Hello. I am writing in opposition to the building of the South Mountain Freeway. I find the proposed construction of this highway deeply troubling due to a) its intrusion into sacred and historic sites of the native community of the area, b) its impact on natural areas, and c) the fact that it further commits our community to a car culture that will exacerbate sprawl, noise and air pollution, and climate change.

As a relatively new resident in the Phoenix area, I have been quite dismayed by the lack of widespread mass transit options. This would seem to be a wonderful opportunity to redirect the billions to be spent on yet another highway toward innovative and wide-reaching transit options that encourage residents to move away from car travel and toward more sustainable transit options. This is particular urgent as we see our area experiencing the impacts of climate change, especially in regard to rising temperatures and stress on our water supply. Continuing to promote car travel can only make these problems worse.

Fyi, I have given up my car for a bicycle, and thus am trying to do my part for a more sustainable future for our area.

David Radcliff
Director
New Community Project
Peoria
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Air Quality</td>
<td>Climate change is an important national and global concern. While the earth has gone through many natural changes in climate in its history, there is general agreement that the earth’s climate is currently changing at an accelerated rate and will continue to do. Human-caused greenhouse gas emissions contribute to this rapid change. Carbon dioxide makes up the largest component of these greenhouse gas emissions. Other prominent transportation-related Greenhouse gases include methane and nitrous oxide. Greenhouse gases trap heat in the earth’s atmosphere. Because the atmospheric concentration of greenhouse gases continues to climb, our planet will likely continue to experience climate change-related phenomena (see Final Environmental Impact Statement pages 4-85 through 4-86). To date, no national standards have been established regarding greenhouse gases. Greenhouse gases are different than other air pollutants evaluated in federal environmental reviews because their impacts are not localized or regional due to their rapid dispersion into the global atmosphere. The affected environment for greenhouse gas emissions is the entire planet. In contrast to broad-scale actions such as those involving an entire industry sector or very large geographic areas, it is difficult to isolate and understand greenhouse gas emissions’ impacts for a particular transportation project. Furthermore, presently there is no scientific methodology for attributing specific climatological changes to a particular transportation project’s emissions. Under the National Environmental Policy Act, detailed environmental analysis should focus on issues that are significant and meaningful to decision making. The Federal Highway Administration has concluded, based on the nature of greenhouse gas emissions and the exceedingly small potential greenhouse gas impacts of the proposed freeway (as shown in Final Environmental Impact Statement Table 4-37 on page 4-85), that greenhouse gas emissions from the proposed freeway would not result in “reasonably foreseeable significant adverse impacts on the human environment” [40 Code of Federal Regulations § 1502.22(b)].</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Alternatives, Nonfreeway Alternatives</td>
<td>The Arizona Department of Transportation and Federal Highway Administration identified several issues and concerns that were frequently noted by commenters. Responses to these issues can be found in the Responses to Frequently Submitted Public Comments beginning on page B733 of this appendix.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Purpose and Need</td>
<td>The proposed project is part of the Regional Transportation Plan for the Maricopa Association of Governments region. In 2004, the voters of Maricopa County approved the Regional Transportation Plan and the extension of a half-cent sales tax to fund its projects. The funding for the right-of-way acquisition and construction of the proposed project would come from a combination of federal (National Highway Performance Program) and County (half-cent sales tax, also known as Regional Area Road Funds) sources. Use of these funds for construction of the proposed freeway would not affect available funds for transit projects nor would not constructing this facility make available additional funds for other transit projects.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
We have relocated to the beautiful, peaceful, village of Ahwatukee recently, and are very saddened that a highway would be considered to skirt our schools and houses. The traffic noise is already bad coming from Pecos, so cannot imagine living there when 150,000 vehicles travel this proposed route. This not only presents a noise problem, but a crime problem as well. Ahwatukee has been somewhat protected/isolated from the surrounding areas, and we want it to stay that way. Pollution is another obvious concern that politicians will continue to deny, and lie about. If this is approved, our property values will plummet. Will you compensate us? Our house will go up for sale same day, if this disaster is approved. If it doesn’t sell? It will go abandoned, like so many others. We cannot and will not live on a corridor.

Joe Ray

The Arizona Department of Transportation and Federal Highway Administration identified several issues and concerns that were frequently noted by commenters. Responses to these issues can be found in the Responses to Frequently Submitted Public Comments beginning on page B733 of this appendix.

While the City of Phoenix Police Department reported in 2005 that it did not have any statistics specific to crime adjacent to freeways, the Police Department did note that, based on its experience, there does not appear to be a correlation between crime rates and freeways. See Final Environmental Impact Statement sidebar on page 4-21.

The Arizona Department of Transportation and Federal Highway Administration identified several issues and concerns that were frequently noted by commenters. Responses to these issues can be found in the Responses to Frequently Submitted Public Comments beginning on page B733 of this appendix.

A review of the literature reveals few detailed and comprehensive analyses of the relationship between the transportation infrastructure and residential property values (Transportation Research Record: Journal of the Transportation Research Board, No. 2174, Transportation Research Board of the National Academies, Washington, D.C., 2010, pp. 138–47; “Impact of Highways on Property Values: Case Study of the Superstition Freeway Corridor”). A recent study by the California Department of Transportation concluded that freeway facilities did not substantially affect sales prices in residential areas adjacent to the facility. The study concluded that it is the visibility of the freeway that may influence selling price and not distance or noise. As a result, the researchers generally concluded that the more the visibility of a new freeway is reduced, the less it would determine the sales price of homes sold in the area.

Agencies may acquire only those properties located entirely or partly within the project right-of-way limits (see Final Environmental Impact Statement page 4-45).

While the ET Alternative is adjacent to the largely residential areas of Ahwatukee Foothills Village (to the north), a freeway has been planned in this location for many years (see Final Environmental Impact Statement pages 4-17 and 4-21). Where existing residential uses are adjacent to the proposed freeway, noise mitigation would be implemented according to Arizona Department of Transportation policy (see Final Environmental Impact Statement, page 4-91).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Comment Document</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Noise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Neighborhoods/Communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Air Quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Economics, Socioeconomics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Acquisitions and Relocations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Neighborhoods/Communities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TELEPHONE CONVERSATION RECORD

**SOUTH MOUNTAIN FREEWAY INFORMATION LINE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INCOMING CALL DATE</th>
<th>TIME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>05/1/13</td>
<td>6:56 PM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CALLER:** JOE RAE  
**CALLER ADDRESS:** 16816 S. 33rd WAY, PHOENIX, AZ 85048

**INCOMING CALLERS:**

**PHONE:** EMAIL:

**CALLER REMARKS/QUESTIONS:**

1) I live a block from the proposed freeway. This project should be a no build. I have a daughter and a son that both attend school nearby and they would be affected if this freeway is built. This freeway is a travesty; I will leave my house behind should it be constructed.

2) I will be attending the Public Hearing

---

**Code** | **Issue** | **Response**
---|---|---
1 | Alternatives, No-Action (No-Build) Alternative | The Arizona Department of Transportation and Federal Highway Administration identified several issues and concerns that were frequently noted by commenters. Responses to these issues can be found in the Responses to Frequently Submitted Public Comments beginning on page B733 of this appendix.

2 | Neighborhoods/Communities | While the E1 Alternative is adjacent to the largely residential areas of Ahwatukee Foothills Village (to the north), a freeway has been planned in this location for many years (see Final Environmental Impact Statement pages 4-17 and 4-21). Where existing residential uses are adjacent to the proposed freeway, noise mitigation would be implemented according to Arizona Department of Transportation policy (see Final Environmental Impact Statement page 4-91).
From: Anthony Ramirez [mailto:ajramirez1969@gmail.com]  
Sent: Tuesday, May 14, 2013 4:02 PM  
To: Projects  
Subject: South Mountain Freeway

I saw the article about the PARC meeting held in relation to the release of the DEIS. The freeway is good for the community and needs to constructed sooner rather than later. The PARC only had 50 people show up to their meeting so I think that is indicative of their lack of support.

Keep up the good work and break ground asap.

--
Anthony Ramirez
Comment noted.
Comment Document

Code Comment Document

From: Projects
To: ADOT
Subject: FW: Questions regarding the DEIS for South Mountain Loop 202
Date: Tuesday, July 23, 2013 8:17:06 AM

Thank you,
Salina Tovar
Community Relations Officer
1655 W. Jackson St.
MD 126F, Room 170
Phoenix, AZ 85007
602.712.4629
azdot.gov

-----Original Message-----
From: wdramsay@cox.net [mailto:wdramsay@cox.net]
Sent: Monday, July 22, 2013 10:57 PM
To: Projects
Subject: Questions regarding the DEIS for South Mountain Loop 202

In regards to the proposed South Mountain Loop 202, please identify the specific air quality study or studies that personnel at the Maricopa Association of Governments (MAG) supervised, reviewed, or had any input with. Please identify the name(s) of MAG personnel involved with testing or reviewing testing.

William D. Ramsay

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.
### Purpose and Need

There are numerous reasons why a federal lead agency may select a no-build alternative. Changes in funding, agency policy redirection, agency restructuring of priorities, changes in human and/or natural environmental conditions, and public sentiment are just a few examples. As related to the proposed action, the lead agency has identified an action alternative as its preference. No factors, such as those cited above, would currently alter that preference. Certain members of the public would argue that, given some public sentiment against the project, there is sufficient reason to pursue a no-build alternative. However, as documented in the Final Environmental Impact Statement and in this appendix, substantial support from members of the public has been expressed for the Preferred Alternative.
From: Projects
To: ADOT
Subject: FW: Questions regarding the DEIS for South Mountain Loop 202
Date: Tuesday, July 23, 2013 8:17:50 AM

Thank you,
Salina Tovar
Community Relations Officer
1655 W. Jackson St.
MD 126F, Room 170
Phoenix, AZ 85007
602.712.4629
azdot.gov

-----Original Message-----
From: wdramsay@cox.net [mailto:wdramsay@cox.net]
Sent: Monday, July 22, 2013 11:03 PM
To: Projects
Subject: Questions regarding the DEIS for South Mountain Loop 202

In regards to the proposed South Mountain Loop 202, please identify the following concerning air quality testing associated with the project:
- Name of firm(s) conducting testing;
- Dates that tests were conducted on;
- Specific locations tests were conducted at; Devices used to conduct tests; Dates devices were calibrated on, and names of personnel conducting the calibration; Names of personnel who actually performed tests; Credentials of individuals conducting testing.

William D. Ramsay

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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Air Quality</td>
<td>For the purposes of the Draft Environmental Impact Statement, only limited meteorological monitoring occurred. At the request of (then) Arizona State Senator John Huppenthal, short-term monitoring of meteorological conditions at Pecos Road and 24th and 40th streets was conducted during 2006 and 2007. Results of this sampling were included in the air quality technical report for informational purposes only. All other air quality monitoring and reporting discussed in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (see the discussion beginning on page 4-S8) was completed by the Maricopa County Air Quality Department and the Arizona Department of Environmental Quality.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In regards to the proposed South Mountain Loop 202, ADOT exhorts motorists via overhead signs on freeways to carpool, vanpool, or telecommute during high pollution advisory days in Maricopa County, AZ. This is so because motor vehicles cause particulate matter - "dust" - to be propelled into the air.

Please explain how adding the South Mountain Loop 202 freeway will not exacerbate particulate matter pollution in Maricopa County, AZ caused by motor vehicles.
In regards to the proposed South Mountain Loop 202 freeway study, did any Maricopa Association of Governments personnel:

- Directly hire or influence the hiring of any contractor(s) used in the air quality studies for the DEIS?
- Direct or supervise any work performed by air quality study contractors?
- Review any work performed by said air quality study contractors prior to its release into the DEIS.

Maricopa Association of Government personnel did not directly hire or influence the hiring of any contractor(s) used in the air quality studies for the Draft Environmental Impact Statement or direct or supervise any work performed by air quality study contractors. As members of the project team, Maricopa Association of Governments staff reviewed the entire Draft Environmental Impact Statement, including the air quality section.
From: Ashek Rana [mailto:ashek_rana@yahoo.com]
Sent: Saturday, May 18, 2013 11:59 AM
To: Projects
Subject: South Mountain Freeway (Loop 202)

I support the construction of Loop 202 South Mountain Freeway
I support the proposed 59th alignment.

Comment noted.
TELEPHONE CONVERSATION RECORD
SOUTH MOUNTAIN FREeway INFORMATION LINE

INCOMING CALL
DATE: 5/15/13
TIME: 7:07 PM

CALLER: SUE RANKIN
ADDRESS: 11414 W. COTTONWOOD LANE, AVONDALE, AZ 85392
PHONE: 623-877-8352
EMAIL:

CALLER REMARKS/QUESTIONS:
I am for doing the construction and building the connection from I-10 connecting to Pecos. If you have any questions please call me back. Thank you and have a good day.

Comment noted.
From: Projects
To: ADOT
Subject: FW: Loop 202
Date: Thursday, July 11, 2013 8:28:48 AM

Thank you,
Matthew Eberhart
Community Relations Officer
1655 W Jackson St. MD 126F
Phoenix, AZ 85007
602-712-2060
azdot.gov

-----Original Message-----
From: Rae Ray [mailto:azartpro@yahoo.com]
Sent: Wednesday, July 10, 2013 7:24 PM
To: Projects; Rae
Subject: Loop 202

I moved to the Ahwatukee area 19 years ago to get out of central Phoenix. I wanted to be next to the
mountains, cleaner air and the beauty of the desert. I was born in Arizona and have only seen major
destruction of neighborhoods, families and businesses all for the sake of development and growth. I was
never told about this freeway or I never would have settled here, but I did and now I can not afford to
move. This is the only area in most the world where you will find flora and fauna vendictive to this
small area which will be destroyed by this freeway. I see no reason to build this freeway at the location
chosen. There is Hwy 8 and interstate 85 further west. I have not seen any other plans only the one to
destroy South Mountain Preserve. Ahwatukee is a culitsac and with the largest city park in the world! It
needs to remain that way for the health and safety of its residents.

I hired a private company to take air pollution measures at the entry way of my home, being I have
asthma I was concerned. Those measurements came out to be at industrial park levels! I installed an
industrail type air cleaner on the intake system of my home. A freeway anywhere close to the Warner
/Elliot Loop or Ray /Chandler loop will only make the air even more polluted, unhealthy and unsafe.

When do we as humans say enough is enough with growth and development!?
I support a “no” build on this freeway.

Rene

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/conflicted 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.
### TELEPHONE CONVERSATION RECORD
#### SOUTH MOUNTAIN FREEWAY INFORMATION LINE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Caller</th>
<th>Caller Address</th>
<th>Phone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5/15/13</td>
<td>3:20 PM</td>
<td>DEBORAH REDDING</td>
<td>1443 W. KESSLER LANE, CHANDLER, AZ 85224</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**COMMENT:**
I just wanted to leave a message stating that I am in favor of the freeway system. Thank you.

**Response:**
Comment noted.
I support the South Mountain Freeway build. Phoenicians continuously struggle with commuting times around the valley and this Freeway would greatly help relieve that congestion. This project would also be thousands of jobs created for the people that live in our community.

Tiffany Reddy
I strongly support the construction of the South Mountain Freeway. Not only will this project help to alleviate traffic congestion in the Phoenix area it will also be a huge boom for the local economy.
To whom it may concern,

I am in complete support of building the South Mountain Freeway in Phoenix. Traffic jams continue to be an issue in our city and this freeway will help cut out some of the congested areas in Phoenix, which will save Phoenician's money and time. After reading about a study from ADOT the traffic in this area is only expected to get much worse in the coming years.

I only see positives coming from this project - saves Phoenician's time and money, improves air quality, and creates job for thousands of people.

Thanks so much for your consideration, I do hope that ADOT decides to move forward with building this worthwhile project.

Tiffany Reddy

Confidentiality and Nondisclosure Notice: This email transmission and any attachments are intended for use by the parties named above and may contain confidential/prohibited 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.
ahead and proceed with this project. This project has been approved several times and has the overwhelming support, based on recent polls, and I think it'll be a great benefit to our community. Thank you.

THE FACILITATOR: Thank you.

Ana Morego?

Tiffany Reddy.

MS. REDDY: Good afternoon. My name is Tiffany Reddy and I just wanted to come and show my support for South Mountain freeway. The congestion for the commuters in Phoenix has long been a problem for our community and I think it would greatly help our residents in Phoenix. Also, I love the idea of bringing 30,000 jobs to our community and to our people here in Phoenix, so we're in big support. Thank you.

THE FACILITATOR: Thank you.

If you'd like to speak and have not yet registered, please go out to the front registration table.

Chris Pattock. Could I ask you to use this microphone, please.

MR. PATTOCK: Sure. Thank you. My name is Chris Pattock. I'm a Tempe resident, I work downtown, I'm a lawyer. I'm not prepared to do this, I just got a phone call last night, apparently someone knew that I was

Comment noted.
From: Reed, Shelli - MGMC [mailto:Shelli.Reed@DignityHealth.org]
Sent: Thursday, May 23, 2013 9:00 AM
To: Projects
Subject: Loop 202 South Mountain Freeway

I have been waiting years for this Freeway to come about. Obviously if the voters keep voting it in they want it built. I live in the west valley and have to travel to the east valley to work every day. I have been watching this project fail in every which way and just wish a decision would be made to proceed and build it. The congestion on I-10 is ridiculous not to mention the traffic accidents that happen on that freeway every day. I would think this Freeway would have been top priority for the state of AZ for that reason alone, to stop unnecessary traffic from traveling through downtown to get to Tucson. Please hurry and proceed with the 202 S Mtn Freeway………

Shelli J Reed
TELEPHONE CONVERSATION RECORD
SOUTH MOUNTAIN FREEWAY INFORMATION LINE

INCOMING CALL
DATE: 6/13/13
TIME: 6:46 PM
CALLER: DONNA REESE
CALLER ADDRESS: 21663 N. 57TH AVENUE, GLENDALE, ARIZONA 85308
PHONE: EMAIL:

CALLER REMARKS/QUESTIONS:
I am very much in support of the 202 freeway South Mountain extension. I lease shopping centers in Phoenix, Arizona and I deal with the congestion everyday of my shopping centers basically encompass the west valley from 7th street to Goodyear/Avondale area. The 10 freeway is always congested and always a nightmare and it's so difficult to take the 10 into Ahwatukee from the west side. This will make an immense difference in the congestion on the 10 and the travel time between the west valley and the Ahwatukee/Chandler area. Thank you very much.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Comment noted.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From: Alan Regier [mailto:bbscout@aol.com]
Sent: Monday, May 20, 2013 8:28 AM
To: Projects
Subject: South Mountain Freeway

I hope to see this project begin, finally.

Alan Regier
bbscout@aol.com
As a member of the Laveen Village Planning Committee, I would like to submit my POSITIVE statement FOR the 202 South Mountain Freeway. The residents that have moved here since 1993 have all been aware that this freeway was going to happen and was voted in by the taxpayers in 1985. We understood the impact this Freeway would have on our lives and we committed to move here with that knowledge. I have watched the videos provided, looked at all the material on the site and in person, and agree that this is a project that not only the local area needs but, will help to connect the commuters from around the valley and give much needed relief from our existing freeway system.

As far as the EIS goes, I would hope that this freeway is built with the same attention to detail, wildlife, and preservation as the rest of the valley. Enhancements like rubberized asphalt, sound barriers, and aesthetically pleasing on and off ramps. Keeping true to the rural and farming traditions that have always been in the Southwest Valley.

Claudine Reifschneider
Laveen Community Council
Officer/Past President
Laveen Village Planning Committee
Commissioner
602-758-1902

"Start where you are, use what you have and do what you can." - Arthur Ashe
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Comment noted.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From: Projects
To: ADOT
Subject: FW: Proposed South Mountain Freeway
Date: Monday, July 15, 2013 11:21:17 AM

Thank you,
Matthew Eberhart
Community Relations Officer
1655 W Jackson St. MD 126F
Phoenix, AZ 85007
602-712-2060
azdot.gov

-----Original Message-----
From: Mary Ann Reith [mailto:mareith@cox.net]
Sent: Monday, July 15, 2013 11:19 AM
To: Projects
Subject: Proposed South Mountain Freeway
Build it!

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.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Comment Document</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1    | TELEPHONE CONVERSATION RECORD
SOUTH MOUNTAIN FREEWAY INFORMATION LINE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>TIME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5/17/13</td>
<td>1:49 PM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CALLER</th>
<th>CALLER ADDRESS</th>
<th>PHONE</th>
<th>EMAIL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GERALD RENDY</td>
<td>6508 N. VILLA MANANA DRIVE, PHOENIX, AZ 85014</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CALLER REMARKS/QUESTIONS:**

I support the building of the 202 Extension

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Comment noted.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
From: Reva Lusion
To: Projects
Subject: No to South Mountain Freeway Expansion
Date: Monday, May 27, 2013 8:56:23 PM

Hello,

I’m a resident of Arizona. I am emailing to state my opposition and demand that South Mountain Freeway planning be brought to an end, once and for all. While Scenario A is the closest to a desirable plan, extreme shifts in the state’s focus on public transit and bike lanes must be stepped up beyond this proposal’s current state.

ADOT’s development of the Tentative Five-Year Transportation Plan due to budget restraints makes it apparent that not only is South Mountain Freeway an economic detriment, but a cultural and environmental disaster waiting to happen.

The participation of (insert office name) in the destruction of South Mountain is a clear indication that it does not uphold the best interests of the O’odham tribes and local communities of Ahwatukee and Laveen.

This mountain is held sacred by all O’odham tribes. This type of damage is irreversible and no amount of monetary compensation would ever replace this sacred natural treasure.

After 30 years of this freeway’s planning, an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) has still not been presented. The freeway would impose on a critical wildlife corridor for various threatened desert animals and fragile ecosystems unique to both the Estrella and South Mountain ranges. It is well-known that Phoenix city’s and surrounding area’s air quality is becoming increasingly harmful to residents. Building this freeway would further spread poor air quality in part of the Phoenix valley.

Allocating funds to forms of transportation that lead to further environmental degradation will only take Arizona residents down a road to increased health risks that will eventually drive more individuals to leave the state.

Statewide communities oppose your further involvement in the environmental, cultural, and sacred destruction of South Mountain.

Thank you,
Reva

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Comment Document</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Alternatives, No-Action (No-Build) Alternative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Cultural Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Section 4(f) and Section 6(f)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Draft Environmental Impact Statement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Biology, Plants, and Wildlife</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Air Quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Health Effects</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Thank you,
Matthew Eberhart
Community Relations Officer
1655 W Jackson St. MD 126F
Phoenix, AZ 85007
602-712-2060
azdot.gov

From: Ey5147@aol.com [mailto:Ey5147@aol.com]
Sent: Saturday, July 06, 2013 6:08 PM
To: Projects
Subject: South Mountain Freeway

YES....this freeway should be built....plain and simple....the reason: it will send part of the 1-10 traffic away from the Phx area, creating a lesser traffic buildup, especially around the Broadway Curve. There is plenty of land to consume. I hear that some of the land is on Indian property and considered sacred....well, build the freeway, and give them back some of the cost. Building the freeway will also create a lot of job, for an extended period of time! Plus, build a QuikTrip along the freeway, and I guarantee people will go there for gas or other items.

It's time to break ground, and get the construction people building the new South Mountain Freeway!

Brad Rex
Phoenix
As a resident of Laveen, I am very much in favor of building this freeway. We need it in order to bring more businesses to this area like a hospital, restaurants, and retail shops. It will also help to reduce traffic going through downtown Phoenix on I-10. As Laveen continues to expand, Baseline and the other major streets in the area will keep getting increased traffic until the highway is built.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Comment noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Issue</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Comment noted.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From: Trent Rhodes [mailto:trentr9@cox.net]
Sent: Monday, July 15, 2013 4:01 PM
To: Projects
Subject: Loop 202

I support the construction of the South Mountain Freeway. As a resident of Laveen, I believe that it will bring businesses and jobs to the community. It will also decrease the amount of traffic going through downtown Phoenix on I-10, and will provide Laveen residences with much shorter commute times to the east and west valleys.

