Irrevocable Trust
4631 W Ray Rd
Assessors parcel 30004003C
Date: 6/1/2015
Aerial Imagery: Landiscor July 2013
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Figure 3- Site map

ADOT Parcel 7-11676
Harry Sanaski
Assessors parcel 30004003H
## Area 6 – South Mountains vacant properties

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ADOT Parcel No.</th>
<th>Owner’s Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7-11434</td>
<td>BBC Phoenix LLC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-11443</td>
<td>Cach Holdings LLC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-11451</td>
<td>Mark Clounch dba Mark_L Assoc. Profit Sharing Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-11518</td>
<td>Randolph Dean Gross &amp; Beth Deborah Gross Revocable Living Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-11600</td>
<td>Matmon LLC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-11617</td>
<td>National Christian Foundation Real Estate Inc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-11926</td>
<td>BBC Phoenix LLC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 3- Site map

ADOT Parcel 7-11434
BBC Phoenix LLC
35th Ave 1 Block N of Pecos
Assessors parcels: 30004013E and 30004015X
Figure 3- Site map

Date: 5/15/2015
Aerial imagery: Landiscor July 2013
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ADOT Parcel 7-11617
National Christian Foundation
Real Estate Inc
14801 S 27th Ave
Assessors parcel 30005004E
## Area 7 – West Pecos Road residential properties

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ADOT Parcel No.</th>
<th>Owner’s Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7-10535</td>
<td>ADOT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-10537</td>
<td>ADOT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-10539</td>
<td>ADOT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-11453</td>
<td>John and Sharon Cochran</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-11528</td>
<td>David &amp; Carmen Hernandez</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-11644</td>
<td>Glen Zilly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-11732</td>
<td>Paul &amp; Shelley Wiest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-11911</td>
<td>Boyd &amp; Brianna Johnson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-11912</td>
<td>John and Sharon Cochran</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Service Layer Credits:
Cedarwood Ln
32nd Ln
Date: 1/28/2016
Aerial imagery: Landiscor July 2013
Figure 3- Site map
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Figure 3- Site map
ADOT Parcel 7-10539
ADOT
3205 W Redwood Ln
Assessors parcels 30005704
Date: 1/26/2016
Aerial imagery: Landiscor July 2013
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ADOT Parcel 7-11644
Glen Zilly
3040 W Cedarwood Ln
Assessors parcels 3005668

Figure 3- Site map
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Aerial imagery: Landiscor July 2013

202L MA 000 H8827 01D
RAM 202-D-(200)
South Mountain Transportation Corridor

Figure 3- Site map

ADOT Parcel 7-11732
Paul & Shelley Wiest
3045 W Redwood Lane
Assessors parcels 30005662
Figure 3- Site map
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Aerial imagery: Landiscor July 2013
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ADOT Parcel 7-11912
John and Sharon Cochran
16913 S 32nd Ln
Assessors parcel 30005697
### Area 8 – Mountain Park Church utility corridor property

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ADOT Parcel No.</th>
<th>Owner’s Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7-11184</td>
<td>Mountain Park Church</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Date: 5/11/2015  
Aerial imagery: Landiscor July 2013  

ADOT Parcel 7-11184  
Mountain Park Church  
2408 E Pecos Rd  
Assessors parcel 30170009P  

Figure 3- Site map  
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Area 9 – Lakewood residences outside Project ROW

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ADOT Parcel No.</th>
<th>Owner's Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7-10465</td>
<td>ADOT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-10466</td>
<td>ADOT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-10531</td>
<td>ADOT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-10796</td>
<td>ADOT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-10805</td>
<td>ADOT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-10806</td>
<td>ADOT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-10891</td>
<td>ADOT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-10984</td>
<td>ADOT</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Appendix B – Section 106 Consultation Information

This appendix includes Section 106 consultation results related to Acquisition of Parcels Outside the Footprint for the Proposed South Mountain Freeway, *A Final Class III Survey of the W59 and E1 Alignments for the South Mountain Freeway Project, Maricopa County, Arizona*” (Brodbeck and others 2015), *A Class III Cultural Resources Survey of 20 ADOT Parcels in Support of the 202L, South Mountain Freeway Project Environmental Impact Statement Reevaluation, Maricopa County, Arizona*” (Bartholomew and Brodbeck 2016) and the Programmatic Agreement.
## Section 106 Consultation Summary