Sincerely,

Trent Rhodes
8209 S 45th Lane
Laveen, AZ 85339
TELEPHONE CONVERSATION RECORD
SOUTH MOUNTAIN FREEWAY INFORMATION LINE

INCOMING CALL
DATE: 5/18/13
TIME: 2:20 PM
CALLER: TOM RICE
CALLER ADDRESS: 2934 NO. 47TH STREET, PHOENIX, AZ
PHONE:
EMAIL:

CALLER REMARKS/Q&ACTIONS:
Hi, I want to voice my support of the South Mountain Loop. I think it would help with freeway congestion during both rush hours. Thanks for hearing me.

Comment noted.
Federal regulations stipulate that an environmental impact statement shall “rigorously explore and objectively evaluate all reasonable alternatives” (40 Code of Federal Regulations § 1502.14; see Final Environmental Impact Statement page 3-1). All alternatives were screened using a multidisciplinary set of criteria. Nonfreeway alternatives were considered (see Final Environmental Impact Statement pages 3-3 through 3-6). Among other things, the study took into account improving existing freeways, improving or expanding other travel modes, strategies to reduce travel demand, and various roadway configurations. This study examined not only the potential impacts from improvements, but also the consequences of building nothing, the No-Action Alternative. As proposed by the Maricopa Association of Governments, the South Mountain Freeway would be part of the Regional Freeway and Highway System. Other transportation improvements such as mass transit and local roads are specified in the Regional Transportation Plan and were considered during the evaluation of this proposed new freeway. As noted in the Final Environmental Impact Statement (see page 3-66), the proposed freeway would provide opportunities to enhance operation of future mass transit improvements.

4 Air Quality

The Arizona Department of Transportation and Federal Highway Administration identified several issues and concerns that were frequently noted by commenters. Responses to these issues can be found in the Responses to Frequently Submitted Public Comments beginning on page B733 of this appendix.

5 Health Effects

6 Section 4(f) and Section 6(f)

7 Biology, Plants, and Wildlife

(Responses continue on next page)
Alternative: Thank you. WE MUST BE PROTECTIVE OR OUR AREA WILL DECLINE ENVIRONMENTALLY AND AS A DESIRABLE AREA!

Sincerely,

Mrs. Minnie (Mini) Richards
1882 W. Lantana Dr.
Chandler, AZ 85248-2170
(480) 812-0172

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 and attachments.
From: Sierra Club on behalf of Jacki Richards
To: Projects
Subject: Comments in opposition to South Mountain Freeway
Date: Wednesday, July 24, 2013 3:06:22 PM

Jul 24, 2013
Arizona Department of Transportation South Mountain Study Team
1655 W Jackson St, MD 126F
Phoenix, AZ 85007
Dear South Mountain Study Team,
I am writing to express my opposition to the proposed South Mountain Freeway and to urge ADOT to select the No-Build Alternative.

The proposed freeway would cause more problems than it would solve. In addition, it would only provide short-term congestion relief while at the same time permanently damaging our beautiful park and the wildlife that inhabits it. We are so blessed here in the Valley of the Sun to have this wondrous park right in the middle of our city and it would be a disgrace to ruin that for the benefit of some that need to get to where they are going a little sooner. This will not reduce traffic -- the only way to do that is get cars off the road. The negative permanent effects of this freeway plan are permanent to our park, our wildlife, our air, our community.

Please do not damage South Mountain with this disastrous build plan. It was set aside to protect resources and to benefit our communities. By blasting a freeway through a portion of this park, wildlife and habitat will be destroyed, movement corridors will be cut off, valuable public spaces will be lost, and more. This would set a terrible precedent by demolishing what should remain a protected area.

Please help protect our communities, our health, and our environment by selecting the No Action Alternative. Thank you.

Sincerely,
Ms. Jacki Richards
2083 E Laguna Dr
Tempe, AZ 85282-5965

The Arizona Department of Transportation and Federal Highway Administration identified several issues and concerns that were frequently noted by commenters. Responses to these issues can be found in the Responses to Frequently Submitted Public Comments beginning on page B733 of this appendix.

The Arizona Department of Transportation and Federal Highway Administration identified several issues and concerns that were frequently noted by commenters. Responses to these issues can be found in the Responses to Frequently Submitted Public Comments beginning on page B733 of this appendix.

Federal regulations stipulate that an environmental impact statement shall “rigorously explore and objectively evaluate all reasonable alternatives” (40 Code of Federal Regulations § 1502.14; see Final Environmental Impact Statement page 3-1). All alternatives were screened using a multidisciplinary set of criteria. Nonfreeway alternatives were considered (see Final Environmental Impact Statement pages 3-3 through 3-6). Among other things, the study took into account improving existing freeways, improving or expanding other travel modes, strategies to reduce travel demand, and various roadway configurations. This study examined not only the potential impacts from improvements, but also the consequences of building nothing, the No-Action Alternative. As proposed by the Maricopa Association of Governments, the South Mountain Freeway would be part of the Regional Freeway and Highway System. Other transportation improvements such as mass transit and local roads are specified in the Regional Transportation Plan and were considered during the evaluation of this proposed new freeway. As noted in the Final Environmental Impact Statement (see page 3-60), the proposed freeway would provide opportunities to enhance operation of future mass transit improvements.

The Arizona Department of Transportation and Federal Highway Administration identified several issues and concerns that were frequently noted by commenters. Responses to these issues can be found in the Responses to Frequently Submitted Public Comments beginning on page B733 of this appendix.
### TELEPHONE CONVERSATION RECORD
#### SOUTH MOUNTAIN FREEWAY INFORMATION LINE

**INCOMING CALL**
- **DATE:** 7/23/13
- **TIME:** 3:24 PM

**CALLER:** ROBERT RICHARDS  
**CALLER ADDRESS:** 13038 NORTH 13TH LANE, PHOENIX, ARIZONA 85029

**PHONE:** EMAIL:  

**CALLER REMARKS/QUESTIONS:**
I thought for years they ought to get that freeway in process down there. It would really impact the other freeways. Take some of the heat off from them especially in Ahwatukee. I would be a faster way to get around and I'm fully in support of that. So, thanks, bye.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Comment noted.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Why we need to build the 202 -
It's voter approved, better for the environment (less exhaust than cars at a standstill due to congestion), little impact to displacement of families (City/State owns 90% of the land), no impact to Gila River Indian Reservation, and minimal impact to South Mountain Park. No current access to healthcare, more taxes in mean more revenue for schools (which are already strapped for resources), 4.5MM dollars is lost tax revenue (based on BLS data) to other cities because we shop in Glendale Avondale Chandler. Current road infrastructure is not made to support the traffic as it stands (Laveen doubled in size and will continue as forecasted to double again) BASELINE AND DOBBINS ARE ALREADY CLOGGED WITH TRAFFIC. THE PAVEMENT IS ALREADY COLLAPSING DUE TO OVERUSED DUE TO TRUCKING TRAFFIC. We need this freeway!

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Comment Document</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Aimee Richardson</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comment noted.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Comment Document</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>From:</td>
<td>Projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To:</td>
<td>ADOT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject:</td>
<td>RE: WE NEED THE 202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date:</td>
<td>Wednesday, May 22, 2013 1:11:58 PM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**From:** surfnvolley63@yahoo.com [mailto:surfvolley63@yahoo.com]
**Sent:** Wednesday, May 22, 2013 11:56 AM
**To:** Projects
**Subject:** WHY WE NEED THE 202

Wy we need to build the 202 – It's voter approved, better for the environment (less exhaust than cars at a standstill due to congestion), little impact to displacement of families (City/State owns 90% of the land), no impact to Gila River Indian Reservation, and minimal impact to South Mountain Park. No current access to healthcare, more taxes in mean more revenue for schools (which are already strapped for resources), 4.5MM dollars is lost tax revenue (based on BLS data) to other cities because we shop in Glendale, Avondale, Chandler. Current road infrastructure is not made to support the traffic as it stands (Laveen doubled in size and will continue as forecasted to double again) BASELINE AND DOBBINS ARE ALREADY CLOGGED WITH TRAFFIC. THE PAVEMENT IS ALREADY COLLAPSING DUE TO OVERUSE OF TRUCKING TRAFFIC.

PLEASE BUILD THIS FREEWAY TO HELP LAVEN.
Aimee Richardson
2770 W. Cheyenne Drive
Laveen AZ 85339

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 destroy or delete all copies plus attachments.
1) The Avenues between 43rd and 67th avenues and the Salt River and I-10 have a very high concentration of businesses, including major trucking companies, a tank farm, and large warehouses. These businesses have heavy truck traffic day and night. To locate the new L202 away from these businesses would only add to the present gridlock.

2) I live south of the Salt River in Laveen. The 51st Avenue preferred route would add an additional bridged river crossing for the folks living west of 59th Avenue, south of the river. This would give some relief to Baseline Rd. and 51st Avenue in the morning rush hours.

3) I am not for putting the L202 on the Gila River Indian Community (GRIC). They have not approved it and it is not necessary. The Tribe would have to take another vote, which may not pass. The delay will cost us dearly. Just by waiting two years, the cost can increase 10 percent simply due to inflation, along with stunting the growth of the southwest Valley. I don't think there should be any exit or on-ramp to the L202 south of Baseline because this may encourage truckers to use 51st Avenue to get to the freeway.

4) The Laveen and GRIC residents would like to get rid of the big truck traffic using 51st Avenue. If another route is chosen it would be too far away from the truckers, forcing them to continue using 51st Avenue, which I don't want to see. If another route is chosen it would not be reasonable for local traffic to go west in the morning to cross the river on the new L202 to catch I-10.

5) I hope that ADOT and FHWA would realize that the L202 is more than just a bypass. It is a key part of our community's infrastructure and needed to grow the southwest Valley. If done right it can quiet the neighborhoods, provide easy access for local businesses, and stimulate new and targeted growth. It should be built as soon as possible, with the idea of efficiency and getting the most for our hard-earned buck.

Terry Richardson
5218 W. Gwen
Laveen, Arizona 85339

I would like to see the L202 built on the preferred route for the following reasons:

As part of the proposed freeway, there are interchanges planned at Dobbins Road, Elliot Road, and 51st Avenue (see page 3-51 of the Final Environmental Impact Statement). As noted in other areas of the comment and in the Final Environmental Impact Statement on page 3-29, the proposed freeway would reduce traffic on 51st Avenue in 2035 in comparison to the No-Action Alternative.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Comment Document</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**TELEPHONE CONVERSATION RECORD**
**SOUTH MOUNTAIN FREEWAY INFORMATION LINE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INCOMING CALL</th>
<th>INCOMING CALL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DATE: 5/19/13</td>
<td>TIME: 5:54 PM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CALLER</th>
<th>CALLER ADDRESS</th>
<th>PHONE</th>
<th>EMAIL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MARGIE A. RICO</td>
<td>8434 N. CENTRAL PHOENIX, ARIZONA 85020</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CALLER REMARKS/QUESTIONS:**
I support the South Mountain freeway.

```plaintext
1
Comment noted.
```
To whom it may concern:

I oppose building the South Mountain Freeway. Such a freeway will increase urban sprawl, destroy natural habitats, and eradicate open space that enhances the quality of life for those in the Phoenix metropolitan area. South Mountain Park is one of the few natural wonders in this area. It is one reason why many people enjoy visiting this area and why some people choose to move here. It adds a great deal to the quality of life in this region. To bisect South Mountain Park would be a terrible mistake that would negatively affect the quality of life and natural beauty of this area. It would also destroy natural habitats and dissect wildlife corridors. Finally, the destruction of South Mountain Park would have a negative economic impact. It is one of the few jewels of this area, it is the largest urban park in America, and it helps to give Phoenix a unique image and reputation as an outdoor mecca. South Mountain Park is too valuable to sacrifice.

Sincerely,

Dr. Karyn Riedell

### Code Comment Document

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Comment Document</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>To whom it may concern:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I oppose building the South Mountain Freeway. Such a freeway will increase urban sprawl, destroy natural habitats, and eradicate open space that enhances the quality of life for those in the Phoenix metropolitan area. South Mountain Park is one of the few natural wonders in this area. It is one reason why many people enjoy visiting this area and why some people choose to move here. It adds a great deal to the quality of life in this region. To bisect South Mountain Park would be a terrible mistake that would negatively affect the quality of life and natural beauty of this area. It would also destroy natural habitats and dissect wildlife corridors. Finally, the destruction of South Mountain Park would have a negative economic impact. It is one of the few jewels of this area, it is the largest urban park in America, and it helps to give Phoenix a unique image and reputation as an outdoor mecca. South Mountain Park is too valuable to sacrifice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Sincerely,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Dr. Karyn Riedell</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Neighborhoods/Communities</td>
<td>Unplanned growth is often termed “urban sprawl.” Generally, this term is used in the context of rapid and uncontrolled urban growth onto previously undeveloped land—usually on the outskirts of an existing urban area. Projects like the proposed freeway are often identified as contributors to urban sprawl. Freeway projects are often cited as making land at the urban fringe more accessible and, therefore, more attractive for development. However, examination of data comparing population and land use between 1975 and 2000 suggests major transportation projects like the proposed freeway do not induce growth in the region (see Final Environmental Impact Statement pages 4-170 through 4-174). The proposed freeway would be implemented in a historically quickly urbanizing area (most noticeably in the Western Section of the Study Area, although the nationwide recession which began in 2007 slowed growth). In the Eastern Section of the Study Area, the proposed freeway would abut public parkland, Native American land, and a near-fully developed area—therefore, any contribution to accelerated or induced growth would be constrained. The proposed freeway would be built in an area planned for urban growth as established in local jurisdictions’ land use plans for at least the last 25 years.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Biology, Plants, and Wildlife</td>
<td>The Arizona Department of Transportation and Federal Highway Administration identified several issues and concerns that were frequently noted by commenters. Responses to these issues can be found in the Responses to Frequently Submitted Public Comments beginning on page B733 of this appendix.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Section 4(f) and Section 6(f)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
From: Karyn Riedell [mailto:karyriedell@yahoo.com]
Sent: Tuesday, May 21, 2013 3:32 PM
To: Projects
Subject: NO on South Mountain Freeway

To whom it may concern:

I oppose building the South Mountain Freeway. Such a freeway would increase urban sprawl, destroy natural habitats, and eradicate open space that enhances the quality of life for those in the Phoenix metropolitan area. South Mountain Park is one of the few natural wonders in this area. It is one reason why many people enjoy visiting this area and why some people choose to move here. It adds a great deal to the quality of life in this region. To bisect South Mountain Park would be a terrible mistake that would negatively affect the quality of life and natural beauty of this area. It would also destroy natural habitats and dissect wildlife corridors. Finally, the destruction of South Mountain Park would have a negative economic impact. It is one of the few jewels of this area, it is the largest urban park in America, and it helps to give Phoenix a unique image and reputation as an outdoor mecca. South Mountain Park is too valuable to sacrifice.

Sincerely,

Dr. Karyn Riedell

Unplanned growth is often termed “urban sprawl.” Generally, this term is used in the context of rapid and uncontrolled urban growth onto previously undeveloped land—usually on the outskirts of an existing urban area. Projects like the proposed freeway are often identified as contributors to urban sprawl. Freeway projects are often cited as making land at the urban fringe more accessible and, therefore, more attractive for development. However, examination of data comparing population and land use between 1975 and 2000 suggests major transportation projects like the proposed freeway do not induce growth in the region (see Final Environmental Impact Statement pages 4-170 through 4-174). The proposed freeway would be implemented in a historically quickly urbanizing area (most noticeably in the Western Section of the Study Area, although the nationwide recession which began in 2007 slowed growth). In the Eastern Section of the Study Area, the proposed freeway would abut public parkland, Native American land, and a near-fully developed area—therefore, any contribution to accelerated or induced growth would be constrained. The proposed freeway would be built in an area planned for urban growth as established in local jurisdictions’ land use plans for at least the last 25 years.

The Arizona Department of Transportation and Federal Highway Administration identified several issues and concerns that were frequently noted by commenters. Responses to these issues can be found in the Responses to Frequently Submitted Public Comments beginning on page B733 of this appendix.

Section 4(f) and Section 6(f)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Comment noted.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TELEPHONE CONVERSATION RECORD**
**SOUTH MOUNTAIN FREEWAY INFORMATION LINE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INCOMING CALL</th>
<th>INCOMING CALL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DATE: 5/15/13</td>
<td>TIME: 5:03 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CALLER: JULIE RILEY</td>
<td>CALLER ADDRESS: 11837 S. KI ROAD, PHOENIX, AZ 85044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHONE: 480-496-4585</td>
<td>EMAIL:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CALLER REMARKS/QUESTIONS:**
I support the South Mountain Freeway. Thank you.
TELEPHONE CONVERSATION RECORD
SOUTH MOUNTAIN FREEWAY INFORMATION LINE

INCOMING CALL
DATE: 6/13/13
TIME: 7:00 PM

CALLER
KEVIN RINGGER

CALLER ADDRESS:
17903 W. BANFLAME, SURPRISE, ARIZONA 85388
PHONE:
EMAIL:

CALLER REMARKS/QUESTIONS:
I'm calling in support of the South Mountain freeway.

Comment noted.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Comment Document</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Robert Ringwald</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Document Created: 5/7/2013 12:05:00 PM by Web-Comment Form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>This is a much needed project which will greatly improve freeway congestion by allowing traffic including trucks bypass downtown Phoenix.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>comment noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Comment Document</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Wyatt Ringwald</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I am for the new freeway. It will help reduce traffic congestion.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Comment noted.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Wyatt Ringwald
I am for the south mountain freeway.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Comment Document</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Wyatt Ringwald</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I am for the south mountain freeway.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Comment noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Comment Document</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Shelley Ringwald</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I support the new freeway.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Response:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Comment noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Comment Document</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From: Projects  
To: ADOT  
Subject: FW: 202 south mtn.  
Date: Monday, May 20, 2013 8:42:07 AM  

-----Original Message-----  
From: r3308@netzero.com  
Sent: Friday, May 17, 2013 6:54 PM  
To: Projects  
Subject: 202 south mtn.  

I approve it...  
Jerry ritter

Comment noted.
create is pollution, contamination, poor air quality, and it doesn't make sense in this year of 2013. So please take those opinions and make sure that you know that I represent Arizona and many people that can't be here today, and certainly in my community. Thank you.


MS. RITTER: Good morning, panel members. Thank you for letting us speak here today. My name is Haley Ritter. And I live off of 23rd Avenue and Camelback. There's a lot of horrible uranium mining going on up north, which is poisoning communities, leaving children waiting for kidneys and things like that. That type of waste is going to be transported on a type of freeway like this, which is also going to contaminate when those types of hazardous chemicals pass through. And we need to, like other folks have been saying, we need to look to alternatives means of sustaining our community. This national park and this sacred mountain are very, very important to Arizona, and the livelihood of the species, the remainder of endangered species that live there, for example. The native community would be, and the folks that live in

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Hazardous Materials</td>
<td>The Arizona Department of Transportation and Federal Highway Administration identified several issues and concerns that were frequently noted by commenters. Responses to these issues can be found in the Responses to Frequently Submitted Public Comments beginning on page B733 of this appendix.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Section 4(f) and Section 6(f)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Cultural Resources</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Biology, Plants, and Wildlife</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Comment Document</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>the scheduled pathway to build this freeway are going</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>to be horribly displaced, and there's way too many</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>things that we need to be doing instead.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Like other people have been saying, we</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>need to focus on the streets, the Complete Streets</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Program, my understanding, is a wonderful proposal.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Take all those billions of dollars, put them back</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>into the streets, enhance the city itself rather than</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>building another freeway. We don't need more</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>freeways, we've got plenty. We don't want this to</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>look like L.A. It -- these are outdated ideas; they</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>really need to be put aside for now and thrown out.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>So please move forward with sustainable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>means, you know. We need to get bike lanes on all</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>the streets. I've lived in Phoenix for 20 years and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>I've ridden a bicycle everywhere. I take the public</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>transportation, and it's very challenging to ride a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>bicycle legally on the streets with cars, you know,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>swiping by me going 50 miles an hour.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>You know, there's streets that have nine</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>lanes of traffic, vehicle traffic, and no bike lanes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>without any buffers between the pedestrians and the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>streets. And there's a lot more people riding</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>bicycles today to stay in shape, and to get around</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>the city, because it's really not that difficult,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Code Issue Response**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Acquisitions and Relocations</td>
<td>The Arizona Department of Transportation and Federal Highway Administration identified several issues and concerns that were frequently noted by commenters. Responses to these issues can be found in the Responses to Frequently Submitted Public Comments beginning on page B733 of this appendix.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Purpose and Need</td>
<td>The proposed project is part of the Regional Transportation Plan for the Maricopa Association of Governments region. In 2004, the voters of Maricopa County approved the Regional Transportation Plan and the extension of a half-cent sales tax to fund its projects. The funding for the right-of-way acquisition and construction of the proposed project would come from a combination of federal (National Highway Performance Program) and County (half-cent sales tax, also known as Regional Area Road Funds) sources. Use of these funds for construction of the proposed freeway would not affect available funds for statewide projects nor would not constructing this facility make available additional funds for other statewide projects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Purpose and Need, Old Plan or Use of Old Data</td>
<td>The Arizona Department of Transportation and Federal Highway Administration identified several issues and concerns that were frequently noted by commenters. Responses to these issues can be found in the Responses to Frequently Submitted Public Comments beginning on page B733 of this appendix.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1 even with the heat. I've done it for 20 years.
2 So please, please don't approve this idea
3 for the 202 Freeway. It's very unnecessary. Supply
4 and demand are not high enough for this type of
5 project. Thank you.

6 THE FACILITATOR: Thank you. Has Prem
7 Goyal returned? Did I pronounce your name correctly?
8 MR. GOYAL: Yes, thanks. I won't take
9 three minutes. A good question is I was looking at
10 the curves, which are growth curves, they are based
11 on 2005 data; they should be based on 2013 data. And
12 I have the newspaper cuttings every day that you did
13 at least expect lower demand. That directive curve
14 leads to the expansion of the future demand of the
15 transportation. Only way they can project the future
16 demands is from the utility demands. It looks like
17 we should verify those curves, as the
18 [unintelligible] president said, trust but verify.
19 All those curves have been verified, or they're just
20 ten years old, which don't mean very much in today's
21 environment.
22 Thanks very much. Have a good day.
23 THE FACILITATOR: Thank you very much.
24 MS. ROGERS: Good morning. Let's turn
going to revolt or do something like that. But I don’t think that’s fair, you know. And I would just like to,
you know, kind of let the people know, you know, what’s going on, because they won’t let news media or reporters
go to their meetings or anything, and nobody knows, you know, what’s going on out there.
So I just thought maybe I could make a little comment that -- you know, let them know how I feel about it. So that’s it. That’s it. Thank you.

I’m excited about the upcoming city council elections, because I think a lot of the younger people coming into leadership in this city will realize that we can’t keep building freeways.
I’m against the 202 because there’s a lot of pollution going through the city already. The uranium mines up north in Flagstaff and surrounding communities are very, very harmful for that community up there. And then the toxic chemicals that are being hauled through Phoenix and then through the South -- South Mountain Gila River Community if the 202 is built are going to be horrible to the environment.
There have been plenty of environmental

The Arizona Department of Transportation and Federal Highway Administration identified several issues and concerns that were frequently noted by commenters. Responses to these issues can be found in the Responses to Frequently Submitted Public Comments beginning on page B733 of this appendix.
1 impact studies done already that show that it’s not a good idea. It’s going to cause a lot of destruction for the city.

2 And there’s a lot of people around the world that come to Phoenix for South Mountain because it’s a beautiful natural park -- national park. And it’s a sacred mountain for the surrounding Native American community.

3 And I’ve -- I’ve ridden a bicycle around the city for 20 years now. And it’s not that difficult. We don’t need more vehicles, more traffic, more freeways. We need less vehicles, less freeways, less traffic.