### Acquisition of Property Parcels Outside Project Footprint

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Letters</th>
<th>Date Sent</th>
<th>Purpose of Consultation</th>
<th>Consulting Parties</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agencies</td>
<td>March 25, 2015</td>
<td>Finding of project effect</td>
<td>Arizona State Land Department</td>
<td>April 20, 2015, concurred</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Arizona State Museum</td>
<td>No response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bureau of Indian Affairs</td>
<td>April 13, 2015, concurred</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bureau of Land Management</td>
<td>March 30, 2015, concurred</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bureau of Reclamation</td>
<td>March 30, 2015, concurred</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>City of Avondale</td>
<td>April 6, 2015, concurred</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>City of Chandler</td>
<td>March 30, 2015, concurred</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>City of Glendale</td>
<td>April 6, 2015, concurred</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>City of Phoenix, City Archaeologist</td>
<td>April 8, 2015, concurred</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>City of Phoenix, Historic Preservation Office</td>
<td>April 17, 2015, concurred</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>City of Tolleson</td>
<td>April 10, 2015, concurred</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Flood Control District of Maricopa County</td>
<td>No response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Maricopa County Department of Transportation</td>
<td>June 3, 2015, concurred</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Roosevelt Irrigation District</td>
<td>April 27, 2015, concurred</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Salt River Project</td>
<td>April 20, 2015, concurred</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>State Historic Preservation Office</td>
<td>March 30, 2015, concurred</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Western Area Power Administration</td>
<td>No response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>U.S. Army Corps of Engineers</td>
<td>No response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>U.S. Army Corps of Engineers</td>
<td>No response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>City of Tolleson</td>
<td>No response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Flood Control District of Maricopa County</td>
<td>No response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Maricopa County Department of Transportation</td>
<td>June 3, 2015, concurred</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Roosevelt Irrigation District</td>
<td>April 27, 2015, concurred</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Salt River Project</td>
<td>April 20, 2015, concurred</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>State Historic Preservation Office</td>
<td>March 30, 2015, concurred</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Western Area Power Administration</td>
<td>No response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>U.S. Army Corps of Engineers</td>
<td>No response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tribes</td>
<td>March 25, 2015</td>
<td>Finding of project effect</td>
<td>Ak-Chin Indian Community</td>
<td>March 31, 2015, noted that they had no concerns via email</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Chemehuevi Tribe</td>
<td>April 13, 2015, concurred</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cocopah Tribe</td>
<td>April 13, 2015, concurred</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Colorado River Indian Tribes</td>
<td>No response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fort McDowell Yavapai Nation</td>
<td>No response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fort Mojave Tribe</td>
<td>No response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fort Yuma-Quechan Tribe</td>
<td>No response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Gila River Indian Community</td>
<td>April 6, 2015, concurred</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Havasupai Tribe</td>
<td>No response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hopi Tribe</td>
<td>March 30, 2015, concurred</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hualapai Tribe</td>
<td>No response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kaibab-Paiute Tribe</td>
<td>No response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Navajo Nation</td>
<td>No response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pascua Yaqui Tribe</td>
<td>No response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pueblo of Zuni</td>
<td>No response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community</td>
<td>No response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>San Carlos Apache Tribe</td>
<td>May 14, 2015, concurred</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>San Juan Southern Paiute</td>
<td>No response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tohono O’odham Nation</td>
<td>April 27, 2015, concurred</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tonto Apache Tribe</td>
<td>No response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>White Mountain Apache Tribe</td>
<td>April 2, 2015, concurred</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yavapai-Apache Nation</td>
<td>No response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yavapai-Prescott Indian Tribe</td>
<td>No response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letters</td>
<td>Date Sent</td>
<td>Purpose of Consultation</td>
<td>Consulting Parties</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agencies</td>
<td>July 23, 2015</td>
<td>Adequacy of Class III report (Brodbeck and others 2015)</td>
<td>Arizona State Land Department</td>
<td>No response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Arizona State Museum</td>
<td>No response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NRHP eligibility recommendations</td>
<td>Bureau of Indian Affairs</td>
<td>August 25, 2015, concurred</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Finding of project effect</td>
<td>Bureau of Land Management</td>
<td>No response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bureau of Reclamation</td>
<td>August 4, 2015, concurred</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>City of Avondale</td>
<td>No response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>City of Chandler</td>
<td>August 20, 2015, concurred</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>City of Glendale</td>
<td>August 8, 2015, concurred</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>City of Phoenix, Historic Preservation Office</td>
<td>August 4, 2015, concurred</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>City of Tolleson</td>
<td>No response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Flood Control District of Maricopa County</td>
<td>No response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Maricopa County Department of Transportation</td>
<td>No response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Roosevelt Irrigation District</td>
<td>August 24, 2015, concurred</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Salt River Project</td>
<td>No response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>State Historic Preservation Office</td>
<td>July 29, 2015, concurred</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Western Area Power Administration</td>
<td>August 5, 2015, concurred</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>U.S. Army Corps of Engineers</td>
<td>No response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ak-Chin Indian Community</td>
<td>No response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Chemehuevi Tribe</td>
<td>July 27, 2015, noted that they had no concerns regarding the project via email</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cocopah Tribe</td>
<td>No response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Colorado River Indian Tribes</td>
<td>No response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fort McDowell Yavapai Nation</td>
<td>No response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fort Mojave Tribe</td>
<td>No response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fort Yuma-Quechan Tribe</td>
<td>No response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Gila River Indian Community</td>
<td>September 8, 2015, concurred</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Havasupai Tribe</td>
<td>No response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hopi Tribe</td>
<td>July 30, 2105, concurred</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hualapai Tribe</td>
<td>No response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kaibab-Paiute Tribe</td>
<td>No response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Navajo Nation</td>
<td>No response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pascua Yaqui Tribe</td>
<td>No response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pueblo of Zuni</td>
<td>No response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community</td>
<td>No response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>San Carlos Apache Tribe</td>
<td>August 4, 2015, concurred</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>San Juan Southern Paiute</td>
<td>No response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tohono O’odham Nation</td>
<td>November 4, 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tonto Apache Tribe</td>
<td>No response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>White Mountain Apache Tribe</td>
<td>No response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yavapai-Apache Nation</td>
<td>August 5, 2015, concurred</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yavapai-Prescott Indian Tribe</td>
<td>August 4, 2015, concurred</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tribes</td>
<td>July 23, 2015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letters</td>
<td>Date Sent</td>
<td>Purpose of Consultation</td>
<td>Consulting Parties</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Agencies | March 28, 2016 | • Adequacy of Class III report for survey of 20 acquisition parcels (Bartholomew and Brodbeck 2016)  
• NRHP eligibility recommendations  
• Finding of project effect | Arizona State Land Department  
Arizona State Museum  
Bureau of Land Management  
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers  
Bureau of Indian Affairs  
Bureau of Reclamation  
City of Avondale  
City of Chandler  
City of Glendale  
City of Phoenix, City Archaeologist  
City of Tolleson  
Flood Control District of Maricopa County  
Maricopa County Department of Transportation  
Roosevelt Irrigation District  
Salt River Project  
State Historic Preservation Office  
Western Area Power Administration | March 30, 2016, concurred  
No response  
No response  
No response  
April 4, 2016, concurred  
April 13, 2016, concurred  
April 3, 2016, concurred  
April 20, 2016, concurred  
May 4, 2016, concurred  
No response  
April 13, 2016, concurred  
April 4, 2016, concurred  
April 4, 2016, concurred |
| Tribes | March 28, 2016 | • Adequacy of Class III report for survey of 20 parcels (Bartholomew and Brodbeck 2016)  
• NRHP eligibility recommendations  
• Determination of project effect | Ak Chin Indian Community  
Chemehuevi Tribe  
Cocopah Tribe  
Colorado River Indian Tribes  
Fort McDowell Yavapai Nation  
Fort Mojave Tribe  
Fort Yuma-Quechan Tribe  
Gila River Indian Community  
Havasupai Tribe  
Hopi Tribe  
Hualapai Tribe  
Kaibab-Paiute Tribe  
Navajo Nation  
Pascua Yaqui Tribe  
Pueblo of Zuni  
Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community  
San Carlos Apache Tribe  
San Juan Southern Paiute  
Tohono O’odham Nation  
Tonto Apache Tribe  
White Mountain Apache Tribe  
Yavapai-Apache Nation  
Yavapai-Prescott Indian Tribe | No response  
March 29, 2016, noted that the tribe had no specific comments regarding the project and asked to be contacted if cultural resources are found during construction.  
No response  
No response  
No response  
No response  
No response  
April 29, 2016, concurred  
No response  
April 4, 2016, concurred  
No response  
No response  
No response  
No response  
No response  
No response  
No response |
PROGRAMMATIC AGREEMENT

AMONG

FEDERAL HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION
ARIZONA STATE HISTORIC PRESERVATION OFFICE
ARIZONA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

LOOP 202 – SOUTH MOUNTAIN FREEWAY PROJECT
PROJECT NO. NH-202-D(ADY)
TRACS NO. 202L MA 054 H5764 01L
MARICOPA COUNTY, ARIZONA

WHEREAS, the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) proposes to construct a loop highway connecting Interstate 10 (I-10) west of Phoenix with I-10 south of Phoenix (the Loop 202 – South Mountain Freeway Project), a federally-funded project in Maricopa County, Arizona (hereafter referred to as “the Project”); and

WHEREAS, FHWA has determined, pursuant to 36 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) 800.5(a)(2)(i), that the proposed Project may have an adverse effect upon historic properties, which are defined as “any prehistoric or historic district, site, building, structure, or object included in, or eligible for inclusion in the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP), including artifacts, records, and material remains related to such a property or resource” National Historic Preservation Act [NHPA] 54 United States Code [U.S.C.] § 300101 et seq.; and

WHEREAS, all the historic properties that may be affected by this Project have not yet been identified; and

WHEREAS, it has been determined through consultation the proposed project may have an adverse effect upon the South Mountains Traditional Cultural Property (TCP). A TCP is defined as a place that is “eligible for inclusion in the NRHP because of its association with cultural practices or beliefs of a living community that (a) are rooted in that community’s history, and (b) are important in maintaining the continuing cultural identity of the community” (National Park Service National Register Bulletin: Guidelines for Evaluating and Documenting Traditional Properties) (National Register Bulletin 38: Guidelines for Evaluating and Documenting Traditional Cultural Properties); and

WHEREAS, all the TCPs that may be affected by this Project have not yet been identified; and

WHEREAS, FHWA will assume lead responsibilities for compliance under Section 106 of the NHPA of 1966, as amended, and will consult with the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) pursuant to Sections 101 and 106 of the NHPA of 1966, as amended, 54 U.S.C. § 300101 et seq., and pursuant to 36 CFR 800.2 (c)(1)(i) and 800.6(b)(1); and
WHEREAS, the Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) is the project sponsor and must comply with the State Historic Preservation Act. ADOT’s participation in this agreement as an invited signatory satisfies compliance with Arizona Revised Statutes (A.R.S.) §41-861 - 864; and

WHEREAS, SHPO is authorized to enter into this Agreement in order to fulfill its role of advising and assisting Federal agencies in carrying out their responsibilities pursuant to Sections 101 and 106 of the NHPA of 1966, as amended, 54 U.S.C. § 300101 et seq., and pursuant to 36 CFR 800.2 (c)(1)(i) and 800.6(b)(1)(i), and SHPO is a signatory to this Agreement; and

WHEREAS, SHPO is authorized to advise and assist federal and state agencies in carrying out their historic preservation responsibilities and cooperate with these agencies under A.R.S. § 41-511.04(D)(4); and

WHEREAS, FHWA has consulted with the Bureau of Land Management (BLM), the Bureau of Reclamation (Reclamation), the Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA), the Western Area Power Administration (Western), the Arizona State Land Department (ASLD), the Salt River Project (SRP), the Maricopa Department of Transportation, the Flood Control District of Maricopa County, the Roosevelt Irrigation District, the City of Avondale (COA), the City of Chandler (COC), the City of Glendale (COG), the City of Phoenix (COP), and the City of Tolleson (COT), in accordance with Section 106 of the NHPA and its implementing regulations (36 CFR §800.6(b)(2)) to resolve the possible adverse effects of the Project on historic properties; and have been consulted [pursuant to 36 CFR § 800.2(c)(2)(ii)(A-F)], and these parties have been invited to be concurring parties in this Agreement; and

WHEREAS, the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (Council) has participated in consultation pursuant to 36 CFR §800.6(a)(1), has been invited to be a signatory to the Agreement, and has declined to participate; and

WHEREAS, FHWA and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (Corps) have agreed that FHWA will assume lead responsibility for compliance under Section 106 of the NHPA for issuance of permits by the Corps for the development of land and waters of the United States under Section 404 of the Clean Water Act, and the Corps has participated in consultation and has been invited to concur in this agreement; and

WHEREAS, the Indian Tribes that may attach religious or cultural importance to affected properties have been consulted [pursuant to 36 CFR § 800.2 (c)(2)(ii)(A-F)], and the following tribes have been invited to be concurring parties in the Agreement: the Ak-Chin Indian Community, the Chemehuevi Tribe, the Cocopah Tribe, the Colorado River Indian Tribe, the Fort McDowell Yavapai Nation, the Fort Mojave Tribe, the Fort Yuma-Quechan Tribe, the Gila River Indian Community, the Hopi Tribe, the Havasupai Tribe, the Hualapai Tribe, the Kaibab Paiute Tribe, the Navajo Nation, the Pasqua Yaqui Tribe, the Pueblo of Zuni, the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community, the San Carlos Apache Tribe, the San Juan Southern Paiute,
the Tohono O’Odham Nation, the Tonto Apache Tribe, the White Mountain Apache Tribe, the Yavapai Prescott Indian Tribe, the Yavapai-Apache Nation; and

WHEREAS, the Yavapai Prescott Indian Tribe has declined to participate in consultation, deferring to the Tribes near the project area, the Hopi tribe declined participation in this agreement, deferring to the Gila River Indian Community, and the San Carlos Apache Tribe has declined to participate in consultation, deferring to the Ak-Chin Indian Community, the Gila River Indian Community, the Salt River Pima Maricopa Indian Community, the Tohono O’Odham Nation, the Hopi Tribe, and the Pueblo of Zuni; and

WHEREAS, by their signature all parties agree that the regulations specified in the ADOT document, "ADOT Standard Specifications for Road and Bridge Construction" (Section 104.12, 2008; see Appendix A) will account for the cultural resources in potential material sources used in Project construction; and

WHEREAS, an agreement regarding the treatment and disposition of Human Remains, Associated Funerary Objects, and Objects of Cultural Patrimony will be developed by the Arizona State Museum (ASM) in consultation with the Tribes for State and private land pursuant to A.R.S. §41-844 and 41-865; and

WHEREAS, Human Remains and Associated /Unassociated Funerary Objects, Sacred Objects or Objects of Cultural Patrimony recovered on Federal or Tribal lands will be treated in accordance with the Native American Graves and Protection Repatriation Act (NAGPRA), and with the American Indian Religious Freedom Act (AIRFA); and

WHEREAS, any activity described in A.R.S. § 41-841, implementing rules, and ASM policy on State land necessitated by the Project must be permitted by ASM pursuant to A.R.S. § 41-842 and ASM has been invited to be a concurring party to this Agreement; and

WHEREAS, any data recovery on Federal lands necessitated by the Project must be permitted under the Archaeological Resource Protection Act (ARPA) (43 CFR 7) in accordance with the Federal land-holding agency; and

WHEREAS, FHWA is using the provisions of this Agreement to address applicable requirements of the Antiquities Act of 1906 (16 USC 431–433), ARPA (16 U.S.C. 470aa), AIRFA (42 U.S.C. 1996), and NAGPRA (25 U.S.C. 3001–13); and

WHEREAS, in the event that any data recovery for the Project should take place on Tribal lands, all applicable permits would be obtained in consultation with the BIA; and

NOW, THEREFORE, all parties agree that upon FHWA’s decision to proceed with the Project, FHWA shall ensure that the following stipulations are implemented in order to take into account the effects of the Project on historic properties, and that these stipulations shall govern the Project and all of its parts until this Agreement expires or is terminated.