4 All that money being hoarded for such a project needs to be deterred into the streets that exist already as they are. In Phoenix they’re crumbling beneath us. There are no bike lanes on most of them. And the pedestrian walkways are so hot and unbearable that people can’t travel that way. So we need to -- I’m in support of Mayor Stanton’s proposal to put 1.5 million of that money in -- back into the streets, into the Complete Streets program suggested by the federal government for major cities like Phoenix to -- to invest all that money in local community and local businesses and people that need it rather than more freeways for huge industries that are destroying the planet.

The Arizona Department of Transportation and Federal Highway Administration identified several issues and concerns that were frequently noted by commenters. Responses to these issues can be found in the Responses to Frequently Submitted Public Comments beginning on page B733 of this appendix.

The proposed project is part of the Regional Transportation Plan for the Maricopa Association of Governments region. In 2004, the voters of Maricopa County approved the Regional Transportation Plan and the extension of a half-cent sales tax to fund its projects. The funding for the right-of-way acquisition and construction of the proposed project would come from a combination of federal (National Highway Performance Program) and County (half-cent sales tax, also known as Regional Area Road Funds) sources. Use of these funds for construction of the proposed freeway would not affect available funds for statewide projects nor would not constructing this facility make available additional funds for other statewide projects.
So in conclusion, I guess, I just want to make sure that -- that all these comments against the freeway are realized and heard, and I want to make sure that this project does not go through to the highest bidder or whoever. It's become a private project anyway. It's all about money at this point. And I want to see the streets improved. I want to see more bike lanes. I want to see Complete Streets passed and moved forward with. And I support Mayor Stanton, in that I do not support the 202 Freeway.

Thank you very much. I appreciate your willingness to hear my comments.

If you could add something to that, one of the pro-202 speakers mentioned that we need a freeway in order to build a hospital in Laveen. And I believe the complete opposite is true. We need a hospital in Laveen before we build a freeway. We don't need a freeway to get to a hospital.

That's all.

MS. GARZA: Well, my name is Anna Garza, A-n-n-a, G-a-r-z-a. I am a living resident in ZIP Code 85239. And I'm here to share my comments. I feel it is time to build the South Mountain Freeway. Our Valley commuters have waited long enough. In the meantime, we are -- we have traffic jams,
From: GcrBusinesses
To: Projects
Subject: Loop 202 Extension Feedback
Date: Sunday, May 26, 2013 9:56:17 PM

Hello,
Since this project has been conceptualized for about 30 years, please give the Gila River Indian Community another year or two to get their act together and “see the light”. Don’t all of a sudden be rushed into a bad decision. If we have waited 30 years, we can wait two more!

If they (GRIC) accept a path at least one half mile south of Pecos Road (on vacant, unused land), everyone will benefit. It is simply logical to put the highway on worthless, vacant land instead of tearing up developed Ahwatukee. Does logic and common sense matter anymore?

No matter how many facts you shove at environmental wackos, they live in their own little bubble world and simply say “no” to anything involving development. That is how brainwashed they can be. Ignore them.

Thank You,
George C. Ritz
(Concerned Ahwatukee resident)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Alternatives, Gila River Indian Community Alignment</td>
<td>The Arizona Department of Transportation and Federal Highway Administration identified several issues and concerns that were frequently noted by commenters. Responses to these issues can be found in the Responses to Frequently Submitted Public Comments beginning on page B733 of this appendix.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Neighborhoods/Communities</td>
<td>Prospective home buyers and members of the church built after the freeway was conceived, according to State law, should have been informed of the proposed facility. (Sellers are obligated by Arizona common law to disclose all known material facts about a property to the buyer.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MR. RIVERS: So the first thing I want to do is talk about where I’m from. And I’m from a village called Vahki, V-a-h-k-i. And that translates into “medicine house” or “a sacred house.” And my family has been there for a long time. I don’t know how long, but we know that it’s several, probably, millennia as far as we understand.

I am a member of the Gila River Indian Community. But, more importantly, I am an O’oodham, which is the people that live on this land. The O’oodham have a history that dates back several thousand years. Archeologists talk about the Hohokam, or Hohokam, who we are descendants of. And we were given this specific responsibilities, to take care of this land, and, if we were to take care of this land, this land would take care of us.

So I just wanted to mention that much about the culture.

But I want to go into today and some of the issues that we’re looking at and why it’s important for us to address this issue about a 202 Freeway, specifically a freeway that will impact some of our most sacred cultural areas and sites.

The United States in 2008, along with other member States of the United Nations, supported the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples. And in 2010 President Obama supported, moved even further and said that he would do anything to support the rights of indigenous peoples; and that...

The Arizona Department of Transportation and Federal Highway Administration identified several issues and concerns that were frequently noted by commenters. Responses to these issues can be found in the Responses to Frequently Submitted Public Comments beginning on page B733 of this appendix.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Comment Document</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>being specifically that the first people, the original people of these territories, human rights have been violated, so much so that we have been placed on reservations and quarantined, to some degree.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The other -- The concern about that is, though I -- Though I understand that the United States is supporting the Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, we still struggle to have our basic human rights needs when it comes to our culture and our tradition and our spirituality.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>And those are all English terms that are not -- that are difficult to translate as Native people. But what we recognized is that all of us, even our white brothers, our non-Native people, have some sort of awareness of the spiritual connectedness to their God.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>We, as O’odham, believe that this area, this South Mountain area, is one of the most sacred connections to our hinduc, our way of life. And, if we lose -- continue to lose that way of life, we will cease to exist.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>And by that I mean that we can adapt and adopt and even go so far as to assimilate into another culture. But that's all we're doing; we're assimilating.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>If we are a distinct people, a distinct people from all other people, who have a different idea of religion and cultural ties to a sacred place or a sacred land, then what is the -- an agency like the Arizona Department of Transportation,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Environmental Justice/Lifestyle

The Draft Environmental Impact Statement describes a decade-long consultation and coordination effort led by the Arizona Department of Transportation and the Federal Highway Administration with the Gila River Indian Community and other Native American tribes. As a result of the consultation, the cultural importance of the South Mountains is acknowledged in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement in several locations, notably page 5-26. The proposed project would accommodate and preserve (to the fullest extent possible from the available alternatives) access to the South Mountains for religious practices.

Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act requires a government-to-government relationship between the Federal Government and Indian tribes as described beginning on page 4-140 of the Final Environmental Impact Statement. Section 106 requires federal agencies take into account the effects of their undertakings on historic properties and requires consultation with tribal authorities. Consultation has occurred with Gila River Indian Community government officials, the Tribal Historic Preservation Officer, the Cultural Resource Management Program, other tribes, and the State Historic Preservation Office and has led to concurrence from the Gila River Indian Community Tribal Historic Preservation Office and the State Historic Preservation Office on National Register of Historic Places eligibility recommendations (including traditional cultural properties like the South Mountains), project effects, and proposed mitigation and measures to minimize harm. This consultation has been ongoing and will continue until any commitments in a record of decision are completed.

The section entitled Title VI and Environmental Justice, beginning on page 4-29 in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement, presents acceptable methods, data, and assumptions to assess the potential for disproportionately high and adverse effects from the proposed action on environmental justice populations and disparate impacts to populations protected under Title VI. Based on the content of the section, no such effects would result from the action alternatives.

In light of comments received on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement, the above-referenced conclusions were confirmed in the preparation of the Final Environmental Impact Statement. To provide further clarity, the discussions of environmental justice and Title VI were separated and additional text explaining the relationship of environmental justice and Title VI to various environmental elements was added throughout Chapter 4, Affected Environment, Environmental Consequences, and Mitigation, as exemplified by the inserted text on page 4-29 of the Final Environmental Impact Statement.

2. Heat Island

As buildings, parking lots, roads, and other infrastructure replace open land and vegetation, an urban heat island may result. The heat island effect is of a regional nature and, therefore, there is no requirement to analyze potential impacts and no possibility of determining the localized contribution at the project level to the regional heat island effect. It is likely, however, that a proposed project such as the South Mountain Freeway would be a minor contributor to the overall issue.

(Codes continue on next page)
or the other agencies that are Federal agencies and under the
umbrella of the United States Government, doing to protect
those sacred sites or those very basic needs, the human rights
of indigenous peoples, especially the O’odham people, the Gila
River Indian Community.

So there are a lot of -- a lot of things that we
need to address here. And, specifically, I want to talk about
the environmental impact. What will the environmental impact
look like?

We know that Phoenix is one of the largest urban
islands anywhere, urban heat islands. We know that there’s --
this urban sprawl has an impact on our territory. And our
territorial boundaries are being impacted by the encroachment
of large development and population growth.

So we are forced to -- to live under this
pollution, under this -- this environment that’s taking place.
And that environment is that it’s not -- We are concerned about
the health and the future of our children. We’ve seen a
60 percent increase in the asthma-related problems here.

We always seen South Mountain as a buffer to
the city. But now we see the encroachment, and we see the
expansion of it. It’s now impacting. So it, environmentally,
is impacting us. Physically, it’s impacting us. It’s creating
many more lung problems for our people.

As a population that already suffers from certain

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Neighborhoods/Communities</td>
<td>Unplanned growth is often termed “urban sprawl.” Generally, this term is used in the context of rapid and uncontrolled urban growth onto previously undeveloped land—usually on the outskirts of an existing urban area. Projects like the proposed freeway are often identified as contributors to urban sprawl. Freeway projects are often cited as making land at the urban fringe more accessible and, therefore, more attractive for development. However, examination of data comparing population and land use between 1975 and 2000 suggests major transportation projects like the proposed freeway do not induce growth in the region (see Final Environmental Impact Statement pages 4-170 through 4-174). The proposed freeway would be implemented in a historically quickly urbanizing area (most noticeably in the Western Section of the Study Area, although the nationwide recession which began in 2007 slowed growth). In the Eastern Section of the Study Area, the proposed freeway would abut public parkland, Native American land, and a near-fully developed area—therefore, any contribution to accelerated or induced growth would be constrained. The proposed freeway would be built in an area planned for urban growth as established in local jurisdictions’ land use plans for at least the last 25 years.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Air Quality</td>
<td>The Arizona Department of Transportation and Federal Highway Administration identified several issues and concerns that were frequently noted by commenters. Responses to these issues can be found in the Responses to Frequently Submitted Public Comments beginning on page B733 of this appendix.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Health Effects</td>
<td>Indirect impacts such as damage to archaeological sites as a result of increased access as a result of the freeway are being considered in the environmental impact statement process (see proposed mitigation beginning on page 4-146 of the Draft Environmental Impact Statement).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
medical illnesses, diabetes being one of them, how do we, then, as a society, as an indigenous -- as distinct people, protect our people for -- from the future of all these other impacts, specifically the environment?

We are here to protect this environment. We are here to live distinctly in this environment, but we can't if we're being forced -- if we're being forced to adopt or to live next to another freeway. So that was the issue on the air quality.

The second is -- and for specific reasons, I can't go into the cultural sites and what they specifically mean to our people because that is our cultural protection. So the concern that I have is the access to these sites by non-Native people. For decades and millennia, we have visited these sites and prayed at these sites. We don't disrupt these sites. But we know that, with the increased population and increased visibility and awareness from non-Native communities, they will come and in and destroy and take some of these petroglyphs and these -- maybe some of these things that are there that are sacred to our community.

Lastly, I want to say that, because these Federal agencies are involved, the issue of free prior and informed consent, with indigenous peoples and populations, has not been taking its proper course by these Government agencies under the United States Federal Government. And that is a priority to

---

### Code Comment Document

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Comment Document</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>medical illnesses, diabetes being one of them, how do we, then,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>as a society, as an indigenous -- as distinct people, protect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>our people for -- from the future of all these other impacts,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>specifically the environment?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>We are here to protect this environment. We are</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>here to live distinctly in this environment, but we can't if</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>we're being forced -- if we're being forced to adopt or to live</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>next to another freeway. So that was the issue on the air</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>quality.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>The second is -- and for specific reasons, I can't</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>go into the cultural sites and what they specifically mean to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>our people because that is our cultural protection. So the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>concern that I have is the access to these sites by non-Native</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>people. For decades and millennia, we have visited these sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>and prayed at these sites. We don't disrupt these sites. But</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>we know that, with the increased population and increased</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>visibility and awareness from non-Native communities, they will</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>come and in and destroy and take some of these petroglyphs and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>these -- maybe some of these things that are there that are</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>sacred to our community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Lastly, I want to say that, because these Federal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>agencies are involved, the issue of free prior and informed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>consent, with indigenous peoples and populations, has not been</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>taking its proper course by these Government agencies under the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>United States Federal Government. And that is a priority to</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

### Code Issue Response

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Public Involvement</td>
<td>Arizona Department of Transportation and Federal Highway Administration solicited input from the Gila River Indian Community and other Native American tribes and tribal members and considered fully the substantive input and comments that were received. Consultation related to cultural resources strictly followed the requirements of Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act. Project communication with Gila River Indian Community officials followed a protocol established for this study, from years of previous coordination recognizing the sovereign nation status of the Gila River Indian Community and with respect for the Gila River Indian Community’s cultural norms. Coordination occurred one-on-one with the appropriate Gila River Indian Community officials. Representatives from the Gila River Indian Community participated for years in the South Mountain Citizens Advisory Committee. During the public comment period, Gila River Indian Community members were provided the same opportunities to attend the public hearing and participate in a public forum as all other populations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Cultural Resources</td>
<td>The communication protocol established for this study, from years of previous coordination and with respect for the Gila River Indian Community’s cultural norms, was conducted in a “government-to-government” nature (i.e., the Arizona Department of Transportation Project Manager would speak directly to the Gila River Indian Community Manager; the Arizona Department of Transportation Communications Director would speak directly to the Gila River Indian Community Public Involvement Officer). Coordination occurred one-on-one with the appropriate Gila River Indian Community officials.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Native people, that they have to have community comments, not just government-to-government relationship comments, but people that will be directly impacted by a freeway that goes through our territory.

So, as a member of the Gila River Indian Community, I oppose this freeway because of the -- the things that I mentioned: the air quality, the environmental impact, the cultural significant sites to our people. And, lastly, our way of life will cease to exist if we continue to allow people and governments and corporations to develop and destroy our territory.

That's it.
The cost estimates for the proposed freeway, as described beginning on page 3-59 of the Final Environmental Impact Statement, were developed in accordance with accepted engineering practices by professional engineers. The project has been subject to multiple peer reviews of both the quantities and unit costs used in the estimate by the Arizona Department of Transportation, Federal Highway Administration, Maricopa Association of Governments, and their consultants. In each case, the estimate was found to be reasonable and accurate. The proposed project is part of the Regional Transportation Plan for the Maricopa County region. In 2004, the voters of Maricopa County approved the Regional Transportation Plan and the extension of a half-cent sales tax to fund its projects. The funding for right-of-way acquisition and construction of the proposed project would come from a combination of federal (National Highway Performance Program) and County (half-cent sales tax, also known as Regional Area Road Funds) sources.

While the City has some ability to control development through its zoning ordinances, the City does not have the authority to stop private land from being developed. The Arizona Department of Transportation was able to acquire large tracts of land along the Pecos Road alignment in the 1980s, but funding shortfalls kept the Arizona Department of Transportation from acquiring all of the needed land. Developers were aware of the potential freeway and made the decision to develop the land based on the risk that the freeway would eventually be built. Citizens were also aware of the potential and chose to buy homes near the freeway despite the same risk. Information related to freeway awareness and the responsibilities of the City of Phoenix, developers, and the Arizona Department of Transportation related to disclosure of the planning for the freeway is presented on page 4-13 of the Final Environmental Impact Statement.

Depressing the proposed Pecos Road sections would entail installation of pump stations to drain the main line freeway. A depressed freeway would also need a drainage channel to capture the off-site flows to prevent their entering the freeway. Pump stations were not used because of the high cost of construction and maintenance needed for their operation. The preferred freeway configuration would have the E1 Alternative aboveground and the existing culverts extending to pass the drainage under the freeway. Pecos Road currently has numerous existing culvert crossings. Depressing the freeway in this area would eliminate the existing culvert crossings and potentially have adverse flooding impacts on adjacent properties. Extending the existing culverts or upsizing the culverts would maintain or improve drainage flows. This would ensure that there would be no adverse flooding impacts on adjacent properties. (See Final Environmental Impact Statement pages 3-15 and 3-18.)

To reduce impacts by depressing the proposed freeway in the Eastern Section, the Arizona Department of Transportation would:

1. need to spend an additional $400 million for right-of-way acquisition and construction
2. displace an additional 300 residences
3. maintain additional pump stations and detention basins for the life of the freeway
4. observe noise-related impacts requiring mitigation (i.e., noise barriers and their associated costs and visual impacts)

Because the belowground option would result in substantially greater costs and residential displacements, this option was eliminated from further study.
For most of the alignments of each of the action alternatives, the proposed freeway would be elevated above the natural grade of the surrounding land. This elevated profile would allow noise to carry farther, creating noise impacts at greater distances from the freeway. Depressing the profile of the freeway below grade might reduce traffic noise levels adjacent to depressed sections. However, it would be necessary to also construct at-grade noise barriers to achieve noise reduction goals at receiver locations adjacent to depressed freeway sections (see page 4-99 in the Final Environmental Impact Statement). This strategy would reduce visual impacts associated with high noise barriers on elevated freeways, but would entail ground-level noise barriers and their associated interference with views. Thus, with either approach to noise reduction, views of nearby mountains could be disrupted. The specific impacts would depend on the geometrics of the height of any noise barriers constructed, the intervening topography, and the distance of the barriers from the residences in question.

A depressed freeway option was evaluated in the Final Environmental Impact Statement and is described on pages 3-15 and 4-99. Although depressing the freeway would reduce noise levels, noise walls would still be needed to further reduce noise to meet the Arizona Department of Transportation noise policy. Whether the freeway is built aboveground with tall walls or belowground with shorter walls, the final mitigated noise levels would be nearly the same at nearby residences.

The Arizona Department of Transportation and Federal Highway Administration identified several issues and concerns that were frequently noted by commenters. Responses to these issues can be found in the Responses to Frequently Submitted Public Comments beginning on page B733 of this appendix.

Impacts on Phoenix South Mountain Park/Preserve have been important considerations since the freeway was first proposed in the mid-1980s. The Draft Environmental Impact Statement discusses how the proposed freeway would affect the park, beginning on page 5-14. None of the existing trails would be directly affected by the proposed freeway. The proposed freeway would introduce noise impacts to those areas of the park close to the freeway, but noise levels would rapidly diminish with increasing distance from the freeway. The trail segments near the proposed freeway are used for active recreation such as running, hiking, and biking, the noise sensitivities of which would depend on the specific activity, user, and time of day.

The Arizona Department of Transportation and Federal Highway Administration identified several issues and concerns that were frequently noted by commenters. Responses to these issues can be found in the Responses to Frequently Submitted Public Comments beginning on page B733 of this appendix.
1 Purpose and Need, Truck Bypass

The Arizona Department of Transportation and Federal Highway Administration identified several issues and concerns that were frequently noted by commenters. Responses to these issues can be found in the Responses to Frequently Submitted Public Comments beginning on page B733 of this appendix.

2 Trucks

The Maricopa Association of Governments regional travel demand model forecasts approximately 10 percent truck traffic on the proposed freeway in 2035 (see Final Environmental Impact Statement pages 3-64 and 4-72). The forecast truck traffic is based on existing traffic studies and projected socioeconomic data. This percentage is similar to current traffic conditions on Interstate 10 between State Route 101L and Interstate 17 and on US 60. Commercial trucks would use the proposed freeway. As with all other freeways in the region, trucks would use it for the through transport of freight, for transport to and from distribution centers, and for transport to support local commerce. Nevertheless, the primary users of the proposed freeway would be automobiles. Vehicle classification counts (2007) from the Arizona Department of Transportation for Maricopa County show passenger vehicles and other nontruck vehicles make up over 90 percent of all traffic on the regional freeway system, and it is expected these percentages would not vary with the proposed freeway. Further, it is not expected that the entire 21 percent of through truck traffic (by tonnage) using Interstate 10 would divert from Interstate 10 to use the proposed freeway (see Final Environmental Impact Statement page 3-64). Trucking destinations in the Phoenix metropolitan area would still prompt trucks to enter congested areas. Choosing to travel on the proposed freeway versus Interstate 10 would not produce substantial travel time benefits. Therefore, it is expected that "true" through truck traffic (not having to stop in the metropolitan area) would continue to use the faster, designated, and posted bypass system of Interstate 8 and State Route 85.

3 Design

Depressing the proposed Pecos Road sections would entail installation of pump stations to drain the main line freeway. A depressed freeway would also need a drainage channel to capture the off-site flows to prevent their entering the freeway. Pump stations were not used because of the high cost of construction and maintenance needed for their operation. The preferred freeway configuration would have the E1 Alternative abovert he ground and the existing culverts extending to pass the drainage under the freeway. Pecos Road currently has numerous existing culvert crossings. Depressing the freeway in this area would eliminate the existing culvert crossings and potentially have adverse flooding impacts on adjacent properties. Extending the existing culverts or upsizing the culverts would maintain or improve drainage flows. This would ensure that there would be no adverse flooding impacts on adjacent properties. (See Final Environmental Impact Statement pages 3-15 and 3-16.) To reduce impacts by depressing the proposed freeway in the Eastern Section, the Arizona Department of Transportation would:

- need to spend an additional $400 million for right-of-way acquisition and construction
- displace an additional 300 residences
- maintain additional pump stations and detention basins for the life of the freeway
- observe noise-related impacts requiring mitigation (i.e., noise barriers and their associated costs and visual impacts)

Because the belowground option would result in substantially greater costs and residential displacements, this option was eliminated from further study.
For most of the alignments of each of the action alternatives, the proposed freeway would be elevated above the natural grade of the surrounding land. This elevated profile would allow noise to carry farther, creating noise impacts at greater distances from the freeway. Depressing the profile of the freeway below grade might reduce traffic noise levels adjacent to depressed sections. However, it would be necessary to also construct at-grade noise barriers to achieve noise reduction goals at receiver locations adjacent to depressed freeway sections (see page 4-99 in the Final Environmental Impact Statement). This strategy would reduce visual impacts associated with high noise barriers on elevated freeways, but would entail ground-level noise barriers and their associated interference with views. Thus, with either approach to noise reduction, views of nearby mountains could be disrupted. The specific impacts would depend on the geometrics of the height of any noise barriers constructed, the intervening topography, and the distance of the barriers from the residences in question.

A depressed freeway option was evaluated in the Final Environmental Impact Statement and is described on pages 3-15 and 4-99. Although depressing the freeway would reduce noise levels, noise walls would still be needed to further reduce noise to meet the Arizona Department of Transportation noise policy. Whether the freeway is built aboveground with tall walls or belowground with shorter walls, the final mitigated noise levels would be nearly the same at nearby residences.

Information related to origins and destinations of motorists that would use the proposed freeway is presented in Figure 3-18 on page 3-36 of the Final Environmental Impact Statement. The definition of freeway users considers only those motorists who travel through the South Mountains; so, motorists who begin their trips in Ahwatukee Foothills Village and travel east to Interstate 10 (Maricopa Freeway) or motorists who begin in Laveen Village and travel north to Interstate 10 (Papago Freeway) are not counted in the analysis. The analysis of origins and destinations shows that 73 percent of travelers would be involved in trips beginning or ending in the Study Area or areas immediately surrounding it. Seven percent of the trips would begin, end, or begin and end outside of the Maricopa Association of Governments region; ten percent would either begin or end in Pinal County.