Final Programmatic Agreement (revised July 2015)
Loop 202 – South Mountain Freeway
December 2006
Stipulations

FHWA will ensure that the following measures are carried out.

1. Consultation as Design Progresses

   ADOT, on behalf of FHWA, will provide plans and related documents pertaining to the
design of this undertaking, and cultural resource survey reports to the parties to this
agreement for a 30 calendar day review and comment period.

2. Additional Inventory Survey

   ADOT, on behalf of FHWA, shall ensure that new inventory surveys are conducted for any
modifications to the area of potential effects (APE). Such surveys would include, but not be
limited to additional rights-of-way and temporary construction easements, any added staging
or use areas, design revisions, or evaluations of the built environment. FHWA shall make
determinations of eligibility for any unevaluated cultural resources in accordance with 36
CFR § 800.4. Should any party to this Agreement disagree with FHWA regarding eligibility,
the SHPO shall be consulted and resolution sought within 20 calendar days. If the FHWA
and SHPO disagree on eligibility, FHWA shall request a formal determination from the
Keeper of the National Register, pursuant to 36 CFR §800.4(c)(2).

3. Identification, Evaluation, Documentation, and Minimization of Effects to Traditional
Cultural Places

   a) FHWA shall ensure that consultation with the Native American Tribes that attach
religious or cultural importance to affected properties will continue throughout the life
of the project in order to identify, evaluate, document, and mitigate possible impacts to
TCPs according to National Park Service National Register Bulletin 38: Guidelines for
Evaluating and Documenting Traditional Cultural Properties.

   b) FHWA and ADOT will fund a TCP evaluation of the South Mountains TCP to be
prepared and implemented by the Gila River Indian Community. The TCP evaluation
will include a consultation plan for effectively working with and integrating the
viewpoints of participating Tribes, SHPO, the Tribal Historic Preservation Office
(THPO), Community elders, and other persons or organizations of interest.

   c) FHWA and ADOT will fund the development and implementation of a TCP
Enhancement Plan to be prepared by the Gila River Indian Community. The TCP
enhancement measures would be part of project planning, not environmental review,
and would serve to expand cultural awareness and eliminate the potential for adverse
effect and detriment to the spiritual welfare of the Gila River Indian Community, other
affiliated Tribes, and their individual members.
i) The TCP Enhancement Plan would be developed and implemented upon approval of the Record of Decision.

ii) The TCP Enhancement Plan would outline:
   1) Educational opportunities that enhance cultural knowledge and awareness
   2) Traditional religious activities that would take place prior to implementation of the proposed undertaking
   3) On-going Tribal consultation
   4) Cultural awareness and sensitivity training developed by the Gila River Indian Community for federal and state representatives as well as consultants working on or in the vicinity of culturally sensitive areas.

iii) Upon acceptance of the TCP Enhancement Plan all relevant parties would enter into appropriate agreements or understandings with regard to funding and implementation of the plan.

4. Development of a Historic Properties Treatment Plan

ADOT will ensure that a Historic Properties Treatment Plan (HPTP) is developed. The HPTP will be consistent with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards and Guidelines for Archaeological Documentation (48 FR 44734-37) and with the rules implementing the Arizona Antiquities Act (A.R.S. 41-841, et seq.) for project portions located on State land. The HPTP will specify:

   a) The properties or portions of properties where data recovery is to be carried out. The HPTP will also specify any property or portion of property that would be destroyed or altered without treatment along with the rationale for not treating the property or portion of property;

   b) The results of previous research relevant to the Project,

   c) An historic context, or contexts to guide the focus of the research,

   d) The research questions to be addressed through data recovery, with an explanation of their relevance and importance within an appropriate historic context;

   e) The field and laboratory analysis methods to be used, with an explanation of their relevance to the research questions;

   f) The methods to be used in analysis, data management, and dissemination of data to the professional community and the public;

   g) The proposed disposition and curation of recovered materials and records in accordance with 36 CFR 79 and with Federal land manager direction and policy for materials recovered on federal lands;
h) A Monitoring and Discovery Plan outlining the procedures for monitoring, evaluating and treating discoveries of unexpected or newly identified properties during construction of the Project, including consultation with other parties;

i) A protocol for the treatment of Human Remains, in the event that such remains are discovered, describing methods and procedures for the recovery, analysis, treatment, and disposition of Human Remains, Associated Funerary Objects, and Objects of Cultural Patrimony. This protocol will reflect concerns and/or conditions identified as a result of consultations among parties to this Agreement and will be consistent with the ASM Burial agreement for State Lands and with NAGPRA for federal or Tribal lands;

j) A proposed schedule for Project tasks, including a schedule for the submission of draft and final archaeological reports to the consulting parties to this Agreement;

k) The HPTP will include a public involvement plan that includes benefits to the public.

5. Review and Comment on the HPTP

a) FHWA will distribute the draft HPTP to the parties to this Agreement for review. All parties to this Agreement will have 30 calendar days from receipt to review the report and provide comments to ADOT and FHWA. All comments shall be in writing. Lack of response within this review period will be taken as concurrence with the adequacy of the HPTP.

b) If revisions to the HPTP are made, FHWA will distribute the revised HPTP to all parties to this Agreement, who will have 14 calendar days from receipt to review the revisions and provide comments to ADOT and FHWA. Lack of response within this review period will be taken as concurrence with the adequacy of the revised HPTP.

c) Once the HPTP is determined adequate by all signatories, FHWA shall issue authorization to proceed with the implementation of the HPTP, subject to obtaining all necessary permits.

d) The final HPTP will be provided to all consulting parties.