The proposed South Mountain Freeway would be funded by State, federal and local dollars. The total budget for constructing the proposed freeway is $1.9 billion, approved by the Maricopa Association of Governments Regional Council in May 2012. The approved program includes design, right-of-way, and construction of the proposed action. Funding for project-related activities is included in the current 5-year program identified in the regional Transportation Improvement Program as well as in the State Transportation Improvement Program.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Comment Document</th>
<th>Issue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>Acquisitions and Relocations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While the City has some ability to control development through its zoning ordinances, the City does not have the authority to stop private land from being developed. The Arizona Department of Transportation was able to acquire large tracts of land along the Pecos Road alignment in the 1980s, but funding shortfalls kept the Arizona Department of Transportation from acquiring all of the needed land. Developers were aware of the potential freeway and made the decision to develop the land based on the risk that the freeway would eventually be built. Citizens were also aware of the potential and chose to buy homes near the freeway despite the same risk. Information related to freeway awareness and the responsibilities of the City of Phoenix, developers, and the Arizona Department of Transportation related to disclosure of the planning for the freeway is presented on page 4-13 of the Final Environmental Impact Statement.
Comment Document

MS. ROBB: My name is Mary Robb. In the map there because you don’t have a little map that I could show you, okay, I live down in the Foothills reserve up in the mountain, you know, which is fine. I’m a little distance from the freeway where it’s going to be, but there’s no -- there’s going to be no entry for me to go to the freeway. I have to go up -- now they’re going to make me go -- take Chandler, which isn’t even there now, and go up. You know, I don’t know how many miles it would be. It would be a few miles and then come down 17 for me to enter the freeway. Whereas now, I go to the end of that Chandler, just south, you know, and I just enter Pecos Road. So every time I want to go to the freeway, I’ve got another six miles to go for no reason. And I figured they were going to put a frontage road that would make like a -- like a straight line to our home to 17th Avenue. So, you know, we’d just bypass -- so a frontage road just bypassing the whole freeway. But, no, they’re putting that Chandler thing in up higher and around and it’s just crazy.
And then so that’s going to make a lot more traffic on 17 too, and there’s a lot of homes.

Design

The determination to not include an interchange at 32nd Street was made in coordination with the City of Phoenix (see Figure 3-8 on page 3-15 of the Final Environmental Impact Statement). The interchange was evaluated but ultimately eliminated because of increased residential displacements and cost. In 2006, the City of Phoenix conducted a traffic circulation study to evaluate the impacts of the proposed freeway on the local street system, including the shift of access to Foothills Reserve and Calabria from Pecos Road to Chandler Boulevard. The City study found no adverse effects on the local street system from the freeway (see Appendix 3-1 in the Final Environmental Impact Statement). There are no provisions for frontage roads connecting 17th Avenue to the residential area to the west. Reasonable access is provided from 17th Avenue and the extension of Chandler Boulevard. Traffic volume on 17th Street in 2011 was approximately 4,500 vehicles per day just north of Pecos Road (see phoenix.gov/streets/traffic/volumemap). With the proposed freeway in place, an additional 4,000 vehicles per day would use 17th Avenue to gain access to residences west of 17th Avenue. The total daily traffic would be well below the capacity of a two-lane road (approximately 15,000 vehicles per day).

Acquisitions and Relocations

A review of the literature reveals few detailed and comprehensive analyses of the relationship between the transportation infrastructure and residential property values. A recent study by the California Department of Transportation concluded that freeway facilities did not substantially affect sales prices in residential areas adjacent to the facility. The study concluded that it is the visibility of the freeway that may influence selling price and not distance or noise. As a result, the researchers generally concluded that the more the visibility of a new freeway is reduced, the less it would determine the sales price of homes sold in the area.
1 over there and they're not going to like that. But
2 if there was a frontage road down towards like
3 running right along the freeway, at least they're
4 saying that it would have to be an entrance and an
5 exit, but why? Why can't it just be an entry for all
6 the -- all those homes that are down there, and
7 eventually they have a thing in front of that where
8 Chandler is going to be put through over to 17. They
9 have a big piece of land. Now, they can put those
10 homes there now.
11             I mean, it's going to be all new homes
12 there eventually. And if they don't put a frontal
13 road there now, it's going to be even -- you know,
14 they'll do the same darn thing. They're going to
15 knock down a bunch of houses to put a frontage road
16 in, and they aren't planning at all. I just don't
17 see it.
18             They're going to make -- all our homes
19 are going to be lowered in value. It's totally --
20 they're going to do -- what they did years ago is
21 they let someone buy that property and they go, well,
22 it wasn't the state's -- you know, it wasn't this, it
23 wasn't that. Well, somebody had to okay it knowing
24 that freeway was there. And it's going to cost $2.1
25 million to even get so they can even start the darn

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Acquisitions and Relocations</td>
<td>While the City has some ability to control development through its zoning ordinances, the City does not have the authority to stop private land from being developed. The Arizona Department of Transportation was able to acquire large tracts of land along the Pecos Road alignment in the 1980s, but funding shortfalls kept the Arizona Department of Transportation from acquiring all of the needed land. Developers were aware of the potential freeway and made the decision to develop the land based on the risk that the freeway would eventually be built. Citizens were also aware of the potential and chose to buy homes near the freeway despite the same risk. Information related to freeway awareness and the responsibilities of the City of Phoenix, developers, and the Arizona Department of Transportation related to disclosure of the planning for the freeway is presented on page 4-13 of the Final Environmental Impact Statement.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1 road.
2 So I just don't understand why they just
3 can't make us all happy and, you know, they could do
4 a frontal road and do the one -- put Chandler
5 through, but there's just no reason not to. So
6 they're going to wait until -- I think what they're
7 trying to do is they aren't putting a frontal road up
8 there because whoever buys that land and develops it
9 is going to be responsible for that road. So what,
10 10 years, 15 years. In the meantime, we have to do
11 this big long route just to go to the freeway. It's
12 just -- it's just nonsense.
July 24, 2013

To: ADOT

My husband and I live in Foothills Reserve in the Sunrise gated community. I am requesting that Liberty Lane be continued west to Chandler as a frontage road. The only way to our community will be Chandler when it is built. The extended Chandler Boulevard going west will be bumper to bumper without the Liberty Lane extended. Also, The only other way we can access our community will be the 17th Avenue exit which also will be bumper to bumper at the exit. Have you ever driven out here during the after work/dinner hour? We could exit 17th Avenue and get the Liberty Lane extension much easier and it will alleviate all the traffic traveling home on Chandler only. If Liberty Lane is not extended 17th Avenue will be blocked to the point people won’t even be able to take the exit and also cause difficulty turning onto Chandler to be able to get to our home(s). Also, The 17th Avenue exit/road will be extremely busy and loud going up the hill causing very high level noise and pollution for all the homes backing up to 17th Avenue. This area too is an upscale neighborhood and it is possible that they will decrease in value because of the reasons I indicated. Will ADOT be building higher sound walls on 17th Avenue heading north to Chandler Blvd? I don’t believe the existing walls are adequate to handle the forthcoming noise.

If we had a choice we would rather you work with the GRIC Community or just NOT BUILD!

It is hard for us to believe you want to displace so many families and cause so much hardship for so many. Think about it...what if were your community? I believe all of us in The Foothills Reserve use Pecos Road in and out of our community. Once you take our Pecos Road you are creating a true One Way In and One Way Out for all of us living here.

Please extend Liberty Lane as our frontage road.

Thank you!

Arnold Robb
Mary Robb
480-283-8851 (Home)
480-236-2080 (mobile)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Comment Document</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Alternatives, No-Action (No-Build) Alternative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Neighborhoods/Communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Neighborhoods/Communities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Code 6: Alternatives, No-Action (No-Build) Alternative**

The Arizona Department of Transportation and Federal Highway Administration identified several issues and concerns that were frequently noted by commenters. Responses to these issues can be found in the Responses to Frequently Submitted Public Comments beginning on page B733 of this appendix.

**Code 7: Neighborhoods/Communities**

Prospective home buyers and members of the church built after the freeway was conceived, according to State law, should have been informed of the proposed facility. (Sellers are obligated by Arizona common law to disclose all known material facts about a property to the buyer.)

**Code 8: Neighborhoods/Communities**

While the E1 Alternative is adjacent to the largely residential areas of Ahwatukee Foothills Village (to the north), a freeway has been planned in this location for many years (see Final Environmental Impact Statement pages 4-17 and 4-21). Where existing residential uses are adjacent to the proposed freeway, noise mitigation would be implemented according to Arizona Department of Transportation policy (see Final Environmental Impact Statement page 4-91). The proposed freeway would not adversely affect north-south access because the land immediately south of Pecos Road is Gila River Indian Community land, with no existing north-south access. (See the E1 portion of Table 4-9 on Final Environmental Impact Statement page 4-27.)
Although the region's freeways are now congested during the peak travel period, conditions in 2035 without the proposed freeway would be substantially worse with more congested areas and congested conditions for longer periods of time (see Final Environmental Impact Statement pages 1-21 and 1-22). Congestion relief resulting from the proposed freeway would provide localized reductions of delays on arterial streets and at interchanges. Reduced travel times would result in lower exposure to elevated concentrations of mobile source air toxics occurring in traffic. Other benefits of the proposed freeway in comparison to the No-Action Alternative are presented in Table 3-9 on page 3-38 of the Final Environmental Impact Statement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Purpose and Need</td>
<td>Although the region's freeways are now congested during the peak travel period, conditions in 2035 without the proposed freeway would be substantially worse with more congested areas and congested conditions for longer periods of time (see Final Environmental Impact Statement pages 1-21 and 1-22). Congestion relief resulting from the proposed freeway would provide localized reductions of delays on arterial streets and at interchanges. Reduced travel times would result in lower exposure to elevated concentrations of mobile source air toxics occurring in traffic. Other benefits of the proposed freeway in comparison to the No-Action Alternative are presented in Table 3-9 on page 3-38 of the Final Environmental Impact Statement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Purpose and Need, Lack of Support</td>
<td>The Arizona Department of Transportation and Federal Highway Administration identified several issues and concerns that were frequently noted by commenters. Responses to these issues can be found in the Responses to Frequently Submitted Public Comments beginning on page B733 of this appendix.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Air Quality</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Noise</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Section 4(f) and 6(f)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Neighborhoods/Communities</td>
<td>While the City of Phoenix Police Department reported in 2005 that it did not have any statistics specific to crime adjacent to freeways, the Police Department did note that, based on its experience, there does not appear to be a correlation between crime rates and freeways. See Final Environmental Impact Statement sidebar on page 4-21.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Neighborhoods/Communities</td>
<td>While the E1 Alternative is adjacent to the largely residential areas of Ahwatukee Foothills Village (to the north), a freeway has been planned in this location for many years (see Final Environmental Impact Statement pages 4-17 and 4-21). Where existing residential uses are adjacent to the proposed freeway, noise mitigation would be implemented according to Arizona Department of Transportation policy (see Final Environmental Impact Statement page 4-91).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Alternatives, E1 Alternative</td>
<td>The Arizona Department of Transportation and Federal Highway Administration identified several issues and concerns that were frequently noted by commenters. Responses to these issues can be found in the Responses to Frequently Submitted Public Comments beginning on page B733 of this appendix.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Purpose and Need, Truck Bypass</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Health Effects</td>
<td>A review of the literature reveals few detailed and comprehensive analyses of the relationship between the transportation infrastructure and residential property values (Transportation Research Record: Journal of the Transportation Research Board, No. 2174, Transportation Research Board of the National Academies, Washington, D.C., 2010, pp. 138–47; &quot;Impact of Highways on Property Values: Case Study of the Superstition Freeway Corridor&quot;). A recent study by the California Department of Transportation concluded that freeway facilities did not substantially affect sales prices in residential areas adjacent to the facility. The study concluded that it is the visibility of the freeway that may influence selling price and not distance or noise. As a result, the researchers generally concluded that the more the visibility of a new freeway is reduced, the less it would determine the sales price of homes sold in the area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Economics, Socioeconomics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To whom it may concern:

After living in this beautiful community of Ahwatukee for almost 20 years, I am compelled to write in stark opposition to this proposed UNNECESSARY freeway. We will be about 1/4-mile from the Desert Foothills Parkway exchange and this attached it lane 22 miles of solid concrete. We will be subjected to air and noise pollution as well as crime with the new access in and out of the Foothills. This destruction of natural mountains and desert (not to mention our quality of life) serves no purpose for any of the families that reside in what the Indians call “The place of our dreams.” Those of us who have chosen to buy our homes and decided to spend the rest of our lives here WOULD NOT depend on this proposed freeway. The only people liking their chips would be the truckers and contractors who are looking for a more expedient way around Phoenix.

We have experienced the wrath of freeways in our backyard in Los Angeles - - and will never go through that again!! There are numerous detrimental effects, not to mention ones health and the impact it will have on the young children as they are trying to develop. Contrary to the hype of rising home prices, in actuality the value decreases as most people want to be able to enjoy the peace and quiet of their backyards, especially those that have a mountain preserve lot with magnificent sunsets. Who wants to sit outside amid the constant 24/7 roar of truck and automobile tires. Currently when I'm outside I hear the gentle hum of AC units and an occasional dog.

We could have lived anywhere in the valley, but chose this little community of Ahwatukee (Our Paradise) because of the tranquility and the beauty of the desert and it sickens me to think that we might be uprooted - to benefit the truckers and contractors who DO NOT live here.

A proud resident of Ahwatukee

Date: Wednesday, July 24, 2013 5:19:58 PM

Subject: Oppose proposed SMF

To: Lynn Robbins

From: A proud resident of Ahwatukee

Socioeconomics

Bypass

Need, Truck

Alternative

Communities

Section 4(f)

Support

B2856 - Comment Response Appendix
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Comment noted.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From: Projects
To: ADOT
Subject: FW: 202
Date: Monday, May 20, 2013 8:43:56 AM

-----Original Message-----
From: Robert [mailto:worshiphimforever@yahoo.com]
Sent: Friday, May 17, 2013 5:59 PM
To: Projects
Subject: 202

Keep building the 202
Sent from my iPhone 5

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.
TELEPHONE CONVERSATION RECORD
SOUTH MOUNTAIN FREEWAY INFORMATION LINE

INCOMING CALL
DATE: 5/15/13
TIME: 7:42 PM

CALLED: CONNIE ROBERTS
CALLER ADDRESS: 4632 W. BEVERLY ROAD, LAVEEN, AZ 85339
PHONE: EMAIL:

CALLER REMARKS/QUESTIONS:
I support South Mountain Freeway. Thank you.

Comment noted.
I'm a member of the Queen Creek Planning and Zoning commission as well as the Maricopa County's Citizens' Transportation Oversight Committee. I fully support the South Mountain Freeway.

The Gila River Indian Community chose to not have alternative routes considered on their land. This is unfortunate, as they would have had more authority to dictate requirements and conditions. I feel the loop 101 portion of freeway on Native American land was beneficial to that community as well as their neighbors.

Recommended route: Any one of the three 101 routes would be acceptable. The Central or Easter routes would be preferred as being the more efficient. This route would preserve commercial/industrial properties, which to me are critical to a community's overall health and land use balance.

Reasons for support of this freeway:
- Estimated increase in area population necessitates additional freeway resources, as well as expansion of public transportation.
- Reduced congestion and pollution from stationary or slow moving vehicles would be significantly reduced.
- Any loss to communities due to displaced tax revenue, I feel will be more than made up for with future business opportunities.
- Reduced regional CO and particulate emissions. Reduced energy consumption.

The Arizona Department of Transportation and Federal Highway Administration identified several issues and concerns that were frequently noted by commenters. Responses to these issues can be found in the Responses to Frequently Submitted Public Comments beginning on page B733 of this appendix.
1 up Baseline and the 51st Avenue corridor that
2 is only going to increase when the casino opens
3 its new hotel and restaurants.
4 There isn’t, right now, any way to support
5 the kind of traffic that the Gila River Tribe is
6 putting on their sacred land without the highway.
7 The alternative, the W59 Alternative, is not
8 going to cause any damage to their sacred land or
9 to South Mountain.
10 Currently I am thinking that we have to
11 continue with the program of the Loop 202 Freeway
12 because it’s the best alternative. It meets the
13 needs of everyone in the community and it’s
14 critical for the development of Laveen and
15 to be really a turning point for Laveen right
16 at a place where this community can either move
17 forward and excel and succeed, or you can put us
18 in a holding place and we are going to have
19 nothing but problems when it comes to traffic
20 and the exponential growth we are going to
21 experience in the next ten years.
22 ***

MICHAEL ROBINSON: I oppose the Loop 202
24 through South Mountain Park near South Mountain
1 Park, because I feel it’s an idea that has passed its usefulness.
2 I don’t believe that building this freeway would reduce the congestion.
3 I do think it would encourage sprawl and encourage the waste of the natural resources that we have remaining.
4 I think the massive amount of money projected to be spent on this freeway could be better spent elsewhere repairing our aging infrastructure throughout the region, promoting public transit, bikes, other alternatives.
5 That’s all I need.
6 ***
7 ADAM JOHNSON: I like the 59 Alternative.
8 I feel that brings the community closer to downtown Phoenix.
9 I think bringing the community together involves bringing the economy up. You connect the cities together, to me it helps the people grow, helps the city connect.
10 I guess what I am trying to say is putting the 59 in, economically it will help the city...
Federal regulations stipulate that an environmental impact statement shall “rigorously explore and objectively evaluate all reasonable alternatives” (40 Code of Federal Regulations § 1502.14; see Final Environmental Impact Statement page 3-1). All alternatives were screened using a multidisciplinary set of criteria. Nonfreeway alternatives were considered (see Final Environmental Impact Statement pages 3-3 through 3-6). Among other things, the study took into account improving existing freeways, improving or expanding other travel modes, strategies to reduce travel demand, and various roadway configurations. This study examined not only the potential impacts from improvements, but also the consequences of building nothing, the No-Action Alternative. As proposed by the Maricopa Association of Governments, the South Mountain Freeway would be part of the Regional Freeway and Highway System. Other transportation improvements such as mass transit and local roads are specified in the Regional Transportation Plan and were considered during the evaluation of this proposed new freeway.
TELEPHONE CONVERSATION RECORD
SOUTH MOUNTAIN FREEWAY INFORMATION LINE

INCOMING CALL
DATE: 5/15/13
TIME: 6:35 PM
CALLER: ROBINSON
ADDRESS: 55 S. 64TH AVENUE, PHOENIX, AZ 85043
PHONE: EMAIL:

CALLER REMARKS/QUESTIONS:
We are the Robinson’s and support the South Mountain Freeway Loop. Thank you.

1

Comment noted.
From: Jesse Robinson
To: Projects
Subject: AZ LOOP 202: opposed!
Date: Wednesday, July 24, 2013 5:58:50 AM

Just emailing to express my opposition to the loop 202 extension.

It is a bandaid solution to a symptom of a larger problem that we’ve created.

There are other ways to relieve congestion on the roads. Put these funds toward expanding the light rail. Or make it easier and safer to ride bikes.

Many Phoenix residents drive because it feels like that’s the only option.

What if we became known as one of the most forward thinking cities by becoming champions of new better ways to get around beyond the archaic freeway?

Thanks for reading.
We wish to voice our strong opposition to the South Mountain Freeway being built on Pecos Road. The DEIS report mentions the improvement in emissions on cars as a reason why air quality should not be an issue. This will be a diesel TRUCK route. All of the major LTL trucking companies and warehouse are on the west side and will use this route. It will be a truck bypass creating bad air and hazmat issues for Ahwatukee.

The cost of the project is prohibitive and crime in Ahwatukee will increase.

We are affiliated with PARC and hope our financial support to them will help in their litigation of building any such highway.

It’s too late to consider this project. Move it elsewhere. This community is already established and you will destroy our way of life.

Respectfully submitted,

Susan and Edward Rotota
Sent from my iPad

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Comment Document</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>From: <a href="mailto:robotafamily@gmail.com">robotafamily@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>To: Projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Subject: South mountain freeway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Date: Saturday, June 08, 2013 2:45:03 PM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Code Comment Document

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Air Quality</td>
<td>The Arizona Department of Transportation and Federal Highway Administration identified several issues and concerns that were frequently noted by commenters. Responses to these issues can be found in the Responses to Frequently Submitted Public Comments beginning on page B733 of this appendix.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Purpose and Need, Truck Bypass</td>
<td>The project is completely funded through federal sources and a local ½-cent sales tax, as programmed in the Arizona Department of Transportation 5-year Transportation Facilities Construction Program and the Maricopa Association of Governments Regional Transportation Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Hazardous Materials</td>
<td>While the City of Phoenix Police Department reported in 2005 that it did not have any statistics specific to crime adjacent to freeways, the Police Department did note that, based on its experience, there does not appear to be a correlation between crime rates and freeways. See Final Environmental Impact Statement sidebar on page 4-21.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Purpose and Need</td>
<td>The Arizona Department of Transportation and Federal Highway Administration identified several issues and concerns that were frequently noted by commenters. Responses to these issues can be found in the Responses to Frequently Submitted Public Comments beginning on page B733 of this appendix.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Neighborhoods/Communities</td>
<td>While the E1 Alternative is adjacent to the largely residential areas of Ahwatukee Foothills Village (to the north), a freeway has been planned in this location for many years (see Final Environmental Impact Statement pages 4-17 and 4-21). Where existing residential uses are adjacent to the proposed freeway, noise mitigation would be implemented according to Arizona Department of Transportation policy (see Final Environmental Impact Statement page 4-91).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Alternatives, E1 Alternative</td>
<td>While the E1 Alternative is adjacent to the largely residential areas of Ahwatukee Foothills Village (to the north), a freeway has been planned in this location for many years (see Final Environmental Impact Statement pages 4-17 and 4-21). Where existing residential uses are adjacent to the proposed freeway, noise mitigation would be implemented according to Arizona Department of Transportation policy (see Final Environmental Impact Statement page 4-91).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TELEPHONE CONVERSATION RECORD
SOUTH MOUNTAIN FREEWAY INFORMATION LINE

INCOMING CALL
DATE: 6/13/13
TIME: 7:10 PM

CALLER
MONTE RODMAN
CALLER ADDRESS: 18200 W. PARADISE LANE, SURPRISE, ARIZONA 85388
PHONE: EMAIL:

CALLER REMARKS/QUESTIONS:
I am in support of building that South Mountain freeway and I would really like to see it get going. It sure would ease up on traffic conditions. Thank you. Hurry up build that thing, save me a lot of miles when I go to Tucson. Bye.

Comment noted.
From: Projects
To: ADOT
Subject: FW: Build the 202
Date: Monday, May 20, 2013 8:42:17 AM

-----Original Message-----
From: Shawn Rodrigues [mailto:aporia34@aol.com]
Sent: Friday, May 17, 2013 6:51 PM
To: Projects
Subject: Build the 202

Please consider the positive impact building the 202 could have on overall air quality.

Sent from my iPhone

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/professional 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.
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Comment noted.
From: Rodriguez, Alfredo UTAS [mailto:Alfredo.Rodriguez@utas.utc.com]
Sent: Tuesday, May 21, 2013 12:36 PM
To: Projects
Subject: Loop 202 South Mountain Freeway

As a resident of Laveen for over 10 years I support the completion of the Loop 202 South Mountain Freeway.

I agree with the Environmental Impact Study and the effects it will have on reducing commuting times and reducing the amount of pollution emitted by vehicles in stop and go traffic. In the years I have lived in Laveen I have seen the congestion grow, particularly north along 51st Avenue and east along Baseline Rd. Prior to the widening of 51st Ave and Baseline Rd, traffic would come to a complete stand still near my community, making it nearly impossible to go anywhere during rush hour. Not only that, in the past few years, I have seen the number of car accidents along Baseline increase significantly, as more and more traffic attempts to move toward the East Valley through the busy South Central intersections.

I work in the Downtown area and am also a strong supporter of all of the recent Downtown growth. But I am also conscious of the issues faced along the I-10/I510 commutes to and from the East Valley. If we don’t build the South Mountain Freeway, traffic in that region will get much worse. According to ADOT’s own study, over the next two decades, traffic on I-10 through Central Phoenix will grow by 28%, another 103,000 cars will use the Broadway Curve each day and another 38,000 cars will jam the Tunnel every day. Morning and evening commute times will increase by up to 82% and traffic congestion on city streets will go up by 46%.

I understand the environmental concerns by some of the opposing parties, but it seems clear that unless the number of residents and the number of vehicles in the Valley decreases, not acting on this project results in even greater detrimental impact. I also agree that it’s important to ensure the construction is as unobtrusive and environmentally-friendly as possible. In fact, most residents of Laveen that support the project also request that freeway construction must include means for pedestrian and bike traffic, including but not limited to sidewalks, bike paths and trails.

Finally, the money to build the freeway has been approved by voters twice, first in 1985 and again in 2004. The project will also create 30,000 jobs during the five to six year construction period and result in a $2 billion investment in the Phoenix-area economy. Residents of Laveen have waited long enough for this. Those of us that support our community and have stuck it out through the economic downturn and related housing crisis, are counting on the long term economic growth we believe this freeway will help bring to the area. Laveen was built with this freeway in mind. Without it, the future prosperity of Laveen and the surrounding area is in jeopardy.

Comment noted.
Thank you for your time and consideration,

Alfredo Rodriguez
I support the completion of the Loop 202 South Mountain Freeway. I live in Laveen and it has been frustrating not to have an alternative and fast way to get to other places. It takes about 15-25 minutes to get to the nearest freeway, sometimes even more depending on the traffic. Traffic has increase in the area. There is a lot of semi trucks through 51st Ave and there have been more car accidents along Baseline Ave. Also, I think this freeway can help bring economy growth to our area. This community has increase significantly and we need this freeway.

I agree with other residents of Laveen that it’s important to ensure the construction is as unobtrusive and environmentally-friendly as possible and that freeway construction must include means for pedestrian and bike traffic, including but not limited to sidewalks, bike paths and trails.

Thank you for your time and consideration,

Ana Karina Rodriguez
lucrative for them, now there's not such an uproar about it. So I do believe that we are respecting their values and giving them a voice. But I also believe that there's a louder voice, including that with my community and residents in Laveen and everything, that absolutely this is the right choice and the right direction for growth.

MR. RODRIGUEZ: Yeah. Basically, I just want to state my absolute support for the 59th Avenue alternate. That's the priority one right now. I think it's probably --

Well, I know it's the best option based on the city planners of the City of Phoenix. They've expected this for a long time. It's a great benefit to Maricopa County. It's a great benefit to the Valley. And, quite honestly, a lot of people coming from the West Valley, all the way out to Buckeye, eventually, you have to cross 59th.

If it were to go any further west, then people that live on, for example, 51st, 59th, 67th, 75th, 83rd, they're not going to go back to try to catch it at the 101 if they're heading out to the East Valley. It's counterintuitive to what human nature would tell you. So they would just jump on the I-10, currently, and continue to take the regular flow, causing the same problems that we're experiencing downtown, when it comes to major traffic. So I would say 59th Avenue is, without a doubt, the best alternative.

The worst alternative is the one going through...
Tolleson. Tolleson has been here since 1929. They have given
to our state. That city was actually split when the I-10 came
in. So, much like Margaret T. Hance and the Deck Park Tunnel,
that kind of divided up the -- that broke up the downtown
community, the same thing happened in Tolleson. Part of the
property is on the northern side of the I-10 and part of it is
on the -- on the southern side of I-10. And so it took many
years, many decades, for that city to be able to grow back
together; and, successfully, it has.

Unfortunately, the north part of it hasn't
developed. A lot of it has to do with the disconnection
between the government and property owners north of the I-10
corridor or the I-10 freeway.

So, to ask a city of that size -- that's already
given so much to the greater part of the state transportation
system -- to now divide itself again, with the 101 dividing it
right down to 99th Avenue, would be a travesty. So not only
for the reasons of Tolleson, but also for the practical reasons
of why 59th Avenue would be the top-notch selection.

So, finally, I would say, going back to 59th
Avenue, the economic impact of sales-tax revenue to the City of
Phoenix, just the developmental impacts to the City of Phoenix;
property taxes that we would pay to the local school districts,
including Maricopa County Community College districts, would be
top-notch. Every single exit off of the 101 on the 59th
1 lineup -- 59th connection would be an economic engine. And so
2 it's designed that way. The setbacks are already set up that
3 way. And it would be a -- It would just be a win/win for
4 everybody at the end of the day.
5 And you're taking that from a person who lives in
6 Tolleson but is employed by the City of Phoenix. So it's a
7 win/win for me because that's how -- that's how I feed my
8 family, with the City of Phoenix.
9 And the sales-tax revenue coming back to the City
10 would be huge, especially during these -- especially during
11 these difficult economic times. And who knows -- who knows how
12 long it's going to last? But also because, as a long-term,
13 long-time -- actually, life-long resident of the City of
14 Tolleson, I would hate to see what happened to our city many,
15 many moons ago happen again.
16 And so that, my friend, is what I have to say.
17 MR. BRENNAN: Another point that I would like to
18 bring up regarding, sort of, a land-use concern of the Loop 202
19 is, in light of the recent Brookings Institution report that
20 has been publicized in the last week regarding the shift in
21 poverty from more urban to suburban areas around the country,
22 while not being a total shift in the share of impoverished
23 populations, it does illustrate the challenges that more
24 suburban areas are -- are experiencing in trying to address
25 those social problems.
The Arizona Department of Transportation and Federal Highway Administration identified several issues and concerns that were frequently noted by commenters. Responses to these issues can be found in the Responses to Frequently Submitted Public Comments beginning on page B733 of this appendix.

Federal regulations stipulate that an environmental impact statement shall “rigorously explore and objectively evaluate all reasonable alternatives” (40 Code of Federal Regulations § 1502.14; see Final Environmental Impact Statement page 3-1). All alternatives were screened using a multidisciplinary set of criteria. Nonfreeway alternatives were considered (see Final Environmental Impact Statement pages 3-3 through 3-6). Among other things, the study took into account improving existing freeways, improving or expanding other travel modes, strategies to reduce travel demand, and various roadway configurations. This study examined not only the potential impacts from improvements, but also the consequences of building nothing, the No-Action Alternative. As proposed by the Maricopa Association of Governments, the South Mountain Freeway would be part of the Regional Freeway and Highway System. Other transportation improvements such as mass transit and local roads are specified in the Regional Transportation Plan and were considered during the evaluation of this proposed new freeway.

Responses to these issues can be found in the Responses to Frequently Submitted Public Comments beginning on page B733 of this appendix.

The Arizona Department of Transportation and Federal Highway Administration identified several issues and concerns that were frequently noted by commenters. Responses to these issues can be found in the Responses to Frequently Submitted Public Comments beginning on page B733 of this appendix.

The Arizona Department of Transportation and Federal Highway Administration identified several issues and concerns that were frequently noted by commenters. Responses to these issues can be found in the Responses to Frequently Submitted Public Comments beginning on page B733 of this appendix.
Unplanned growth is often termed “urban sprawl.” Generally, this term is used in the context of rapid and uncontrolled urban growth onto previously undeveloped land—usually on the outskirts of an existing urban area. Projects like the proposed freeway are often identified as contributors to urban sprawl. Freeway projects are often cited as making land at the urban fringe more accessible and, therefore, more attractive for development. However, examination of data comparing population and land use between 1975 and 2000 suggests major transportation projects like the proposed freeway do not induce growth in the region (see Final Environmental Impact Statement pages 4-170 through 4-174). The proposed freeway would be implemented in a historically quickly urbanizing area (most noticeably in the Western Section of the Study Area, although the nationwide recession which began in 2007 slowed growth). In the Eastern Section of the Study Area, the proposed freeway would abut public parkland, Native American land, and a near-fully developed area—therefore, any contribution to accelerated or induced growth would be constrained. The proposed freeway would be built in an area planned for urban growth as established in local jurisdictions’ land use plans for at least the last 25 years.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Neighborhoods/Communities</td>
<td>Unplanned growth is often termed “urban sprawl.” Generally, this term is used in the context of rapid and uncontrolled urban growth onto previously undeveloped land—usually on the outskirts of an existing urban area. Projects like the proposed freeway are often identified as contributors to urban sprawl. Freeway projects are often cited as making land at the urban fringe more accessible and, therefore, more attractive for development. However, examination of data comparing population and land use between 1975 and 2000 suggests major transportation projects like the proposed freeway do not induce growth in the region (see Final Environmental Impact Statement pages 4-170 through 4-174). The proposed freeway would be implemented in a historically quickly urbanizing area (most noticeably in the Western Section of the Study Area, although the nationwide recession which began in 2007 slowed growth). In the Eastern Section of the Study Area, the proposed freeway would abut public parkland, Native American land, and a near-fully developed area—therefore, any contribution to accelerated or induced growth would be constrained. The proposed freeway would be built in an area planned for urban growth as established in local jurisdictions’ land use plans for at least the last 25 years.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
even with the heat. I’ve done it for 20 years.

So please, please don’t approve this idea for the 202 Freeway. It’s very unnecessary. Supply and demand are not high enough for this type of project. Thank you.

THE FACILITATOR: Thank you. Has Prem Goyal returned? Did I pronounce your name correctly?

MR. GOYAL: Yes, thanks. I won’t take three minutes. A good question is I was looking at the curves, which are growth curves, they are based on 2005 data; they should be based on 2013 data. And I have the newspaper cuttings every day that you did at least expect lower demand. That directive curve leads to the expansion of the future demand of the transportation. Only way they can project the future demands is from the utility demands. It looks like we should verify those curves, as the [unintelligible] president said, trust but verify. All those curves have been verified, or they’re just ten years old, which don’t mean very much in today’s environment.

Thanks very much. Have a good day.

THE FACILITATOR: Thank you very much.

Greta Rogers. Greta Rogers.

MS. ROGERS: Good morning. Let’s turn
The Arizona Department of Transportation and Federal Highway Administration identified several issues and concerns that were frequently noted by commenters. Responses to these issues can be found in the Responses to Frequently Submitted Public Comments beginning on page B733 of this appendix.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Section 4(f) and Section 6(f)</td>
<td>The Arizona Department of Transportation and Federal Highway Administration identified several issues and concerns that were frequently noted by commenters. Responses to these issues can be found in the Responses to Frequently Submitted Public Comments beginning on page B733 of this appendix.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Cultural Resources</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Purpose and Need, Truck Bypass</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Good morning. I’m Greta Rogers. I live in Ahwatukee, near 48th Street and Elliott, just five miles north of the proposed route. ADOT has been mucking around on this for 30 years. And they’re 30 years too late to come on the 202 west of I-10 to blow up the mountain and then go north. We don’t need to blow up the mountain, and it isn’t because it’s a sacred site to me; personally, it is not. But it is a natural benefit to all of us. And part of the South Mountain Park Preserve.

We don’t need to do this to facilitate the trucking industry. And I’m talking about those that carry ICC license plates and are hauling freight and 18-wheelers. One of the things that the -- the IES [sic] report that was delivered recently within the past 30 days, the first of any that has ever been delivered. The third allegedly, that ADOT filed with the -- with NQA, and allegedly the first two were returned to them with a big red X on it. Go back to the beginning, follow instructions. They still have not done that.

There is absolutely no indication in this at all for the danger to the communities that will be affected, both on the north and the south sides of...
the mountain with the hauling of hazardous materials. Nitrates, fuel, and chlorine. And the existence for clear and present endangerment, i.e., death, if you live within the wind distance of these things being carried by the winds in the event of a crash and an imminent subsequent explosion. And all are.

Nothing -- this is criminal negligence by ADOT to the citizens of this city and by HDR, their $21 million consultant whom they depend upon like they were biblical. They are all guilty of criminal negligence to the citizens directly affected and to the citizens of Phoenix, and I unalterably oppose this.

Thank you.

THE FACILITATOR: Please refrain from applause or boos. Be respectful of both build and no-build discussions today. This is a hearing and we appreciate your patience.

Michelle Stewart. Michelle Stewart.

Those of you whose names have been registered now to speak, you should make your way to the front of the room; that will help speed this up a little bit.

MR. STEWART: Good morning. Speak this way? Hi, everyone, thanks for -- my name is Michelle Stewart. Thank you for listening to our comments today, and I'm addressing you. And you. I'm an...
TELEPHONE CONVERSATION RECORD
SOUTH MOUNTAIN FREEWAY INFORMATION LINE

INCOMING CALL
DATE: 6/13/13
TIME: 7:27 PM
CALLER: JANET WHEELOWER ROGERS
CALLER ADDRESS: 17635 W. IRONWOOD ST., SURPRISE, ARIZONA
PHONE: EMAIL:

CALLER REMARKS/QUESTIONS:
I support the Loop 202 expansion plan. Good luck with your project.
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Code Issue Response
1 Comment noted.
From: Gary Rohr  
To: Projects  
Subject: South Mountain Study Team - Comment  
Date: Tuesday, June 04, 2013 11:25:51 AM

I moved into the Lakewood Community of Ahwatukee in 1988. Back then there was talk of building this loop. I believe Pecos dead-ended at 32nd ST back then and Chandler Blvd looped into Ray Road but didn’t go any further. Back then it wouldn’t have cost much and it could have made sense to do this project. Back then the land should have been zoned, purchased or whatever to keep it from being developed. Of course it was not. Now it does not make any sense to continue with this project - the cost and disruptions far outweigh any possible benefit.

We now live in the Foothills Reserve community at the end of Pecos - the area you wish to destroy. The quiet secluded area where crime is fairly low due to how hard it is to leave the area. Building the Loop 202 around South Mountain now would open us to all sort of crime.

Will building this Loop 202 ease the congestion on I-10? I seriously doubt it - it’s not like the Phoenix metropolitan area is some little hick place that people want to avoid - trucks coming down I-10 need to drop things off in the Phoenix area and pick things up.

Our vote is to not build the South Mountain 202 Loop - save the money and use it for something that will provide more benefit - like either an upper or lower level to I-10 with limited entry and exit points.

Gary & Leslie Rohr  
3036 W Cottonwood LN  
Phoenix, AZ 85045

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Comment Document</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Acquisitions and Relocations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Purpose and Need, Old Plan or Use of Old Data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Purpose and Need</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Neighborhoods/Communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Neighborhoods/Communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Neighborhoods/Communities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Responses continue on next page)
In 2035, the average daily traffic on the proposed freeway is projected to range from 117,000 to 190,000 vehicles per day (see Final Environmental Impact Statement page 3-62). The estimated volume depends on location. The purpose and need for the South Mountain Freeway are not solely to relieve congestion on Interstate 10 (Maricopa Freeway). Facilitating mobility in the Maricopa Association of Governments region does not mean just relieving congestion on the Broadway Curve (see Final Environmental Impact Statement page 1-21). Among other criteria, the proposed freeway is to permit the entire Regional Freeway and Highway System to function as designed. Optimal function of that design includes completing all the segments of the State Route 202L system (see Final Environmental Impact Statement pages 3-35 and 3-37). With implementation of the South Mountain Freeway, many motorists would be able to get from Point A to Point B, a route that never included needing to use Interstate 10.
Cannot wait till it is built, will detour a lot of traffic around Phoenix

1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1    |       | Comment noted.
The Arizona Department of Transportation and Federal Highway Administration identified several issues and concerns that were frequently noted by commenters. Responses to these issues can be found in the Responses to Frequently Submitted Public Comments beginning on page B733 of this appendix.

The alignment of the W59 Alternative had not been changed in the area of the Country Garden Charter School. The freeway would not directly affect the school, but would run just east of the school. Design of each action alternative, while completed to an equivalent level, is still preliminary and subject to change because designs would be further refined. The Arizona Department of Transportation would work with businesses during the design phase to identify ways to minimize property impacts that allow the business to continue operations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Alternatives, No-Action (No-Build) Alternative</td>
<td>The Arizona Department of Transportation and Federal Highway Administration identified several issues and concerns that were frequently noted by commenters. Responses to these issues can be found in the Responses to Frequently Submitted Public Comments beginning on page B733 of this appendix.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Alternatives, W59 Alternative Versus W101 Alternative</td>
<td>The alignment of the W59 Alternative had not been changed in the area of the Country Garden Charter School. The freeway would not directly affect the school, but would run just east of the school. Design of each action alternative, while completed to an equivalent level, is still preliminary and subject to change because designs would be further refined. The Arizona Department of Transportation would work with businesses during the design phase to identify ways to minimize property impacts that allow the business to continue operations.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Laveen Village area is anticipated to have a built-out population of over 105,000 (see Final Environmental Impact Statement page 4-5). This proposed level of development places increasing demand on the road network. The City of Phoenix’s General Plan for Laveen Village has designated areas along the proposed freeway for commercial development that cannot support the projected densities without implementation of the proposed freeway. Without the proposed freeway, the conversion of land from undeveloped and agricultural uses to residential, commercial, and industrial land uses would likely continue, placing a greater demand on surface streets (see Final Environmental Impact Statement page 4-14).

Low-income populations were evaluated to ensure there were not disproportionately high and adverse impacts. The Preferred Alternative would not adversely affect any census block groups with low-income populations south of the Salt River (e.g., South Mountain Village).

The Arizona Department of Transportation and Federal Highway Administration have engaged all population segments to ensure access to the environmental impact statement process. Assisted by this involvement, analytical results indicate the proposed action would provide net benefits to all populations in the Study Area in general by reducing traffic congestion, enhancing accessibility, and supporting local economic development plans.
1. PROCUREMENT

2. THE REPORTER: Can you state your name?

3. MASTER ROMERO: Benjamin Romero.

4. Dear ADOT, I oppose your idea of the

5. South Mountain Freeway, it will take out my

6. neighborhood and school, but it's not any other

7. school. I've gone on -- it has these awesome trips

8. and stuff. I just went on one recently, it was a

9. three-week trip to Florida and Washington, D.C. Can

10. you find another school that met our Senator Flake?

11. They take care of us. They never give up on us, and

12. I won't give up on them.

13. The school is important to me and my

14. family. It has been here for 13 years and my house

15. only has stood there for 30 years. We can't give up

16. now. Sincerely, Benjamin Romero.

17. THE REPORTER: Thanks, Benjamin.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Comment Document</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>THE REPORTER: Can you state your name, please. MR. ROMERO: Daniel Romero. I oppose against it. I oppose it, you know. We've lived out there for 30 years, and there's never been, you know what I mean? We knew what we got into when we were there, and basically, it's going to affect wildlife and there's a proven fact on that, for one. My second issue is it's going to increase crime, number two. There's already a path through there, I don't understand why, there's nothing in the river bottom, why they don't take the 99th Avenue route, the 91st Avenue route. You're going through two quarter million dollars homes or going right next to them. My other fact is -- I'm just trying to put it together, you know -- you're putting ramps up right next to Country Gardens School. You're talking about a 3,000-foot bridge, which is over half a mile, you know, and you sit there and do construction on that, it's going to take a year, at least, and that's going to hurt the school. And I have a niece and nephew going to that school. And they exceed any</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 2    | 3
| 3    | 4
| 4    | 5
| 5    | 6
| 6    | 7

**Code Comment Document**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Biology, Plants, and Wildlife</td>
<td>The Arizona Department of Transportation and Federal Highway Administration identified several issues and concerns that were frequently noted by commenters. Responses to these issues can be found in the Responses to Frequently Submitted Public Comments beginning on page B733 of this appendix.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Neighborhoods/Communities</td>
<td>While the City of Phoenix Police Department reported in 2005 that it did not have any statistics specific to crime adjacent to freeways, the Police Department did note that, based on its experience, there does not appear to be a correlation between crime rates and freeways. See Final Environmental Impact Statement sidebar on page 4-21.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Alternatives, W59 Alternative Versus W101 Alternative</td>
<td>The Arizona Department of Transportation and Federal Highway Administration identified several issues and concerns that were frequently noted by commenters. Responses to these issues can be found in the Responses to Frequently Submitted Public Comments beginning on page B733 of this appendix.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Neighborhoods/Communities</td>
<td>Prospective home buyers after the freeway was conceived, according to State law, should have been informed of the proposed facility. (Sellers are obligated by Arizona common law to disclose all known material facts about a property to the buyer.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Acquisitions and Relocations</td>
<td>The Arizona Department of Transportation and Federal Highway Administration identified several issues and concerns that were frequently noted by commenters. Responses to these issues can be found in the Responses to Frequently Submitted Public Comments beginning on page B733 of this appendix.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Acquisitions and Relocations</td>
<td>The alignment of the W59 Alternative had not been changed in the area of the Country Garden Charter School. The freeway would not directly affect the school, but would run just east of the school. Design of each action alternative, while completed to an equivalent level, is still preliminary and subject to change because designs would be further refined. The Arizona Department of Transportation would work with businesses during the design phase to identify ways to minimize property impacts that allow the business to continue operations.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
other school around there. And they're going to put a freeway right next to it?

My other concern is industrial. They're going to put industrial next to it? That kills residences. I oppose it. I do not want it there. There's already alternatives on I-10 to get to the same location. So that's why I oppose against it.

THE REPORTER: That's it?

MR. ROMERO: Yes, that's it.

THE REPORTER: Thank you, sir.

Planning

Cities' and towns' adopted land use plans were evaluated as part of the environmental impact statement process. The effect of a freeway corridor on these plans was considered (see Final Environmental Impact Statement pages 1-21, 4-18, and 4-19). The City of Phoenix's General Plan land use map shows the freeway alignment as “Future Transportation,” generally matching the W59 (Preferred) Alternative alignment. The City of Phoenix’s plans for both Laveen and Estrella Villages identify “cores” along the W59 Alternative, surrounded by commercial/mixed-commercial uses for each planning area clearly intended to benefit from proximity to the proposed freeway.
MS. ROMERO: My name is Tokcha Romero. I've lived in Laveen for 30 years. My husband and I built our house there. Contractor didn't do it, we did. We raised our five children there. We have five grandchildren now that call that place their sanctuary, their home, their go to place and the happy place because they go there when they just need some extra care.

You can build a house anywhere. It takes a long time to build a home. I live on an acre and a quarter and I can walk out there in the dead of night in the dark and my feet know every inch of that property. They say that a place belongs forever to the person who loves it so much they wrench it from itself and remake it in their own image, and that's what my home is to me.

It's not a fancy house. It's a wood frame house, but it has memories that I can only begin to tell you. One of them is handprints on the south wall that my grandchildren thought would be nice to paint with mud handprints, and they faded over the years, but you can still see them. And rather than making me angry, they're now a cherished, cherished memory.

My neighborhood. We've seen each other
The school. The school will be impacted if they take that 59, 62, 63, whatever it is they're going to call it now. And pardon me if I don't have a lot of faith that they won't keep moving it over, but, you know, I'm a realist. I think they will. Even if they take the 59 route, it's going to impact us. I would prefer if they're going to do this, follow Pecos all the way out and go up 99th. Why cut up? There's already a freeway goes north. Take that. But if you really have to get to the far northwest valley, take it out to Pecos and all the way up 99th. Then you're really over there as opposed to cutting through homes.

The school. The impact it would have on that is enormous. My granddaughter went to Laveen Elementary for several years and as my kids had, but it had changed over the years. A lot of newcomers.
I came in and things were different, and she got beat
down not only mentally but physically and dropped out
of in sixth grade and had to stay home for a half
year.
She went to Country Gardens. They
embraced her and brought out the best in her and
she's now an honor student. She's in high school.
She has huge plans and Country Gardens gave her what
she needed. They gave her the discipline. I never
have to speak to her about her homework, and she does
huge amounts of homework.

Her writing. I worked at one of the
public schools, and the amount of writing they do at
Country Gardens is enormous. Other kids get out of
high school and don't know how to write at all, but
they make them write reports, history reports on all
these trips they take to Washington, to St.
Augustine, all these places. It's -- it is a unique
school. And if they even put it at 59th, it is going
to be so impacted that it will destroy what we've
had. And I don't believe they'll keep it at 59th. I
think it will keep its way over and eventually our
neighborhood, our school will be gone.

I beg them, what looks good on paper
isn't always good for people. Look at the other
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Comment Document</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>alternatives. Look at going all the way out to 99th where you already will hook up with the freeway. Why here? Why now? Why right there? I beg them to rethink this. I didn't build a house in Laveen. I built a home, and this will be so impacted that at the age of 63, I won't be able to find another place where my feet will know every inch of it when I walk down the street. I can walk down the street in the dark and my feet know, well, that's where the grass goes across it. You've got to lift your foot a little higher. These people that are going to make this decision, come out and visit us in our neighborhood. Come out and talk to the neighbors in our neighborhood and see what you're going to do to us if you don't change this alignment, preferably as far west as you can take it because that would make sense. Follow Pecos all the way out and up 99th. Thank you.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25
The Arizona Department of Transportation and Federal Highway Administration identified several issues and concerns that were frequently noted by commenters. Responses to these issues can be found in the Response to Frequently Submitted Public Comments beginning on page B733 of this appendix.
**TELEPHONE CONVERSATION RECORD**  
**SOUTH MOUNTAIN FREEWAY INFORMATION LINE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>TIME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5/16/13</td>
<td>12:28 PM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CALLER**  
ROSANNA  
**PHONE**  
602-402-7063

**EMAIL**  

**CALLER REMARKS/QUESTIONS:**
Hi, we were calling to say that we are for the freeway. We are just off of 26th Street and Liberty Lane in the cul-de-sac. If anyone can call me back with any more info’, I am going to go on your website to look at the information. We have been at this location for about 14 to 15 years. O.k., thank you so much and have a great day. Bye bye.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Comment noted.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
From: Projects
To: ADOT
Subject: FW: Support for building the 202
Date: Monday, May 20, 2013 3:11:23 PM

Comment noted.