a) Ten calendar days prior to completion of Phase I and Phase II fieldwork, the institution, firm, or consultant responsible for the work will prepare and submit a brief Preliminary Report of Findings to ADOT. This report shall contain at a minimum:

i. A discussion of the methods and treatments applied to each property, with an assessment of the degree to which these methods and treatments followed the
direction provided by the HPTP along with a justification of all deviations, if any, from the approved HPTP;

ii. Topographic site plans for the properties depicting all features and treatment areas;

iii. General description of recovered artifacts and other data classes, including features excavated or sampled;

iv. Discussion of further analyses to be conducted for the final HPTP Report, including any proposed changes in the methods or levels of effort from those proposed in the HPTP.

b) FHWA will distribute the Preliminary Report of Findings to the parties to this Agreement with notification of an in-field meeting to be held upon completion of fieldwork. The in-field meeting will apprise the parties to this Agreement of the methods employed and the preliminary results of the field effort.

i. After Phase I fieldwork, the decision if Phase II data recovery is required will be made based on the results of the in-field meeting and comments on the Preliminary Report of Findings for Phase I fieldwork. If the parties to the Agreement are unable to attend the in-field meeting, written (electronic mail is acceptable) or oral comments on the Preliminary Report of Findings for Phase I fieldwork received within seven calendar days from receipt will be used in the decision making process. Lack of response within this review period will be taken as concurrence with the adequacy of the report. If necessary, Phase II data recovery will begin immediately upon approval by the parties to this Agreement of the results of Phase I fieldwork.

ii. After Phase II fieldwork, the decision if construction can proceed will be made based on the results of the in-field meeting and comments on the Preliminary Report of Findings for Phase II fieldwork. If the parties to the Agreement are unable to attend the in-field meeting, written (electronic mail is acceptable) or oral comments on the Preliminary Report of Findings for Phase II fieldwork received within seven calendar days from receipt will be used in the decision making process. Lack of response within this review period will be taken as concurrence with the adequacy of the report. Once the Preliminary Report of Findings for Phase II fieldwork has been approved by the parties to this Agreement and accepted as a final document, ADOT, on behalf of FHWA, will notify appropriate Project participants that construction may proceed.

c) If revisions to the Preliminary Report of Findings are made, all parties to this Agreement have seven calendar days from receipt to review the revisions and provide written comments to ADOT and FHWA (electronic mail is acceptable). Lack of response within this review period will be taken as concurrence with the report.

d) FHWA shall ensure that any written comments received are taken into account during the preparation of the final document.
e) If any party to this Agreement objects to any aspect of the report, the FHWA shall resolve the objection according to the Dispute Resolution section herein.

7. Review and Comment on Data Recovery Report

a) Upon completion of all data recovery, a report will be prepared incorporating all appropriate data analyses and interpretations. The schedule for completion of the report will be developed in accordance with Stipulation 4 (j) above, and in consultation with all parties to this Agreement.

b) FHWA will distribute the draft Data Recovery Report to all parties to this Agreement for review. All parties to this Agreement will have 60 calendar days from receipt to review and provide written comments to ADOT and FHWA (electronic mail is acceptable). Lack of response within this review period will be taken as concurrence with the adequacy of the report.

c) If revisions to the data recovery report are made, all parties to this Agreement have 20 calendar days from receipt to review the revisions and provide written comments to ADOT. Lack of response within this review period will be taken as concurrence with the report.

d) FHWA shall ensure that any written comments received are taken into account during the preparation of the final document.

e) If any party to this Agreement continues to object to any aspect of the report, FHWA shall resolve the objection according to the Dispute Resolution section herein.

8. Standards for Monitoring and Data Recovery

All cultural resource work carried out pursuant to this Agreement shall be carried out by or under the supervision of a person, or persons, meeting the Secretary of the Interior’s Professional Qualifications Standards (48 FR 44738-44739) and under the terms of the permits issued for the archaeological investigations.

9. Changes in the APE

If the APE changes during the Undertaking, FHWA shall notify and consult with the parties to this Agreement to determine whether amendments to this Agreement are necessary. If an amendment is determined necessary, FHWA will initiate consultation with the parties to this Agreement pursuant to 36 CFR 800.4 through 800.6, and follow Stipulation 12 in this Agreement.
10. Treatment and Disposition of Human Remains and Funerary Objects

ADOT, on behalf of FHWA, shall ensure that the institution, firm, or consultant responsible for the work obtains a Burial Agreement from ASM and thereafter adheres to the terms of that Burial Agreement in the event Human Remains, Funerary Objects, Sacred Objects, and Objects of Cultural Patrimony are encountered during the investigation.

FHWA shall comply with NAGPRA regarding the treatment and disposition of human remains and funerary objects encountered on Federal or Tribal Lands.

11. Curation

All materials and records resulting from the data recovery program conducted within the Project area, except as noted below, shall be curated in accordance with standards 36 CFR 79, the Federal land managing agency direction and policy as appropriate, and guidelines generated by the ASM. Right of first refusal will be given to the Huhugam Heritage Center. If the Huhugam Heritage Center is unable to curate all materials and records, the repository for materials either will be the ASM or a facility that meets those standards and guidelines in Maricopa County.

All materials subject to repatriation under NAGPRA, A.R.S. § 41-844 and A.R.S. § 41-865 shall be maintained in accordance with the burial agreement until any specified analyses, as determined following consultation with the appropriate Indian tribes and individuals, are complete and the materials are returned.

12. Discoveries

If potential historic or prehistoric archaeological materials or properties are discovered after construction begins, the person in charge of the construction shall require construction to immediately cease within the area of the discovery, take steps to protect the discovery, and promptly report the discovery to the ADOT Historic Preservation Specialist, representing FHWA.

If human remains or funerary objects are discovered, ADOT shall require construction to immediately cease within the area of the discovery, take steps to protect the discovery, and notify and consult with appropriate Native American groups to determine treatment and disposition measures in accordance with the previously implemented burial agreement. ADOT shall inform the Director of the ASM (the Director) and the SHPO of the discovery, and the Federal land manager as appropriate.

If Human Remains are not involved, and the discovery is located on state land the ADOT Historic Preservation Specialist shall evaluate the discovery, and in consultation with FHWA, SHPO, and ASM determine if the HPTP previously approved in accordance with Stipulation 4 is appropriate to the nature of the discovery. If the discovery is located on federal land, the
Federal land manager shall be consulted to determine if the HPTP previously approved in accordance with Stipulation 4 is appropriate to the nature of the discovery. If appropriate, the HPTP shall be implemented by ADOT, on behalf of FHWA. If the HPTP is not appropriate to the discovery, FHWA shall ensure that an alternate plan for the resolution of adverse effects is developed pursuant to 36 CFR § 800.6 and circulated to the parties to this Agreement to review and comment as per the process outlined in Stipulation 5.