From: Megan Rose [mailto:mrose@gcjpr.com]
Sent: Monday, May 20, 2013 3:04 PM
To: Projects
Subject: Support for building the 202

Hello! I am a resident of Laveen, Arizona and an Arizona native. I am writing in support of building the 202 in the SW Valley. The Valley is growing and more and more affordable housing is found along the outskirts of metro Phoenix. Traffic will only get worse and this freeway has been on the books for a long time. Also, I am hoping that a freeway will bring more commercial business to Laveen, which is not only good for our city but for residents like me that spend my money in other cities because there isn’t a lot to do in Laveen.

Thank you for the opportunity to voice my support.

Megan Rose
602-690-0801

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.
I don't know how to put it. We were never notified that our house was no longer in the line of demolition. And so what's ADOT's recourse to those of us homeowners who all these years had thought that our I'm home was going to be purchased by ADOT because we couldn't sell them. And now all of the sudden, we're not in the alignment anymore, our house is not going to be bought by ADOT, and I'm faced with a house that's going to be worthless.

And if they had told us, given us a written statement, something that notified us, your home is not in the line of demolition anymore, you know, we would have taken action at that time. Either get out somehow, and now we've lost all of that in our home and we have to move. Now what do I do?

We've been in limbo for years, but we were reassured, just sit tight, the freeway goes through, it's no big deal because they're going to have to take our house. At least we'll be able to get out and be recouped. Now we lost everything, everything. I don't know what we're going to do. My name is Erica Slape, 3119 East Redwood Court in Phoenix, 85048.

MR. ROSE: My name's Scott Rose, R-o-s-e,
The Arizona Department of Transportation and Federal Highway Administration identified several issues and concerns that were frequently noted by commenters. Responses to these issues can be found in the Responses to Frequently Submitted Public Comments beginning on page B733 of this appendix.

1 a resident of Laveen. I'm very much in favor of the freeway. We moved out there nine years ago and waiting for the freeway to be built, and we moved out there hoping to raise our family out there with a lot of other amenities and the freeway has been holding this up. So we know that with the building of the freeway, there will be many amenities for us and the family and the whole community to use.

We live about a half mile from there, from the freeway, and it would be great access for us. And what else was I going to say? Oh, we're in favor of the 59 west alignment, but we also would be in favor of a -- potentially a parkway tying in the 101. What else? Anything else? I think that's it.

MR. HARDING: I'm Henry Harding and I live at 304 West Coolidge Street here in Phoenix, 85013. I'm not really in favor of this section of the 202. It's just -- if we promulgate more and more highways -- now, I talked to Ben over there. He said that we would save 40 million gallons or -- yeah, I think 40 million gallons of oil every year or gasoline every year.

What if we didn't do that and people start -- took the amount of money that would take to build this section of road and educated the people
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Comment Document</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TELEPHONE CONVERSATION RECORD**  
**SOUTH MOUNTAIN FREEWAY INFORMATION LINE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>TIME</th>
<th>CALLER</th>
<th>ADDRESS</th>
<th>PHONE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5/15/13</td>
<td>7:30 PM</td>
<td>JANET ROSEN</td>
<td>5371 W. LINDA LANE, CHANDER, AZ 85226</td>
<td>EMAIL</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CALLER REMARKS/QUESTIONS:**

Yes, I support the South Mountain Freeway. Thank you.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Comment noted.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I was resident of Laveen. I was there since 2007 to 2009 -- end of 2012. I work in Chandler, and my commute was only through Baseline Road, and it was like a nightmare every day, and I pretty much couldn't stay anymore because I had to have early morning meetings, so I had to move out to Chandler. But I still have my home back in Laveen. And I'm -- it's rented right now.

So I'm very interested to see this freeway getting built, because if you stay -- if you ever go to Laveen, you'll see that area has a lot of prospects, but it's just not developing or growing because of not having a proper freeway there yet. It's just like a cul-de-sac, with only one road, Baseline, going back and forth.

So -- so I really hope and thank the ADOT team for committing the years. I know it's a long process, and I hope this process moves faster and quickly so that the freeway gets built as soon as possible.

MR. ROSS: Richard Ross, R-i-c-h-a-r-d, R-o-s, as in Sam. So I am against the building of this road for a lot of reasons. One, I don't believe -- I don't believe we have the money. Or another way of saying it is I think the money could be spent in a better way. I don't believe we need more roads built. We have an incredible
Regarding traffic and air quality, I lived in Atlanta during the building of the downtown freeway and the freeway out to the northwest — north, northwest suburbs. The original proposition there was that the building of that expressway would last 30 to 50 years. It would relieve traffic congestion on arterial roads.

That took 11 years to build, and that entire network of roads was completely filled up in one year. It did not alleviate anything. As the road got built, traffic moved to it. I see no reason why the same issue would not happen here. If you build it, they will come. It will cause more interstate traffic and more regional traffic to go on this route. It won't alleviate arterial traffic as well.

Regarding air quality, which is linked to that, if the thought was if we alleviate stop-and-go arterial traffic, that will help air quality, my guess is we will end up with stop-and-go traffic on the proposed expansion, and it wouldn't help with air quality. As a matter of fact, more traffic will come to the area, increasing air quality issues, along with heat island effect, which combines with a one-plus-one-equals-three issue to air quality.

As buildings, parking lots, roads, and other infrastructure replace open land and vegetation, an urban heat island may result. The heat island effect is of a regional nature and, therefore, there is no requirement to analyze potential impacts and no possibility of determining the localized contribution at the project level to the regional heat island effect. It is likely, however, that a proposed project such as the South Mountain Freeway would be a minor contributor to the overall issue.

The proposed freeway is part of the Regional Transportation Plan for the Maricopa Association of Governments region. The Regional Transportation Plan, as described on pages 1-5 and 1-10 of the Final Environmental Impact Statement, addresses freeways, streets, transit, airports, bicycle and pedestrian facilities, freight, demand management, system management, and safety. The proposed freeway is only one part of the overall multimodal transportation system planned to meet the travel demand needs of the Maricopa Association of Governments region.

The Arizona Department of Transportation and Federal Highway Administration identified several issues and concerns that were frequently noted by commenters. Responses to these issues can be found in the Responses to Frequently Submitted Public Comments beginning on page B733 of this appendix.
There's a lot stated in the project is based on future car travel miles increasing dramatically. I don't believe that car travel miles will increase as the study shows. Car travel miles elsewhere are showing a decrease. We have the light rail, causing a decrease. We have bikers, causing a decrease. Car travel miles are not going to increase at the rate that is in the projections. I think it's a bogus projection, and I think we're building a road that is solving a symptom, not a problem. The problem is too many people. What we need to do is stop having people -- we -- we have to stop the growth of people entering the system, and there will not be a need for the road. But with all those issues, the biggest issue for me personally is the park. The park is South Mountain Park. The park is unique. It is our crown jewel. The proposal of this road is one that, once it is done, cannot be undone ever. We need to remember that we did not inherit the land from our ancestors; we borrowed it from our children and our children's children for the next seven generations and beyond. It is our job and our responsibility to protect that land.

That's it. Thank you.
I have lived in Laveen for 25 years, and during that time have been to numerous meetings to discuss the expansion of this area. During those meetings, prior to the growth west of 67th Avenue between Baseline Road and Southern Avenue, we spoke and argued and met with many people to discuss our negativity to the dense growth proposed there.

As it turned out later, we had been speaking to deaf ears, since the property west of 67th Avenue had already been purchased and proceeded on prior to all the meetings we attended, and was going to move forward REGARDLESS of our speeches, and tears. It was a done deal before we got to express our opinions.

Therefore, it is with a heavy heart that I write to you now. I am sure that this is just procedure that you must follow; your decision has probably already been made regardless of what the public says it wants.

My opinion is that the proposed freeway connect via the W101 Western Alternative, which would connect to an already heavy-use freeway area, and exchanges are already in place on the north side of the I-10 interstate. By using the 101 connection, you can bypass the already-congested area of 59th Avenue and I-10, and not add to the congestion there with more vehicles and trucks. It wouldn't matter if you added 100 more lanes in any direction.

The bottleneck at that area will ONLY become worse, not "better." Areas closer to the metropolitan Phoenix area from 99th Avenue is already a disaster area in 2013, and whenever this new freeway will be added will only cause to increase the congestion with cars and pollution. Keeping the proposed Loop 202 SM Freeway at the 101 Interchange keeps that congestion further west, where motorists who only want to continue west will not have to deal with the inner-city congestion too.

Also, the Laveen area, which started out at 8,500 population in 1988 when I moved here, and has blossomed into the 120,000+ population it is today, despite our efforts to "keep Laveen small", will again be bombarded with change – destroying our remaining farm fields and open space, displacing families, adding pollution, removing our irrigation system, destroying our "quiet" living conditions and adding health risks to its population.

Sadly, as mentioned earlier, it will not matter what I want, what I think, or what I feel about this W59 Alternative freeway. You want us to write and express our feelings, but your proposals are probably already established.

I say an emphatic NONONONONONONONONONONONONONONONONONO to the W59 Alternative. My vote would be for the W101 Western Alternative to bypass the my Laveen community.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Comment Document</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Sirs,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I have lived in Laveen for 25 years, and during that time have been to numerous meetings to discuss the expansion of this area. During those meetings, prior to the growth west of 67th Avenue between Baseline Road and Southern Avenue, we spoke and argued and met with many people to discuss our negativity to the dense growth proposed there. As it turned out later, we had been speaking to deaf ears, since the property west of 67th Avenue had already been purchased and proceeded on prior to all the meetings we attended, and was going to move forward REGARDLESS of our speeches, and tears. It was a done deal before we got to express our opinions. Therefore, it is with a heavy heart that I write to you now. I am sure that this is just procedure that you must follow; your decision has probably already been made regardless of what the public says it wants. My opinion is that the proposed freeway connect via the W101 Western Alternative, which would connect to an already heavy-use freeway area, and exchanges are already in place on the north side of the I-10 interstate. By using the 101 connection, you can bypass the already-congested area of 59th Avenue and I-10, and not add to the congestion there with more vehicles and trucks. It wouldn't matter if you added 100 more lanes in any direction. The bottleneck at that area will ONLY become worse, not &quot;better.&quot; Areas closer to the metropolitan Phoenix area from 99th Avenue is already a disaster area in 2013, and whenever this new freeway will be added will only cause to increase the congestion with cars and pollution. Keeping the proposed Loop 202 SM Freeway at the 101 Interchange keeps that congestion further west, where motorists who only want to continue west will not have to deal with the inner-city congestion too. Also, the Laveen area, which started out at 8,500 population in 1988 when I moved here, and has blossomed into the 120,000+ population it is today, despite our efforts to &quot;keep Laveen small&quot;, will again be bombarded with change – destroying our remaining farm fields and open space, displacing families, adding pollution, removing our irrigation system, destroying our &quot;quiet&quot; living conditions and adding health risks to its population. Sadly, as mentioned earlier, it will not matter what I want, what I think, or what I feel about this W59 Alternative freeway. You want us to write and express our feelings, but your proposals are probably already established. I say an emphatic NONONONONONONONONONONONONONONONONONO to the W59 Alternative. My vote would be for the W101 Western Alternative to bypass the my Laveen community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Comment Document</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sincerely,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Debra N Ross</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DNRoss &amp; Associates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Doing Good Business since 1995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Desktop Publishing • Design • Printing Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Everything in print, from business cards to books”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7252 South 65th Drive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Laveen, AZ 85339</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>602-248-9255 PHONE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>602-248-4990 FAX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:dnross@phxinternet.com">dnross@phxinternet.com</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Code | Issue | Response |
From: Debra Ross  
To: Projects  
Subject: Re: DEIS Loop 202/South Mountain Freeway Study  
Date: Thursday, July 18, 2013 10:12 AM

Sirs,

I have lived in Laveen for 25 years, and during that time have been to numerous meetings to discuss the expansion of this area. During those meetings, prior to the growth west of 67th Avenue between Baseline Road and Southern Avenue, we spoke and argued and met with many people to discuss our negativity to the dense growth proposed there.

As it turned out later, we had been speaking to deaf ears, since the property west of 67th Avenue had already been purchased and proceeded on prior to all the meetings we attended, and was going to move forward REGARDLESS of our speeches, and tears. It was a done deal before we got to express our opinions.

Therefore, it is with a heavy heart that I write to you now. I am sure that this is just procedure that you must follow; your decision has probably already been made regardless of what the public says it wants.

My opinion is that the proposed freeway connect via the W101 Western Alternative, which would connect to an already heavy-use freeway area, and exchanges are already in place on the north side of the I-10 interstate. By using the 101 connection, you can bypass the already-congested area of 99th Avenue and I-10, and not add to the congestion there with more vehicles and trucks. It wouldn’t matter if you added 100 more lanes in any direction. The bottleneck at that area will ONLY become worse, not "better".

Areas closer to the metropolitan Phoenix area from 99th Avenue is already a disaster area in 2013, and whenever this new freeway will be added will only cause to increase the congestion with cars and pollution. Keeping the proposed Loop 202 SM Freeway at the 101 Interchange keeps that congestion further west, where motorists who only want to continue...
west will not have to deal with the inner-city congestion too.

Also, the Laveen area, which started out at 8,500 population in 1988 when I moved here, and has blossomed into the 120,000+ population it is today, despite our efforts to “keep Laveen small”, will again be bombarded with change – destroying our remaining farm fields and open space, displacing families, adding pollution, removing our irrigation system, destroying our “quiet” living conditions and adding health risks to its population.

Sadly, as mentioned earlier, it will not matter what I want, what I think, or what I feel about this W59 Alternative freeway. You want us to write and express our feelings, but your proposals are probably already established.

I say an emphatic NONONONONONONONONONONONONONONONONONONO to the W59 Alternative. My vote would be for the W101 Western Alternative to bypass the my Laveen community.

Sincerely,
Debra N Ross
DNRoss & Associates
Doing Good Business since 1995
Desktop Publishing • Design • Printing Services
“Everything in print, from business cards to books”
7252 South 65th Drive
Laveen, AZ 85339
302-248-9265 PHONE
602-248-4990 FAX
dnross@phxinternet.com

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Neighborhoods/Communities</td>
<td>The Laveen Village area is anticipated to have a built-out population of over 105,000 (see Final Environmental Impact Statement page 4-5). This proposed level of development places increasing demand on the road network. The City of Phoenix’s General Plan for Laveen Village has designated areas along the proposed freeway for commercial development that cannot support the projected densities without implementation of the proposed freeway. Without the proposed freeway, the conversion of land from undeveloped and agricultural uses to residential, commercial, and industrial land uses would likely continue, placing a greater demand on surface streets (see Final Environmental Impact Statement page 4-14).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Neighborhoods/Communities</td>
<td>In the Phoenix metropolitan area, vacant and agricultural land is already quickly being converted without the proposed freeway. Of three major land use types, residential land use was predominant in 2009 (see Table 4-2 and sidebar on Final Environmental Impact Statement page 4-3). In addition, the Study Area has over 140 developments encompassing some 11,000 acres (see Final Environmental Impact Statement page 4-7). None of the affected communities’ long-range plans include agriculture as a future land use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Neighborhoods/Communities</td>
<td>Unplanned growth is often termed “urban sprawl.” Generally, this term is used in the context of rapid and uncontrolled urban growth onto previously undeveloped land—usually on the outskirts of an existing urban area. Projects like the proposed freeway are often identified as contributors to urban sprawl. Freeway projects are often cited as making land at the urban fringe more accessible and, therefore, more attractive for development. However, examination of data comparing population and land use between 1975 and 2000 suggests major transportation projects like the proposed freeway do not induce growth in the region (see Final Environmental Impact Statement pages 4-170 through 4-174). The proposed freeway would be implemented in a historically quickly urbanizing area (most noticeably in the Western Section of the Study Area, although the nationwide recession which began in 2007 slowed growth). In the Eastern Section of the Study Area, the proposed freeway would abut public parkland, Native American land, and a near-fully developed area—therefore, any contribution to accelerated or induced growth would be constrained. The proposed freeway would be built in an area planned for urban growth as established in local jurisdictions’ land use plans for at least the last 25 years.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Arizona Department of Transportation and Federal Highway Administration identified several issues and concerns that were frequently noted by commenters. Responses to these issues can be found in the Responses to Frequently Submitted Public Comments beginning on page B733 of this appendix.

The study considered an alternative that would run along Interstate 8 in Casa Grande to State Route 85 from Gila Bend to Interstate 10 (see text on page 3-9 of the Final Environmental Impact Statement). State Route 85 is currently being reconstructed as a four-lane, divided highway with limited-access control, and Interstate 8 is a four-lane, divided Interstate freeway with full access control. Existing signs at each terminus designate the route as a truck bypass of the metropolitan Phoenix area. This route would continue to be available for interstate and interregional travel, but it would not meet the proposed action purpose and need as part of a regional transportation network and, therefore, was eliminated from further consideration.

The Arizona Department of Transportation and Federal Highway Administration identified several issues and concerns that were frequently noted by commenters. Responses to these issues can be found in the Responses to Frequently Submitted Public Comments beginning on page B733 of this appendix.

Prospective home buyers and members of the church built after the freeway was conceived, according to State law, should have been informed of the proposed facility. (Sellers are obligated by Arizona common law to disclose all known material facts about a property to the buyer.)

Two other advantages are presented with the new highway. Current residential homes in the proposed route would not have to be removed, saving millions of dollars. And there is discussion regarding constructing a new interstate (I-9) from Naples to Canada. With I-19, I-10, and I-8 already in place, a highway connecting I-8 and I-10 from Gila Bend to Tonopah would be a good start.

Thanks for listening.

Calvin Ross
PO Box 315
Arizona City, AZ 85123
1 help the commute to work. I know a lot of times the
2 freeway, I-10 gets closed and then the surface
3 streets are just blocked all the time and I just
4 really hope that we can get there. We moved to
5 Laveen counting on that freeway coming in, knowing
6 that it was approved, so I just really hope that you
7 guys take that into consideration and support the
8 freeway.
9 That's all I have to say. Thanks.
10 THE FACILITATOR: Thank you.
11 For those of you who may not have heard,
12 the last bus is leaving in about three minutes for
13 all destinations out there.
14 Jennifer Rouse, take your time.
15 MS. ROUSE: Hi, thank you. I wanted to
16 speak on the record in favor of the 202. I live in
17 Laveen, and have lived there for seven years. When
18 we first moved there I lived close to 35th and
19 [unintelligible] Road, where traffic jams pretty much
20 with the big trucks going down the road, and things
21 have changed, and having moved closer to 51st Avenue
22 and Baseline, we see the semis that come through that
23 earlier we heard people talk about how this is going
24 to bring all of these semis coming through the
25 neighborhood. It's already there. It's already
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Comment Document</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

1. there, going well over 45 miles an hour. It's going
2. to hit a child, I feel eventually, even though
3. they're put in crosswalks. And whether that
4. highway's built or not, the traffic is already there;
5. it needs to be moved through faster.
6. I also, when I first moved to Laveen, we
7. had just two children, and we were quite happy living
8. kind of separated away from the rest of downtown
9. Phoenix; however, things change, we had a third
10. child. And he was born, he has special needs, and we
11. had to have all sorts of therapists and stuff, and
12. what we found is we need access or easier, quicker
13. access to the East Valley. We love where we live;
14. however, there just seems to be a really big
15. disconnect from the rest of the Valley. We want to
16. shop Phoenix; however, many of the stores that we
17. want to go to, there's just one access, they're
18. either way in the East Valley or so far west we have
19. to drive out to Goodyear.
20. We feel that, especially now, a hospital,
21. we hate to hear people say you need the highway
22. before you get the hospital, before you get the
23. malls; the hospital is the big thing. We have well
24. over 40,000 people in Laveen now, and the nearest
25. hospital is Maryvale. I had a friend that had to go
there in an emergency situation, and it's not exactly
the place you want to go. I guess we can’t like --
we can't ask them to take us to Estrella, and I
personally would love to see a hospital in our area.
Other than that. Thank you very much.
Sorry.
THE FACILITATOR: Thank you. It is now
8:00 p.m. This concludes the Loop 202 South Mountain
public hearing. Thanks to everyone here for
participating, and your support throughout the day.
Have a good evening.

(The proceedings concluded at 8:00 p.m.)
THE FACILITATOR: Thank you.

MR. ROWLEY: Good afternoon, it's good to be here with you today. My name is Cade Rowley, I've been here in the Valley for almost 15 years, and I want to show my support for the 202 freeway. This thing's been studied for almost 20 years, I think that I've reviewed the draft EIS, I think the team has done a very thorough job of looking at all the issues, weighing in on the environmental consideration as a need to be taken and, you know, the freeway here's going to provide a lot of great things for the community. It's going to reduce air pollution; as you probably heard today, congestion is at a premium in this part of the Valley, it's very difficult to get from the west side of the Valley to the east side where I live and, you know, it's going to make a big impact on that.

In addition to that, we really need the jobs here in Arizona, so it has the potential to create 30,000 jobs. Our economy is struggling, now is the time to build the 202, and I want to issue my support for the build option of the 202. Thank you.  

THE FACILITATOR: Thank you.

Don Clark.

MR. CLARK: Thank you. I want to just voice my appreciation for the study that has been done and voice...
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Comment Document</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**TELEPHONE CONVERSATION RECORD**  
**SOUTH MOUNTAIN FREEWAY INFORMATION LINE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Incoming Call</th>
<th>Time:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date:</td>
<td>6/12/13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time:</td>
<td>6:10 PM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Caller**  
SONYA ROYALS  
**Caller Address**  
10730 W. GARNETT DRIVE, SUN CITY, AZ  
**Phone**  
623-876-8644  
**Email**  

**Caller Remarks/Questions:**  
Hello, I support the South Mountain Freeway.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Comment noted.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
more highways you have, the less -- the more gas you're going
to use. So it's taking a gas-tax fund and putting that money
back into the same system. How can you not say that that's
collusion? So there is a big problem with the Arizona
Constitution, with this gas-tax law.

There is also a big problem with MAG and how they
operate because they're the Association of Governments. Well,
I think it's pretty clear that most people would agree that our
government in this country has become extremely corrupt. I
think people can, without a doubt, say that. I think special
interests --

As I speaking too loud?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: No, don't worry about it.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: A little bit.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Good job, man.

MR. ROYER: So -- Sorry, I was speaking too loud.

That was inconsiderate. No, I'm just kidding.

So most people, I think, would agree that the
governments have become corrupt. So, again, the people that
are dictating these decisions are the governments, the
corrupted governments that don't represent the people, that
represent special interests, in part because we let them; in
part because there is a serious disparity in influence.

People that have the resources, the time, the
money, the control, the power, are able to influence easier
than people who are stuck in a system where they have to work 60 hours a week, where they have a family and they’re far removed from these meetings and they have a hard time getting to these meetings, speaking of transportation.

I just don’t know what this is about. I don’t -- it’s pretty -- it’s -- Not that I don’t know. I just -- I don’t get why this is trying to happen. Because, to me, if this was really needed, there wouldn’t be so many people opposed to it, and truly opposed to it with all your heart and their bodies, because there is too many red flags.

So, if this was truly a need, you would have to give proven evidence. And, through what I have seen, even though I’m sure a lot of people from ADOT worked hard, which apparently there is a lot of people who work at ADOT because I -- I don’t want to bring up the word “bureaucracy,” but ADOT is a job creator.

I really hope you all are doing good work. But I -- You know, I just don’t -- I don’t see it because, if you’re a Department of Transportation, you should be finding a better way to help people transport. And I don’t see it helping. I see people hurting. I see people hurting at the gas pump. Every time I pump gas, it hurts me. I go in debt. And so I see a lot of people struggling.

And so gas prices, being as they are, going higher, as they can and probably will, is hurting people.

Purpose and Need

Although the region’s freeways are now congested during the peak travel period, conditions in 2035 without the proposed freeway would be substantially worse with more congested areas and congested conditions for longer periods of time (see Final Environmental Impact Statement pages 1-21 and 1-22). Congestion relief resulting from the proposed freeway would provide localized reductions of delays on arterial streets and at interchanges. Reduced travel times would result in lower exposure to elevated concentrations of mobile source air toxics occurring in traffic. Other benefits of the proposed freeway in comparison to the No-Action Alternative are presented in Table 3-9 on page 3-38 of the Final Environmental Impact Statement.

Alternatives

Federal regulations stipulate that an environmental impact statement shall “rigorously explore and objectively evaluate all reasonable alternatives” (40 Code of Federal Regulations § 1502.14; see Final Environmental Impact Statement page 3-1). All alternatives were screened using a multidisciplinary set of criteria. Nonfreeway alternatives were considered (see Final Environmental Impact Statement pages 3-3 through 3-6). Among other things, the study took into account improving existing freeways, improving or expanding other travel modes, strategies to reduce travel demand, and various roadway configurations. This study examined not only the potential impacts from improvements, but also the consequences of building nothing, the No-Action Alternative). As proposed by the Maricopa Association of Governments, the South Mountain Freeway would be part of the Regional Freeway and Highway System. Other transportation improvements such as mass transit and local roads are specified in the Regional Transportation Plan and were considered during the evaluation of this proposed new freeway.
“So ADOT, what does ADOT really do?” is my question. I would love them to -- You know, because I've heard answers but I haven't heard a good answer, because trying to remain neutral is cowardice in times like these. You cannot remain neutral, and especially in a position of you're a Department of Transportation. Your department is transportation. Your whole purpose is to think about transportation. So why does Arizona have one of the -- one of the worst transportation systems? We are overreliant on cars.

And I'm sorry I'm talking your ear off. I'm really sorry. You are a saint.

We have -- We are overreliant on gasoline, which is just hurting a lot of people because it's not -- it's not sustainable for them.

Imagine if we had electric cars; we didn't have to pay 60, a hundred dollars a week, on gas, or whatever people are paying.

I mean, so we're talking about investments here.

And so, if ADOT was talking about investments, then I want good investments. And this is not a good investment. I mean, now we're talking business. This is -- This is not a good social investment.

Sure, this is a good investment for a private corporation that is going to -- and contractors and construction companies or whatever, and developers, developers,
Unplanned growth is often termed “urban sprawl.” Generally, this term is used in the context of rapid and uncontrolled urban growth onto previously undeveloped land—usually on the outskirts of an existing urban area. Projects like the proposed freeway are often identified as contributors to urban sprawl. Freeway projects are often cited as making land at the urban fringe more accessible and, therefore, more attractive for development. However, examination of data comparing population and land use between 1975 and 2000 suggests major transportation projects like the proposed freeway do not induce growth in the region (see Final Environmental Impact Statement pages 4-170 through 4-174). The proposed freeway would be implemented in a historically quickly urbanizing area (most noticeably in the Western Section of the Study Area, although the nationwide recession which began in 2007 slowed growth). In the Eastern Section of the Study Area, the proposed freeway would abut public parkland, Native American land, and a near-fully developed area—therefore, any contribution to accelerated or induced growth would be constrained. The proposed freeway would be built in an area planned for urban growth as established in local jurisdictions’ land use plans for at least the last 25 years.
sustainability starts with building strong communities and not divided communities and sprawled-out communities?

LITERALLY, THIS -- THIS FREEWAY DIVIDES A COMMUNITY FROM A MOUNTAIN. IT DIVIDES A MOUNTAIN FROM PEOPLE. IT SURROUNDS THIS MOUNTAIN WITH FREEWAYS. IT -- IT SEvers THE CONNECTION THAT NATURE HAS TO ITSELF. ANIMALS COME AND GO.

NOW YOU'VE GOT A FREEWAY TO PASS OVER, ANIMALS.

GOOD LUCK WITH THAT.

WHERE IS THE ANIMALS IN HERE? THEY DON'T HAVE NOTHING TO SAY? WE -- WE ALMOST LAUGH AT THAT. AND YET PEOPLE CALL THEMSELVES ANIMAL -- THEY CARE ABOUT ANIMALS, RIGHT?

"WELL, I HAVE A DOG; I CARE ABOUT ANIMALS."

WELL, WHAT ABOUT THE NATURAL ANIMALS THAT HAVE BEEN DESTROYED BECAUSE OF ALL THIS DEVELOPMENT?

Development? What's real development? What really matters to people?

I THINK, TO SOME PEOPLE, WHAT REALLY MATTERS IS THIS IDEA OF BECOMING RICH OR SOMETHING, OF HAVING MORE POWER THAN OTHERS SO THAT THEY CAN EXERT THEIR WILL. TO ME, IT'S ALL ABOUT BULLYING. IT'S A BULLY CULTURE.

And I've seen this firsthand. Pangea, this corporation, is a bully. This kind of methodology, where we're going to build; there's no other option: That's bullying.

"There's no other option. I have to beat you up for your lunch money." That's a bully.
So, to me, what it comes down to, people of ADOT, whoever is going to receive this message, is that: Do you want to stand with the bully or do you want to stand with the people who want to stand against bullying culture? Not that we're going to go and bully the bully. But we need to stand against the bullying culture. We've got to change this culture.

So, anyways, the Sierra Club is against this. Many Gila River community members are against this. PARC -- I wish I could remember what "PARC" stands for. Do you know what "PARC" stands for, by any chance? Let me see. I need to get their name right because it's important.

Can I -- Can I take a moment, real quick?

COURT REPORTER: Yeah.

MR. ROYER: Okay. So here's PARC. So I stand in solidarity with PARC, which is Protecting Arizona's Resources and Children. This is this group, and they've been having meetings.

For instance, one of -- Something that I can see is six reasons why -- six, kind of, like, myths that they're -- or six problems that they have with the EIS.

One is truck traffic from Mexico and high-sulfur diesel. Truck bypass negated.

Another one is air -- Another one is air --
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Hazardous Materials</td>
<td>The Arizona Department of Transportation and Federal Highway Administration identified several issues and concerns that were frequently noted by commenters. Responses to these issues can be found in the Responses to Frequently Submitted Public Comments beginning on page B733 of this appendix.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Alternatives, W59 Alternative Versus W101 Alternative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Cultural Resources</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Environmental Resources, Justice/Lifestyle</td>
<td>The Draft Environmental Impact Statement describes a decade-long consultation and coordination effort led by the Arizona Department of Transportation and the Federal Highway Administration with the Gila River Indian Community and other Native American tribes. As a result of the consultation, the cultural importance of the South Mountains is acknowledged in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement in several locations, notably page 5-26. The proposed project would accommodate and preserve (to the fullest extent possible from the available alternatives) access to the South Mountains for religious practices. Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act requires a government-to-government relationship between the Federal Government and Indian tribes as described beginning on page 4-140 of the Final Environmental Impact Statement. Section 106 requires federal agencies take into account the effects of their undertakings on historic properties and requires consultation with tribal authorities. Consultation has occurred with Gila River Indian Community government officials, the Tribal Historic Preservation Officer, the Cultural Resource Management Program, other tribes, and the State Historic Preservation Office and has led to concurrence from the Gila River Indian Community Tribal Historic Preservation Office and the State Historic Preservation Office on National Register of Historic Places eligibility recommendations (including traditional cultural properties like the South Mountains), project effects, and proposed mitigation and measures to minimize harm. This consultation has been ongoing and will continue until any commitments in a record of decision are completed. The section entitled Title VI and Environmental Justice, beginning on page 4-29 in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement, presents acceptable methods, data, and assumptions to assess the potential for disproportionately high and adverse effects from the proposed action on environmental justice populations and disparate impacts to populations protected under Title VI. Based on the content of the section, no such effects would result from the action alternatives. In light of comments received on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement, the above-referenced conclusions were confirmed in the preparation of the Final Environmental Impact Statement. To provide further clarity, the discussions of environmental justice and Title VI were separated and additional text explaining the relationship of environmental justice and Title VI to various environmental elements was added throughout Chapter 4, Affected Environment, Environmental Consequences, and Mitigation, as exemplified by the inserted text on page 4-29 of the Final Environmental Impact Statement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Section 4(f) and Section 6(f)</td>
<td>The Arizona Department of Transportation and Federal Highway Administration identified several issues and concerns that were frequently noted by commenters. Responses to these issues can be found in the Responses to Frequently Submitted Public Comments beginning on page B733 of this appendix.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
And I don't think most people would be for this if they thought, not as a citizen of a state, but as a citizen to the earth. If we really cared about our environment, which we need, if we really cared about animals, which we need, then we wouldn't continue to destroy those things. It's really that simple.

It comes down to The Lorax story. It comes down to childhood stories. But this is old wisdom, Aesop's wisdom. It comes down to Shel Silverstein's, with The Giving Tree, wisdom. You cannot continue to take and take and expect to have anything left.

I think I'm good. I feel better now.

(The public hearing proceedings concluded at 8:00 p.m.)
Sierra Colina Block Watch Group supports this effort for improving our community and Our Valley Freeway System

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Comment Document</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Phil Royer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Comment noted.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Arizona Department of Transportation and Federal Highway Administration identified several issues and concerns that were frequently noted by commenters. Responses to these issues can be found in the Responses to Frequently Submitted Public Comments beginning on page B733 of this appendix.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Alternatives, No-Action (No-Build) Alternative</td>
<td>The Arizona Department of Transportation and Federal Highway Administration identified several issues and concerns that were frequently noted by commenters. Responses to these issues can be found in the Responses to Frequently Submitted Public Comments beginning on page B733 of this appendix.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Cultural Resources</td>
<td>Although the region’s freeways are now congested during the peak travel period, conditions in 2035 without the proposed freeway would be substantially worse with more congested areas and congested conditions for longer periods of time (see Final Environmental Impact Statement pages 1-21 and 1-22). Congestion relief resulting from the proposed freeway would provide localized reductions of delays on arterial streets and at interchanges. Reduced travel times would result in lower exposure to elevated concentrations of mobile source air toxics occurring in traffic. Other benefits of the proposed freeway in comparison to the No-Action Alternative are presented in Table 3-9 on page 3-38 of the Final Environmental Impact Statement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Purpose and Need</td>
<td>Federal regulations stipulate that an environmental impact statement shall “rigorously explore and objectively evaluate all reasonable alternatives” (40 Code of Federal Regulations § 1502.14; see Final Environmental Impact Statement page 3-1). All alternatives were screened using a multidisciplinary set of criteria. Nonfreeway alternatives were considered (see Final Environmental Impact Statement pages 3-3 through 3-6). Among other things, the study took into account improving existing freeways, improving or expanding other travel modes, strategies to reduce travel demand, and various roadway configurations. This study examined not only the potential impacts from improvements, but also the consequences of building nothing, the No-Action Alternative. As proposed by the Maricopa Association of Governments, the South Mountain Freeway would be part of the Regional Freeway and Highway System. Other transportation improvements such as mass transit and local roads are specified in the Regional Transportation Plan and were considered during the evaluation of this proposed new freeway. As noted in the Final Environmental Impact Statement (see page 3-60), the proposed freeway would provide opportunities to enhance operation of future mass transit improvements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Alternatives</td>
<td>Federal regulations stipulate that an environmental impact statement shall “rigorously explore and objectively evaluate all reasonable alternatives” (40 Code of Federal Regulations § 1502.14; see Final Environmental Impact Statement page 3-1). All alternatives were screened using a multidisciplinary set of criteria. Nonfreeway alternatives were considered (see Final Environmental Impact Statement pages 3-3 through 3-6). Among other things, the study took into account improving existing freeways, improving or expanding other travel modes, strategies to reduce travel demand, and various roadway configurations. This study examined not only the potential impacts from improvements, but also the consequences of building nothing, the No-Action Alternative. As proposed by the Maricopa Association of Governments, the South Mountain Freeway would be part of the Regional Freeway and Highway System. Other transportation improvements such as mass transit and local roads are specified in the Regional Transportation Plan and were considered during the evaluation of this proposed new freeway. As noted in the Final Environmental Impact Statement (see page 3-60), the proposed freeway would provide opportunities to enhance operation of future mass transit improvements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Air Quality</td>
<td>The Arizona Department of Transportation and Federal Highway Administration identified several issues and concerns that were frequently noted by commenters. Responses to these issues can be found in the Responses to Frequently Submitted Public Comments beginning on page B733 of this appendix.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Health Effects</td>
<td>The Arizona Department of Transportation and Federal Highway Administration identified several issues and concerns that were frequently noted by commenters. Responses to these issues can be found in the Responses to Frequently Submitted Public Comments beginning on page B733 of this appendix.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Section 4(f) and Section 6(f)</td>
<td>The Arizona Department of Transportation and Federal Highway Administration identified several issues and concerns that were frequently noted by commenters. Responses to these issues can be found in the Responses to Frequently Submitted Public Comments beginning on page B733 of this appendix.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Biology, Plants, and Wildlife</td>
<td>The Arizona Department of Transportation and Federal Highway Administration identified several issues and concerns that were frequently noted by commenters. Responses to these issues can be found in the Responses to Frequently Submitted Public Comments beginning on page B733 of this appendix.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
infrastructure so that others can live farther and farther from a city center.

Please help protect our communities, our health, and our environment by selecting the No Action Alternative. Thank you.

Sincerely,

Mr. Michael Royer
5312 W Fairview St
Chandler, AZ 85226-4557

Unplanned growth is often termed “urban sprawl.” Generally, this term is used in the context of rapid and uncontrolled urban growth onto previously undeveloped land—usually on the outskirts of an existing urban area. Projects like the proposed freeway are often identified as contributors to urban sprawl. Freeway projects are often cited as making land at the urban fringe more accessible and, therefore, more attractive for development. However, examination of data comparing population and land use between 1975 and 2000 suggests major transportation projects like the proposed freeway do not induce growth in the region (see Final Environmental Impact Statement pages 4-170 through 4-174). The proposed action would be implemented in a historically quickly urbanizing area (most noticeably in the Western Section of the Study Area, although the nationwide recession which began in 2007 slowed growth). In the Eastern Section of the Study Area, the proposed freeway would abut public parkland, Native American land, and a near-fully developed area—therefore, any contribution to accelerated or induced growth would be constrained. The proposed freeway would be built in an area planned for urban growth as established in local jurisdictions’ land use plans for at least the last 25 years.
From: RRoyko1000@aol.com [mailto:RRoyko1000@aol.com]
Sent: Saturday, May 18, 2013 8:59 AM
To: Projects
Cc: mwroyko@gmail.com
Subject: Against Building The South Mountain Freeway

Gentlemen,

Contrary to the unsolicited e-mail I just received from a group calling themselves “We Build Arizona”, urging me to support the building of the 202 through what is now Peoria Road, I urge you not to build it.

I live in Ahwatukee and my quality of life would be irreparably harmed by the proposed South Mountain Freeway. So much so that I am seriously considering selling my home and relocating.

Thank you for your consideration.

Raymond T. Royko, Esq.
16218 S. 14th Way
Phoenix AZ, 85048
(480) 283-1369

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.
I am an Arizona native and have lived in the South Mountain, Laveen Areas for 60 years. Laveen is one of the few areas left that is not overdeveloped. I have stayed in the area due to lack of noise, pollution, traffic and availability of horse property. However, the pollution, traffic and noise have increased in the last ten years due to growth. Many of the projects that were proposed such as an area being developed on Dobbins similar to the Prescott Courthouse area have not happened. Most of the original home owners in the area left in Laveen that is still County moved or stayed in the area because we wanted a rural feel to our community. I have seen many of the traditional small town activities change as Phoenix has expanded into Laveen. As well as an increase in crime. I am close to the proposed exchange and DO NOT want increased traffic, noise, pollution, or loss of land to take place. I have attended community meetings as well as filled out information at one of the barbeques. I feel that because Laveen residents are fewer than residents in some of the other communities polled our voices are not heard. I attend a meeting where an Attorney spoke for one of the larger land owners in the area that supported the Route. His comments were very condescending to the residents in attendance and not appreciated. I realize that growth is inevitable as I have already seen it occur in our community, but I would urge you to reconsider 59th Avenue as the preferred route just due to expense. If you truly respect community welfare and opinion, I believe you need to choose another alternative.
TELEPHONE CONVERSATION RECORD
SOUTH MOUNTAIN FREEWAY INFORMATION LINE

INCOMING CALL
DATE: 5/18/13
TIME: 2:58 PM
CALLER: JOHN RUFNECK
CALLER ADDRESS: 7211 N. 2ND STREET, PHOENIX, AZ 85020
PHONE: EMAIL:

CALLER REMARKS/QUESTIONS:
I would like to announce my support for that and my reason for doing that is because it would alleviate traffic and it would extend the whole valley in a very positive manner. I hope that this will be acted upon. Thank you.

Comment noted.
1 benefit Laveen by adding additional traffic flow to
2 the community, which would then bring in some
3 economic development as well.
4 So, you know, we in Laveen really support
5 the 202, and would appreciate, you know, every eye
6 and ear paying attention to its future development.
7 So thank you.
8 THE FACILITATOR: Thank you.
9 Another reminder, if anyone wishes to
10 speak, please make sure that you register at the
11 front desk. Your name will appear on the screen, and
12 we will call you in the order that you register.
13 Miguel Ruiz.
14 Good afternoon, you have three minutes.
15 Here’s the timer; please begin.
16 MR. RUIZ: Thank you, I’m a Laveen resident
17 and just want to voice my support for the Loop 202
18 extension. I drive from Laveen to Ahwatukee, so 35th
19 Avenue and Baseline down to 48th Street and Ray Road
20 every day, and it is a test of my patience driving
21 down Baseline Road.
22 Aside from my personal issues I run into
23 every day, it will create jobs. It will lead to
24 economic development, like what we’ve seen with the
25 San Tan 202. It will help the Valley as a whole,
1 regional availability. I have friends who live on
2 the east side of town who want to get to the West
3 Valley or points west, and this will also help them
4 by being able to bypass downtown Phoenix completely.
5 That's it for me. Thanks for your time.
6 THE FACILITATOR: Thank you, sir.
7 Larry Landry. Mr. Landry, you have three
8 minutes. Here's your timer; please begin.
9 MR. LANDRY: Thank you. Hey, Steve. My
10 name is Larry Landry; I live at 2409 East Solano Drive. I'm officially retired now; however, for 28,
11 almost 30 years, I've worked on freeway issues,
12 including the 1985 vote where the South Mountain
13 Freeway was voted in. Ironically, the 303 was an
14 optional freeway at that time. Look at all the money
15 that we spent on that. 55th Street alignment, the
16 preferred alignment, avenue alignment, is the key
17 one, and it's been 28 years.
18 I know you have difficult decisions to make
19 on the route, but this was on the map well before any
20 homes were built in Ahwatukee, and sometimes the
21 greater good, our air pollution is getting worse
22 every day in every way, and if you -- you know,
23 better than I, I-10, I-17, the Broadway curve is a
24 parking lot all too often. We need this reliever.
MS. RUIZ: I'm Caroline Ruiz, R-u-i-z.
THE COURT REPORTER: Spell your first name for me, please.
MS. RUIZ: It's C-a-r-o-l-i-n-e.
address?
THE COURT REPORTER: No.
MS. RUIZ: I am just here to comment that I'm --
I'm making a statement for the freeway and 59th Avenue.
We live half a mile from the intersection of 59th Avenue
and Lower Buckeye, and I believe that's where the
commercial core of Estrella Village is planned. And I
think the freeway would really spur that economic
development, which we've lived there 13 years and
currently have no meaningful retail. I think it's waiting
for the freeway to come in.
I also think that we're seeing a lot of large
warehouses go up in the area, and we currently don't have
the road capacity to handle them. We're already doing a
lot of -- there's a lot of mixing of vehicles with large
sems, and we've seen a lot of accidents in the area.
It's a dangerous situation.
I think the freeway would be a good way to just
channel the traffic around the area, around Downtown, and
also help with some of the pollution in the area to get

Comment noted.
the big trucks off the arterial roads.

That's pretty much it. Thank you.

THE COURT REPORTER: You're welcome.

(Proceedings concluded at 7:00 p.m.)
Hello,

My family and I have resided in the natural desert area of the Ahwatukee Foothills since moving to Arizona over 15 years ago. The community is a lovely place to raise a family. It has a low crime rate, low pollution index and is peaceful and quiet. It is a healthy place to live and work. If you build this freeway it will change all those factors and no longer be the community we know, admire and love. The freeway was planned many years ago. Things have changed. I share the same sentiment as many of my neighbors. If this freeway is attempted we will have to leave the area and likely will leave the state. Please consider your alternatives. The beautiful and sacred South Mountain will also be destroyed. Why? We are not at all in favor of this reckless plan by your organization.

Best Regards,

Amy Rulli

Territory Account Manager

Mobile: 602.690.4718 | Fax: 203.460.3497
amy.rulli@pb.com

Every connection is a new opportunity™

Please consider the environment before printing or forwarding this email. If you do print this email, please recycle the paper.

This email message may contain confidential, proprietary and/or privileged information. It is intended only for the use of the intended recipient(s). If you have received it in error, please immediately advise the sender by reply email and then delete this email message. Any disclosure, copying, distribution or use of the information contained in this email message is strictly prohibited. Any views expressed in this message are those of the individual sender, except where the sender specifically states from time the views of the Company.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Comment Document</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Neighborhoods/Communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Neighborhoods/Communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Noise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Air Quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Section 4(f) and Section 6(f)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Cultural Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Purpose and Need, Lack of Support</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Thank you,
Matthew Eberhart
Community Relations Officer
1655 W Jackson St. MD 126F
Phoenix, AZ 85007
602-712-2060
azdot.gov

-----Original Message-----
From: Barbara Russell [mailto:bsuerussell@cox.net]
Sent: Tuesday, July 23, 2013 3:30 PM
To: Projects
Cc: SMF@aol.com
Subject: Draft Environmental Impact Study for the South Mountain Freeway

To Whom It May Concern:

My husband and I have been residents for ten years in the Lakewood Community in Ahwatukee. As you
are aware, the Lakewood Community was established in June 1985. The lakes are fed by a “well” or
“spring”. Our grave concern is the protection of these existing wells or springs to continue as the
source for the two lakes in our community.

We respectfully request that ADOT protect these existing wells as they review the route for construction
of South Mountain Loop 202 Freeway. We recognize the importance of the freeway to the city of
Phoenix and State of Arizona. We also recognize the importance of our community lakes and their
existing properties including the wells that feed and sustain the lakes in this vital Phoenix community.
Any negative change to the lakes would have a devastating impact on our community, residents and
their future children.

We are proud citizens of our community and will be long term residents well into our retirement in
Lakewood Community.

Sincerely,
Zacc & Barbara Russell
3421 E Wildwood Dr
Phoenix, AZ 85048

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.
Jul 24, 2013
Arizona Department of Transportation South Mountain Study Team
1655 W Jackson St, MD 126F
Phoenix, AZ 85007
Dear South Mountain Study Team,

I am writing to express my opposition to the proposed South Mountain Freeway and to urge ADOT to select the No-Build Alternative.

I have carefully read ADOT’s proposal for the South Mountain Freeway. I do not support its implementation. South Mountain Park deserves better. It is a precious urban resource that should be sheltered and protected. As you know it is the largest city park in the USA. As a landmark, as an urban oasis, as an unmatched urban trail system, it is known across the land.

This is precious public space.

Building a new, very busy and, inevitably, very congested major roadway on its very perimeter makes no sense to me at all.