13. Dispute Resolution

Should any party to this Agreement object, within 30 days, to any action, plan or report provided for review, FHWA shall consult with the objecting party to resolve the objection. The objection must be identified specifically and the reasons for objection documented in writing. If the objection cannot be resolved, FHWA shall notify the SHPO of the objection and shall:

a) Forward all documentation relevant to the dispute to the Council in accordance with 36 CFR 800.2(b)(2). Any comment provided by the Council, and all comments from the consulting parties to this Agreement, will be taken into account by FHWA in reaching a final decision regarding the dispute.

b) If the Council does not provide any comments regarding the dispute within 30 days after receipt of adequate documentation, FHWA may render a decision regarding the dispute. In reaching its decision, FHWA will take into account all written comments regarding the dispute from the consulting parties to the Agreement.

c) FHWA will notify all consulting parties of its decision in writing before implementing that portion of the undertaking subject to dispute under this stipulation. FHWA’s decision will be a final agency decision.

d) It is the responsibility of FHWA to carry out all other actions subject to the terms of this Agreement that are not the subject of the dispute.

14. Amendments

In accordance with 36 CFR 800.6(c)(7), if any signatory or invited signatory determines that the terms of this Agreement will not or cannot be carried out or that an amendment to its terms is needed, that party shall immediately notify FHWA and request an amendment. The proposed amendment shall be submitted in draft form with the request. The signatories and invited signatories to this Agreement will consult to review and consider such an amendment. The amendment will be effective on the date a copy is signed by all of the signatories and invited signatories. FHWA shall file any amendments with the Council and provide copies of the amendments to the concurring parties.
15. Termination

Any signatory may terminate the Agreement by providing 30 day written notification to the other signatories. During this 30-day period, the signatories may consult to seek agreement on amendments or other actions that would avoid termination pursuant to 36 CFR § 800.6 (b). If the parties cannot agree on actions to resolve disagreements, FHWA will comply with 36 CFR § 800.7(a).

16. Agreement Review

Any signatory or invited signatory to this Agreement may request a meeting of consulting parties to review the effectiveness and application of this Agreement.

17. This Agreement may be executed in counterparts each of which shall be deemed an original and all of which together shall constitute one and the same instrument.

18. In the event the FHWA or ADOT cannot carry out the terms of this agreement, the FHWA will comply with 36 CFR § 800.3 through 800.6.

19. This agreement shall be null and void if its terms are not carried out within ten (10) years from the date of its execution, unless the signatories agree in writing to an extension for carrying out its terms.

Execution of this Agreement by the signatories and invited signatories, and its subsequent filing with the Council is evidence that FHWA has afforded the Council an opportunity to comment on the Project and its effects on historic properties, and that FHWA has taken into account the effects of the Undertaking on historic properties.
SIGNATORIES

FEDERAL HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION
By ________________________________ Date 7-21-15
Title  Division Administrator

ARIZONA STATE HISTORIC PRESERVATION OFFICER
By ________________________________ Date 7/21/15
Title  State Historic Preservation Officer

INVITED SIGNATORIES

ARIZONA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
By ________________________________ Date 7-21-15
Title  Environmental Planning Group Manager

CONCURRING PARTIES

ARIZONA STATE LAND DEPARTMENT
By ________________________________ Date_____
Title ________________________________

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION
By ________________________________ Date_____
Title ________________________________

BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

By ___________________________  Date ________
Title ___________________________

CITY OF CHANDLER

By ___________________________  Date ________
Title ___________________________

CITY OF GLENDALE

By ___________________________  Date ________
Title ___________________________

CITY OF PHOENIX ARCHAEOLOGY SECTION

By ___________________________  Date ________
Title ___________________________

CITY OF PHOENIX HISTORIC PRESERVATION OFFICE
By Michelle Dodds  Date 8-5-15
Title Historic Preservation Office

CITY OF TOLLESON

By ___________________________  Date ________
Title ___________________________

AK-CHIN INDIAN COMMUNITY
CITY OF CHANDLER

By Masha Reed
Title Acting City Manager
Date 8/20/15

CITY OF GLENDALE

By
Title
Date

CITY OF PHOENIX ARCHAEOLOGY SECTION

By
Title
Date

CITY OF PHOENIX HISTORIC PRESERVATION OFFICE

By
Title
Date

CITY OF TOLLESON

By
Title
Date

AK-CHIN INDIAN COMMUNITY
YAVAPAI-APACHE NATION
By ____________________________
Title ____________________________

Date __________

ARIZONA STATE MUSEUM
By ____________________________
Title ____________________________

Date 26 August 15

WESTERN AREA POWER ADMINISTRATION
By ____________________________
Title ____________________________

Date __________

BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS
By ____________________________
Title ____________________________

Date __________
YAVAPAI-APACHE NATION

ARIZONA STATE MUSEUM

WESTERN AREA POWER ADMINISTRATION

BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS

By
Title
Date

By
Title
Date

By
Title
Date

By
Title
Date

By
Title
Date
Appendix C – Farmland Conversion Impact Rating for Corridor Type Projects

This appendix includes the updated Farmland Conversion Impact Rating for Corridor Type Projects form (NRCS-CPA-106).
Laura
You’re very welcome. Nice to speak to you yesterday, and thank you for completing the CPA-106. Please let me know if I can help in the future.

Have a nice day, Cheryl Lambert
State Environmental Liaison and Technical Service Provider (TSP) Coordinator
Arizona NRCS Asian American and Pacific Islander- Special Emphasis Program Manager
USDA, Natural Resources Conservation Service
230 N. 1st Ave. Suite 509, Phoenix, AZ 85003
Office: (602) 280-8878  Fax: (855)844-9177  Website: www.az.nrcs.usda.gov
NRCS  Helping  People  Help the Land

Cheryl
Per our conversation yesterday, please disregard the items that were e-mailed on May 31, 2016. Enclosed is the initial form and NRCS response letter from January 2014; the form is updated to indicate the selected alternative.

Thank you for all your assistance on this.

Laura Paty, RLA
Landscape Architect

HDR
101 N. 1st Avenue, Suite 1950
Phoenix, AZ 85003-1923
D 602.792.8836  T 602.792.8800
laura.paty@hdrinc.com
hdrinc.com/follow-us

This electronic message contains information generated by the USDA solely for the intended recipients. Any unauthorized interception of this message or the use or disclosure of the information it contains may violate the law and subject the violator to civil or criminal penalties. If you believe you have received this message in error, please notify the sender and delete the email immediately.
June 1, 2016

Dear Ms. Lambert,

The South Mountain Loop 202 Selected Alternative was identified and approved through a Federal Highway Administration Record of Decision (ROD) on March 5, 2015 and the project is now mobilizing for construction. The Selected Alternative, a combination of the W59 and E1 Alternatives, will meet the project needs as well as or better than other alternatives.

The original CPA-106 form and response letter (dated January 31, 2014) from the State Conservationist are enclosed. The form is updated to highlight the W59 and E1 ratings. The form also incorporates an additional 177 acres of remainder parcels that were identified once the Selected Alternative was chosen. These remainder parcels are not part of the project; however, they will be indirectly converted from Prime and Unique Farmland to a use other than agriculture.

It is our understanding, with return of the updated CPA-106 form that identifies the selected alternative, that the project requires no further action relative to Prime and Unique Farmland. If you have any questions, please call me at 602-792-8836.

Sincerely,
HDR Engineering, Inc.

Laura Paty
Landscape Architect
JAN 31 2014
Audrey Unger
HDR Engineering
3200 East Camelback Road, Suite 350
Phoenix, Arizona 85018

RE: Updated NRCS-CPA-106 FPPA Farmland Conversion Impact Rating
South Mountain Freeway

Dear Audrey Unger:

The Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS) has general responsibility, nationwide, for implementing the Farmland Protection Policy Act (FPPA) and reviewing projects that may affect prime and unique important farmland and/or wetlands associated with agriculture. This is an update to the NRCS-CPA-106 form for the South Mountain Freeway.

After reviewing information you provided, the following is noted:

1. The proposed project is subject to the FPPA because they are funded by a Federal agency or program (United States Code 4201 and 7 Code of Federal Regulations 658).

2. Analysis of 2013 NAIP Imagery for Arizona, along with the updated prime and unique farmland designation, reveals that the proposed project area has been changed since the previous evaluation.

Because this area is prime and unique farmland, we have modified the original NRCS-CPA-106 form (Farmland Conversion Impact Rating for Corridor Type Projects), which includes alternative corridors for the South Mountain Transportation Corridor (W59, W71, W101WFR, W101CPR, W101EPR, W101WPR, W101CFR, E1, W101EFR). Please select your preferred alternative by completing and returning the enclosed NRCS-CPA-106 form at your earliest convenience.

Should you have any questions, please contact Andrew Burnes, GIS Specialist, at 602-280-8840, or via email at andrew.burnes@az.usda.gov. Thank you for the opportunity to review the proposed project.

Sincerely,

KEISHA L. TATEM
State Conservationist

Enclosure
### PART I (To be completed by Federal Agency)

1. Name of Project: South Mountain Transportation Corridor
2. Type of Project: EIS/LODR

### PART II (To be completed by NRCS)

3. Date of Land Evaluation Request: 11/18/13
4. Person Completing Form: Andrew Burnes
5. Federal Agency Involved: Federal Highway Administration
6. County and State: Maricopa County, Arizona

### PART III (To be completed by Federal Agency)

#### Alternative Corridor For Segment - Western Section

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Corridor</th>
<th>W59</th>
<th>W71</th>
<th>W101WFR</th>
<th>W101CPR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acres</td>
<td>588</td>
<td>501</td>
<td>779</td>
<td>746</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### PART IV (To be completed by NRCS) Land Evaluation Information

A. Total Acres Prime And Unique Farmland: 588
B. Total Acres Statewide And Local Important Farmland: 501
C. Percentage Of Farmland In County Or Local Govt. Unit To Be Converted: 779
D. Percentage Of Farmland In Govt. Jurisdiction With Same Or Higher Relative Value: 746

### PART V (To be completed by NRCS) Land Evaluation Information Criterion Relative value of Farmland to Be Serviced or Converted (Scale of 0 - 100 Points)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Maximum Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Area in Nonurban Use</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Perimeter in Nonurban Use</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Percent Of Corridor Being Farmed</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Protection Provided By State And Local Government</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Size of Present Farm Unit Compared To Average</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Creation Of Nonfarmable Farmland</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Availability Of Farm Support Services</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. On-Farm Investments</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Effects Of Conversion On Farm Support Services</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Compatibility With Existing Agricultural Use</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL CORRIDOR ASSESSMENT POINTS:** 160

**PART VII (To be completed by Federal Agency)**

Relative Value Of Farmland (From Part V): 100

Total Corridor Assessment (From Part VI above or a local site assessment): 160

**TOTAL POINTS (Total of above 2 lines):** 260

### PART VI (To be completed by Federal Agency) Corridor Assessment Criteria (These criteria are explained in 7 CFR 658.5(c))

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Maximum Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Area in Nonurban Use</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Perimeter in Nonurban Use</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Percent Of Corridor Being Farmed</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Protection Provided By State And Local Government</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Size of Present Farm Unit Compared To Average</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Creation Of Nonfarmable Farmland</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Availability Of Farm Support Services</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. On-Farm Investments</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Effects Of Conversion On Farm Support Services</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Compatibility With Existing Agricultural Use</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL CORRIDOR ASSESSMENT POINTS:** 160

### PART VIII (To be completed by Federal Agency)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Maximum Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Corridor Selected: W59 + E1</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Total Acres of Farmlands to be Converted by Project: 900</td>
<td>161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Date Of Selection: 03/05/15</td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Was A Local Site Assessment Used?</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Signature of Person Completing this Part:**

**NOTE:** Complete a form for each segment with more than one Alternate Corridor

---

The combined W59 and E1 corridors are the Selected Alternative because they meet the project needs as well or better than other alternatives. Remainder parcels were added to the project area (177 acres) after the Selected Alternative was chosen because the freeway bisects agricultural parcels.
**FARMLAND CONVERSION IMPACT RATING FOR CORRIDOR TYPE PROJECTS**

**PART I (To be completed by Federal Agency)**

1. Name of Project: South Mountain Transportation Corridor
2. Type of Project: EIS/LDCR
3. Date of Land Evaluation Request: 11/18/13
4. Federal Agency Involved: Federal Highway Administration
5. County and State: Maricopa County, Arizona

**PART II (To be completed by NRCS)**

6. Date Request Received by NRCS: 11/18/13
7. Person Completing Form: Andrew Burnes
8. Acres Irrigated Average Farm Size: 267,295, 302

**PART III (To be completed by Federal Agency)**

9. Name Of Land Evaluation System Used: N/A
10. Name of Local Site Assessment System: N/A

**PART IV (To be completed by NRCS) Land Evaluation Information**

- A. Total Acres Prime And Unique Farmland: 744
- B. Total Acres Statewide And Local Important Farmland: 748
- C. Percentage Of Farmland In County Or Local Govt. Unit To Be Converted: 3.2
- D. Percentage Of Farmland In Govt. Jurisdiction With Same Or Higher Relative Value: 737

**PART VI (To be completed by Federal Agency) Corridor Assessment Criteria (These criteria are explained in 7 CFR 658.5(c))**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Maximum Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Area in Nonurban Use</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perimeter in Nonurban Use</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Of Corridor Being Farmed</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protection Provided By State And Local Government</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size of Present Farm Unit Compared To Average</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creation Of Nonfarmable Farmland</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability Of Farm Support Services</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-Farm Investments</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effects Of Conversion On Farm Support Services</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compatibility With Existing Agricultural Use</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PART VII (To be completed by Federal Agency)**

- Relative Value Of Farmland (From Part V): 88
- Total Corridor Assessment (From Part VI above or a local site assessment): 160

**TOTAL POINTS (Total of above 2 lines):** 260

**TOTAL CORRIDOR ASSESSMENT POINTS:** 160

**PART VIII (To be completed by Federal Agency)**

- Date Of Selection: 11/18/13
- Was A Local Site Assessment Used? Yes

**NOTE:** Complete a form for each segment with more than one Alternate Corridor.
**FARMLAND CONVERSION IMPACT RATING FOR CORRIDOR TYPE PROJECTS**

**PART I (To be completed by Federal Agency)**

1. **Name of Project**: South Mountain Transportation Corridor  
2. **Type of Project**: EIS - ROD

**PART II (To be completed by NRCS)**

3. **Date of Land Evaluation Request**: 11/18/13  
4. **Person Completing Form**: Andrew Burnes  
5. **Federal Agency Involved**: Federal Highway Administration  
6. **County and State**: Maricopa County, Arizona

**PART III (To be completed by Federal Agency)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative Corridor For Western &amp; Eastern Sections</th>
<th>W101EFR</th>
<th>E1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3. Does the corridor contain prime, unique statewide or local important farmland?</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Acres Irrigated Average Farm Size</td>
<td>267,295</td>
<td>302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Major Crop(s)</td>
<td>alfalfa, cotton, grains</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Farmable Land in Government Jurisdiction</td>
<td>Acres: 267,295, %: 3.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Amount of Farmland As Defined in FPPA</td>
<td>Acres: 190,182, %: 3.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PART IV (To be completed by NRCS) Land Evaluation Information**

| | A. Total Acres To Be Converted Directly | 735 | 135 |
| | B. Total Acres To Be Converted Indirectly, Or To Receive Services | |
| | C. Total Acres In Corridor | 735 | 135 |

**PART VI (To be completed by Federal Agency) Corridor Assessment Criteria (These criteria are explained in 7 CFR 658.5(c))**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Maximum Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Area in Nonurban Use</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Perimeter in Nonurban Use</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Percent Of Corridor Being Farmed</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Protection Provided By State And Local Government</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Size of Present Farm Unit Compared To Average</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Creation Of Nonfarmable Farmland</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Availability Of Farm Support Services</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. On-Farm Investments</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Effects Of Conversion On Farm Support Services</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Compatibility With Existing Agricultural Use</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL CORRIDOR ASSESSMENT POINTS</strong></td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PART VII (To be completed by Federal Agency) Relative Value Of Farmland (From Part V)**

| | 100 | 88 | 88 |

**Relative Value Of Farmland (From Part V)**

**Total Corridor Assessment (From Part VI above or a local site assessment)**

| | 160 | 72 | 15 |

**TOTAL POINTS (Total of above 2 lines)**

| | 260 | 160 | 103 |

**NOTE:** Complete a form for each segment with more than one Alternate Corridor
CORRIDOR - TYPE SITE ASSESSMENT CRITERIA

The following criteria are to be used for projects that have a linear or corridor-type site configuration connecting two distant points, and crossing several different tracts of land. These include utility lines, highways, railroads, stream improvements, and flood control systems. Federal agencies are to assess the suitability of each corridor-type site or design alternative for protection as farmland along with the land evaluation information.

(1) How much land is in nonurban use within a radius of 1.0 mile from where the project is intended?
   More than 90 percent - 15 points
   90 to 20 percent - 14 to 1 point(s)
   Less than 20 percent - 0 points

(2) How much of the perimeter of the site borders on land in nonurban use?
   More than 90 percent - 10 points
   90 to 20 percent - 9 to 1 point(s)
   Less than 20 percent - 0 points

(3) How much of the site has been farmed (managed for a scheduled harvest or timber activity) more than five of the last 10 years?
   More than 90 percent - 20 points
   90 to 20 percent - 19 to 1 point(s)
   Less than 20 percent - 0 points

(4) Is the site subject to state or unit of local government policies or programs to protect farmland or covered by private programs to protect farmland?
   Site is protected - 20 points
   Site is not protected - 0 points

(5) Is the farm unit(s) containing the site (before the project) as large as the average-size farming unit in the County?
   (Average farm sizes in each county are available from the NRCS field offices in each state. Data are from the latest available Census of Agriculture, Acreage or Farm Units in Operation with $1,000 or more in sales.)
   As large or larger - 10 points
   Below average - deduct 1 point for each 5 percent below the average, down to 0 points if 50 percent or more below average - 9 to 0 points

(6) If the site is chosen for the project, how much of the remaining land on the farm will become non-farmable because of interference with land patterns?
   Acreage equal to more than 25 percent of acres directly converted by the project - 25 points
   Acreage equal to between 25 and 5 percent of the acres directly converted by the project - 1 to 24 point(s)
   Acreage equal to less than 5 percent of the acres directly converted by the project - 0 points

(7) Does the site have available adequate supply of farm support services and markets, i.e., farm suppliers, equipment dealers, processing and storage facilities and farmer's markets?
   All required services are available - 5 points
   Some required services are available - 4 to 1 point(s)
   No required services are available - 0 points

(8) Does the site have substantial and well-maintained on-farm investments such as barns, other storage building, fruit trees and vines, field terraces, drainage, irrigation, waterways, or other soil and water conservation measures?
   High amount of on-farm investment - 20 points
   Moderate amount of on-farm investment - 19 to 1 point(s)
   No on-farm investment - 0 points

(9) Would the project at this site, by converting farmland to nonagricultural use, reduce the demand for farm support services so as to jeopardize the continued existence of these support services and thus, the viability of the farms remaining in the area?
   Substantial reduction in demand for support services if the site is converted - 25 points
   Some reduction in demand for support services if the site is converted - 1 to 24 point(s)
   No significant reduction in demand for support services if the site is converted - 0 points

(10) Is the kind and intensity of the proposed use of the site sufficiently incompatible with agriculture that it is likely to contribute to the eventual conversion of surrounding farmland to nonagricultural use?
    Proposed project is incompatible to existing agricultural use of surrounding farmland - 10 points
    Proposed project is tolerable to existing agricultural use of surrounding farmland - 9 to 1 point(s)
    Proposed project is fully compatible with existing agricultural use of surrounding farmland - 0 points