The proposed freeway would cause more problems than it would solve. It might possibly provide short-term congestion relief but for how long? Many major roadways have been built and widened in the last 20 years but our roadways remain clogged. Building yet another road is not the answer. Building this particular road on the edge of a wonderful urban treasure would be a travesty to any notion of Urban Planning for the better good of all citizens.

Please select the No-Build Alternative

Thank you.
Sincerely,
Jim Rutherford
5901 W Park Ave
Chandler, AZ 85226-1246
(480) 705-5271

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Alternatives, No-Action (No-Build) Alternative</td>
<td>The Arizona Department of Transportation and Federal Highway Administration identified several issues and concerns that were frequently noted by commenters. Responses to these issues can be found in the Responses to Frequently Submitted Public Comments beginning on page B733 of this appendix.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Section 4(f) and Section 6(f)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Alternatives, Nonfreeway Alternatives</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Purpose and Need</td>
<td>Although the region’s freeways are now congested during the peak travel period, conditions in 2035 without the proposed freeway would be substantially worse with more congested areas and congested conditions for longer periods of time (see Final Environmental Impact Statement pages 1-21 and 1-22). Congestion relief resulting from the proposed freeway would provide localized reductions of delays on arterial streets and at interchanges. Reduced travel times would result in lower exposure to elevated concentrations of mobile source air toxics occurring in traffic. Other benefits of the proposed freeway in comparison to the No-Action Alternative are presented in Table 3-9 on page 3-38 of the Final Environmental Impact Statement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Issue</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Comment noted.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From: denise ryle [mailto:mdryle31@yahoo.com]
Sent: Sunday, May 19, 2013 7:54 PM
To: Projects
Subject: build more interstate! PLEASE

Please build the 202 free that will better link South Mountain with the other interstate highways. Metro-Phoenix needs more highways/interstates to accommodate the ever increasing traffic issues its citizens face daily.

D. Ryle
TELEPHONE CONVERSATION RECORD
SOUTH MOUNTAIN FREEWAY INFORMATION LINE

INCOMING CALL
DATE: 5/15/13
TIME: 2:52 PM
CALLER: HENNA SADIKI
CALLER ADDRESS: 6301 W. POST ROAD, CHANDLER, AZ 85226
PHONE: EMAIL:

CALLER REMARKS/QUESTIONS:
I am calling to support the South Mountain Freeway. I support the construction of South Mountain Freeway near the Pecos Street and joining at I-10 on the west side. Thank you.

1 Comment noted.
### TELEPHONE CONVERSATION RECORD

**SOUTH MOUNTAIN FREEWAY INFORMATION LINE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Caller</th>
<th>Caller Address</th>
<th>Phone</th>
<th>Email</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6/15/13</td>
<td>12:04 PM</td>
<td>CALEO SALADINE</td>
<td>28738 N. 67TH DRIVE, PEORIA, AZ 85383</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CALLER REMARKS/QUESTIONS:**

Hello, I support the South Mountain freeway construction.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Comment noted.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I am retired. None of my friends who live in north Phoenix, Scottsdale, or the East Valley will come to my home. The drive time is long and the instructions are too complex because much of the drive is on thoroughfares. Please complete the freeway.

Thank you,

Jackie Salamo
The Arizona Department of Transportation and Federal Highway Administration identified several issues and concerns that were frequently noted by commenters. Responses to these issues can be found in the Responses to Frequently Submitted Public Comments beginning on page B733 of this appendix.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Air Quality</td>
<td>The Arizona Department of Transportation and Federal Highway Administration identified several issues and concerns that were frequently noted by commenters. Responses to these issues can be found in the Responses to Frequently Submitted Public Comments beginning on page B733 of this appendix.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Health Effects</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dear ADOT,

My name is Annie Salienne and I am a 12 year old 8th grader. I am currently attending Permian Hall Middle School. My family and I live within a mile of the planned South Mountain Freeway. The pollution of the cars and trucks will affect the environment and health of people in the surrounding areas. The toxins released from the trucks will badly affect people within Phoenix. I am deeply concerned for my family, community, and environment's health. Thank you for your time and I hope you reconsider this proposed highway.

Sincerely,

Annie Salienne

PARC Member
1. **Section 4(f) and Section 6(f)**

The Arizona Department of Transportation and Federal Highway Administration identified several issues and concerns that were frequently noted by commenters. Responses to these issues can be found in the **Responses to Frequently Submitted Public Comments** beginning on page B733 of this appendix.

2. **Alternatives**

The Arizona Department of Transportation purchased some right-of-way along Pecos Road when it was adopted as the freeway alignment in 1988 (see Draft Environmental Impact Statement page 3-53). Should another alternative be adopted as a result of this study, the Arizona Department of Transportation would dispose of the land that has been acquired.

3. **Cultural Resources**

The Arizona Department of Transportation and Federal Highway Administration identified several issues and concerns that were frequently noted by commenters. Responses to these issues can be found in the **Responses to Frequently Submitted Public Comments** beginning on page B733 of this appendix.

4. **Section 4(f) and Section 6(f)**

South Mountain’s newest trails are the Bursera and Pyramid Trails (see Final Environmental Impact Statement page 5-6). The E1 Alternative is approximately 1 mile south of the Pyramid Trail and even farther from the Bursera Trail; thus, it would not affect either trail. The trails have walk-in access from Chandler Boulevard and 19th Avenue, with on-street parking. This walk-in access would be north of and adjacent to the planned extension of Chandler Boulevard and, thus, would not be directly affected. The walk-in access point and the part of the Pyramid Trail at the access point are located adjacent to a residential neighborhood and the City of Phoenix’s planned Chandler Boulevard Extension. These trails are typically used for high-intensity recreational activities such as running, hiking, and biking, not noise- or viewshed-sensitive activities. All proposed action alternatives would span existing and proposed trails to avoid impacts. However, during construction (if an action alternative were selected), trails that would be spanned or would be near potential freeway construction would be closed for limited times for safety reasons. Closures would necessitate that trail users detour around construction sites to rejoins the trails farther along their length. According to Phoenix South Mountain Park/Preserve rangers, the Gila Trail—although well-defined—is not a designated trail within the park. That said, the Gila Trail would not be affected by the proposed freeway or by the Chandler Boulevard Extension. The Draft Environmental Impact Statement Appendix A394 contains information directly from the Phoenix General Plan and early coordination with the City of Phoenix Parks Department. The trails in the preserve are exceptions to this statement and were always meant as such. Should an alternative be selected, the Arizona Department of Transportation and Federal Highway Administration would work closely with the City of Phoenix during final design to ensure the connectivity of trails is maintained, whether they are eligible as Section 4(f) resources or not.

5. **Purpose and Need, Old Plan or Use of Old Data**

The Arizona Department of Transportation and Federal Highway Administration identified several issues and concerns that were frequently noted by commenters. Responses to these issues can be found in the **Responses to Frequently Submitted Public Comments** beginning on page B733 of this appendix.

(Responses continue on next page)
### Purpose and Need

The worldwide recession that began in late 2007 generated a substantial downturn in growth rates for new housing and employment across the United States. Arizona particularly suffered the effects of this recession because, beginning in the early 2000s, Arizona in general and Maricopa County specifically experienced some of the fastest population, housing, and employment growth rates in the country. Because the need for the proposed freeway is predicated in part on projected growth, one might conclude the recession reduced that need. An economic downturn associated with a given recession is, however, generally considered a short-term phenomenon with respect to the longer-term planning horizon established for the proposed freeway. Socioeconomic indicators have steadily and consistently increased in the region since the early 1900s. The critical factors underlying these indicators remain unchanged. (See the sidebar on Final Environmental Impact Statement page 1-11.)

### Hazardous Materials

The Arizona Department of Transportation and Federal Highway Administration identified several issues and concerns that were frequently noted by commenters. Responses to these issues can be found in the Responses to Frequently Submitted Public Comments beginning on page B733 of this appendix.

### Alternatives

The determination to not include an interchange at 32nd Street was made in coordination with the City of Phoenix (see Figure 3-8 on page 3-15 of the Final Environmental Impact Statement). The interchange would have required the displacement of over 100 homes and would have been located near an existing high school. The City recommended that, based on these impacts, the interchange be removed from the study. In 2006, the City of Phoenix conducted a traffic circulation study to evaluate the impacts of the proposed freeway on the local street system, including the shift of access to Foothills Reserve and Calabria from Pecos Road to Chandler Boulevard. The City study found no adverse effects on the local street system from the freeway (see Appendix 3-1 in the Final Environmental Impact Statement).
### TELEPHONE CONVERSATION RECORD
#### SOUTH MOUNTAIN FREEWAY INFORMATION LINE

**INCOMING CALL**
- **DATE:** 7/1/13
- **TIME:** 2:22 PM
- **CALLER:** ROBIN
- **PHONE:** 623-363-9237
- **EMAIL:**

**CALLER REMARKS/QUESTIONS:**
Hi I actually need to talk to someone about adding additional comments now that there's been a chance to study the DEIS. If someone could please contact Robin and a message would be fine if you just tell me what impact submitting additional comments in an organization that previously submitted comments, i.e., at the May 21st public comment forum would have on the total of comments. Or you know would it impact our original comments. Or do you take all comments into consideration? Thank you. Goodbye.

**RESPONSE:**
A voice mail message was left for Robin stating that all comments submitted during the Draft Environmental Impact Statement public comment will be considered and addressed in the document. She was encouraged to submit her additional comments at [www.southmountainfreeway.com](http://www.southmountainfreeway.com) or on the telephone hotline at 602-712-7006.

**RESPONSE DATE:** JULY 3, 2013  
**RESPONSE TIME:** 10 A.M.  
**STAFF INITIAL:** MEB
The Federal Highway Administration regulations do not allow the ownership of

In 2006, the City of Phoenix conducted a traffic circulation study to evaluate the

Alternatives

Traffic

Traffic

Public Comments

Responses to Frequently Submitted Public Comments beginning on page B733 of this appendix.

The Arizona Department of Transportation and Federal Highway Administration identified several issues and concerns that were frequently noted by commenters. Responses to these issues can be found in the Responses to Frequently Submitted Public Comments beginning on page B733 of this appendix.

The Arizona Department of Transportation and Federal Highway Administration identified several issues and concerns that were frequently noted by commenters. Responses to these issues can be found in the Responses to Frequently Submitted Public Comments beginning on page B733 of this appendix.

The Arizona Department of Transportation purchased some right-of-way along Pecos Road when it was adopted as the freeway alignment in 1988 (see Draft Environmental Impact Statement page 3-53). Should another alternative be adopted as a result of this study, the Arizona Department of Transportation would dispose of the land that has been acquired.

The Federal Highway Administration regulations do not allow the ownership of right-of-way to be a factor in the decision regarding the selection of an alternative.

The determination to not include an interchange at 32nd Street was made in coordination with the City of Phoenix (see Figure 3-8 on page 3-15 of the Final Environmental Impact Statement). The interchange would have required the displacement of over 100 homes and would have been located near an existing high school. The City recommended that, based on these impacts, the interchange be removed from the study. In 2006, the City of Phoenix conducted a traffic circulation study to evaluate the impacts of the proposed freeway on the local street system, including the shift of access to Foothills Reserve and Calabrea from Pecos Road to Chandler Boulevard. The City study found no adverse effects on the local street system from the proposed freeway (see Appendix 3-1 in the Final Environmental Impact Statement).

The extension of Chandler Boulevard west of 19th Avenue is included in this project because reasonable access must be maintained to the neighborhoods at the west end of Pecos Road (see Figure 3-33 on page 3-57 in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement). Early in the study process a traffic interchange at approximately 27th Avenue was evaluated but ultimately eliminated because of increased residential displacements and cost. The freeway construction staging plan for the area along Pecos Road would allow for keeping east-west travel open during construction. One side of the freeway would be constructed while traffic remained on Pecos Road. When complete, traffic would be shifted from Pecos Road to the new freeway. At that time, the other side of the freeway would be built. Therefore, traffic would be able to continue to operate as it currently does during construction. However, temporary detours may be needed during construction. (See Draft Environmental Impact Statement page 3-27.)

The DEIS provided for the Loop 202-South Mountain Freeway is a poor design based on outdated data. The current alignment will play havoc with the bordering Ahwatukee community’s traffic with the removal of a major surface street and destroy a good portion of South Mountain with an expensive excavation of three mountain ridges. It is time to stop wasting money and not build the proposed alignment. ADOT has made some pre-decisional actions with the purchase of property before the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) was released. I question the legality of this action and the entire DEIS when it appears ADOT has already made considerable financial investment to establish the alignment for the South Mountain Freeway rather than follow the prescribed process.

The elimination of Pecos Road in building the SMF would be disastrous for local arterial traffic in Ahwatukee Foothills. Not only would there be no interchange at 32nd Street, there would also be no frontage road along the freeway. So Chandler Boulevard would become inundated with traffic, much as it was before Pecos Road was connected to the I-10.

Also, the arterial streets north of Pecos, Liberty Lane and Lakewood Parkway, would become major East-West arterials in the area between Desert Foothills Parkway and 40th Street. Neither Liberty Lane nor Lakewood Parkway was designed for this. They provide access to 4 schools, including Desert Vista High School. Currently, the school bus traffic uses 32nd Street from Pecos Road to get to these schools. Without a SMF interchange at 32nd Street, this bus traffic would clog the already stressed arterials of Liberty Lane and Lakewood Parkway. High school traffic also includes a lot of student cars that would clog the arterials.

Furthermore, the elimination of the access to Pecos Road from near 27th Avenue (the road is currently called S. Chandler Boulevard) exacerbates an already difficult access problem for residents in that area. ADOT promised to pave W. Chandler Boulevard to provide residents’ access to Ahwatukee Foothills further east, but this by no means provides these residents with an acceptable access to/from their homes. Pecos Road currently provides their only access out of their housing area, and it is a direct connection to I-10. With the SMF, Chandler Boulevard would provide their only access out of their housing area, and it would provide a convoluted access for resident to either the SMF or I-10. Egress in case of emergency would be extremely limited.

The DEIS lacks a traffic study of the effect the SMF would have on local arterial streets in Ahwatukee Foothills. A study should have been done both for traffic patterns during construction of the SMF as well as patterns that would develop after the SMF would be completed. Because the data is not current, ADOT and its consultants are missing a continuing trend that young adult and teens are getting their driving licenses later and driving less. ADOT should be examining these trends when allocating funds for future projects to ensure our tax dollars are being used sensibly.

Young adults shift away from car ownership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Comment Document</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Young adults shift away from car ownership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>The Arizona Department of Transportation and Federal Highway Administration identified several issues and concerns that were frequently noted by commenters. Responses to these issues can be found in the Responses to Frequently Submitted Public Comments beginning on page B733 of this appendix.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>The Arizona Department of Transportation purchased some right-of-way along Pecos Road when it was adopted as the freeway alignment in 1988 (see Draft Environmental Impact Statement page 3-53). Should another alternative be adopted as a result of this study, the Arizona Department of Transportation would dispose of the land that has been acquired.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>The Federal Highway Administration regulations do not allow the ownership of right-of-way to be a factor in the decision regarding the selection of an alternative.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>The determination to not include an interchange at 32nd Street was made in coordination with the City of Phoenix (see Figure 3-8 on page 3-15 of the Final Environmental Impact Statement). The interchange would have required the displacement of over 100 homes and would have been located near an existing high school. The City recommended that, based on these impacts, the interchange be removed from the study. In 2006, the City of Phoenix conducted a traffic circulation study to evaluate the impacts of the proposed freeway on the local street system, including the shift of access to Foothills Reserve and Calabrea from Pecos Road to Chandler Boulevard. The City study found no adverse effects on the local street system from the proposed freeway (see Appendix 3-1 in the Final Environmental Impact Statement).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>The extension of Chandler Boulevard west of 19th Avenue is included in this project because reasonable access must be maintained to the neighborhoods at the west end of Pecos Road (see Figure 3-33 on page 3-57 in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement). Early in the study process a traffic interchange at approximately 27th Avenue was evaluated but ultimately eliminated because of increased residential displacements and cost. The freeway construction staging plan for the area along Pecos Road would allow for keeping east-west travel open during construction. One side of the freeway would be constructed while traffic remained on Pecos Road. When complete, traffic would be shifted from Pecos Road to the new freeway. At that time, the other side of the freeway would be built. Therefore, traffic would be able to continue to operate as it currently does during construction. However, temporary detours may be needed during construction. (See Draft Environmental Impact Statement page 3-27.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Responses continue on next page)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Traffic</td>
<td>The references in the comment are primarily related to national trends for travel; however, the local conditions and setting of the Phoenix metropolitan area are not consistent with areas of high-density cities in other parts of the country. In Maricopa County, daily vehicle miles traveled levels increased by almost 2 percent between 2011 and 2012, and the 2012 daily vehicle miles traveled approached the 2007 prerecession peak in. (Source: the Arizona Department of Transportation’s Multimodal Planning Division’s Highway Performance Monitoring System Data for calendar years 2012 and 2011) Even if the recently observed national trend of per capita vehicle miles traveled decreasing continues, total vehicle miles traveled in the region would still increase along with increases in total population.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Biology, Plants, and Wildlife</td>
<td>The Arizona Department of Transportation and Federal Highway Administration identified several issues and concerns that were frequently noted by commenters. Responses to these issues can be found in the Responses to Frequently Submitted Public Comments beginning on page B733 of this appendix.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Biology, Plants, and Wildlife</td>
<td>Mitigation measures to prevent introduction of invasive species during construction are discussed on Draft Environmental Impact Statement pages 4-118 through 4-119 and 4-126 through 4-127. The disposition of protected native species would be determined by the Arizona Department of Transportation, in consultation with the Arizona Department of Agriculture, at least 60 calendar days prior to the start of construction. Please see Draft Environmental Impact Statement pages 4-118 and 4-126 through 4-127.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Biology, Plants, and Wildlife</td>
<td>Less than a mile of the proposed freeway would pass through the park. Issues such as heavy metals, pollutants from asphalt, and airborne emissions that would settle out would have inconsequential potential impacts on adjacent plant vitality and species composition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Air Quality</td>
<td>The Arizona Department of Transportation and Federal Highway Administration identified several issues and concerns that were frequently noted by commenters. Responses to these issues can be found in the Responses to Frequently Submitted Public Comments beginning on page B733 of this appendix.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Health Effects</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
associated species such as nurse plants
- Increased, unmonitored use by humans in an area that had previously escaped heavy, often inappropriate use because of its greater isolation, resulting in a healthier ecosystem (especially compared to the eastern and central part of the Park) and sense of wilderness not experienced in any other City Preserve.

I urge ADOT to stop providing studies that do not accurately or thoroughly address the impact this freeway has on South Mountain. It’s time to stop the $20 million and more in wasted taxpayer’s money to study the environmental impact and design for an alignment that no longer makes sense.

Respectfully,
Robin Salthouse

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Comment Document</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Section 4(f) and Section 6(f)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Purpose and Need, Lack of Support</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1 MS. SALVO: Okay, my concern -- Well, my concern,
2 one of them, is noise readings. In Chapter 4 of the -- of the
3 DEIS, they're using data from September of '03 to July of '04.
4 So they're using very old data, okay, on the noise readings.
5 The fact that they are planning 30-foot sound walls
6 tells me that there's a noise issue. And who wants that sound
7 wall?
8 Another item, on groundwater. In Chapter 4, again,
9 the groundwater withdrawal figures are from 1995. And nothing
10 current.
11 Another item. On replacement water, in Chapter 4,
12 they're using a 1996 lake study, which is out of date and --
13 and incorrect for today's usage. And they have been made aware
14 of that and yet continue to use that study.
15 The next one, the -- They acknowledge, in
16 Chapter 4, that diesel particulate matter will increase with
17 the trucks. Also, Chapter 4, in hazardous materials, they're
18 using a 1986 study of what is being transported. There's no
19 plan to restrict hazardous materials; no plan to respond, on
20 202, to any hazardous-material accidents. And 202 and if they
21 run the South Mountain Freeway, there are no emergency services
22 or assistance for anybody planned along there. You know, if
23 you break down, you're out there.
24 Another item: If, when they -- When they go to cut
25 through South Mountain, they do not address what they may find

Extant noise measurements are used only as a rough check on modeled existing ambient noise levels. The noise model does rely, in part, on the difference between modeled existing ambient noise levels and modeled No-Action and with-project noise levels. The modeled existing ambient noise levels used in the latest noise modeling analyses were not those from 2004 or earlier, ambient or otherwise. The modeled noise levels in the most recent analyses (reported in this Final Environmental Impact Statement) were derived from traffic data generated in August 2013. These analyses updated for the Final Environmental Impact Statement used the most recent Federal Highway Administration and Arizona Department of Transportation policy and traffic projections provided by the Maricopa Association of Governments (August 2013). These updated analyses begin on page 4-88 of the Final Environmental Impact Statement. No substantial differences between the analyses presented in the Draft and the Final Environmental Impact Statements resulted.

Noise walls would range in height from 8 feet to 20 feet tall in the Ahwatukee Foothills area.

The 1995 data were used to provide historical context. Where relevant and available, the latest data available were used. For example, the groundwater data for dissolved solids (Draft Environmental Impact Statement page 4-97) are from 2009 U.S. Geological Survey reports. Often the latest U.S. Geological data are not what would appear to be current. What is important is what the Arizona Department of Transportation would do if its actions were to cause a groundwater impact. The operative language is on Draft Environmental Impact Statement page 4-98: “Affected wells that would need to be fully replaced … would … comply with Arizona Revised Statutes § 45-45(c).”

As with the other groundwater data (previous comment), again, the data were used to provide context. These data were the latest made available from the Foothills Community Association. The project team assumed that the productive capacity of the wells has not appreciably changed since publication of those data. As with the previous comment, the operative language is what is important (text box on Final Environmental Impact Statement page 4-108): “If the well were to be acquired, the water would be replaced …”

The Arizona Department of Transportation and Federal Highway Administration identified several issues and concerns that were frequently noted by commenters. Responses to these issues can be found in the Responses to Frequently Submitted Public Comments beginning on page B733 of this appendix.

The Arizona Department of Transportation and Federal Highway Administration identified several issues and concerns that were frequently noted by commenters. Responses to these issues can be found in the Responses to Frequently Submitted Public Comments beginning on page B733 of this appendix. The Draft Environmental Impact Statement makes no mention in Chapter 4 (or elsewhere) of what hazardous materials might currently be being transported, let alone any 1986 study or data.
there: if there are any mines, any shafts, any sinkholes, anything that might have happened even a hundred years ago when this was a mining area. That's not addressed at all.

And another item is the study area is very narrow, like it was a foregone conclusion that this is where they were going to do it. They didn't go far enough south to hit Highway 85 and the route that way around, that would have eliminated the whole issue of these communities around South Mountain. So they kept the -- the study area specific to where they wanted it, which I believe is against the law. They have to broaden it, so that it's much more -- much wider. And then they could have found possibly another route that they didn't want to deal with because this was easier.

It also -- They also have not adequately addressed CANAMEX, C-A-N-A-M-E-X, which is the freeway that is supposed to take the Mexican trucks through to Canada. They're going to be using this as a bypass. These trucks are not up to our standards for pollution or for safety. And we don't know anything about how they operate. So they didn't even address that. They didn't address it in the video. That's just smoke and mirrors, as far as I'm concerned.

And let me see. Hold on a second. Let me check my notes here. Most of the -- Most of this study is dealing with very old information, very old data, very old studies. There
1 is nothing current.
2 So, basically, they're not being honest with the
3 people and the impact this is going to have, because they don't
4 have current information. And that really bothers me.
5 The money they spent, the time they spent doing
6 this, the taxpayers deserve more.
7 I'm not against the freeway. I'm against the
8 freeway on Pecos Road. There are other alternatives if they
9 had just broadened their study area.
10 Thank you.

The Arizona Department of Transportation and Federal Highway Administration identified several issues and concerns that were frequently noted by commenters. Responses to these issues can be found in the Responses to Frequently Submitted Public Comments beginning on page B733 of this appendix.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Comment Document</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

From: Projects
To: ADOT
Subject: FW: Laveen 202 project
Date: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 10:46:29 AM

From: Sam and Debbie [mailto:sramsey21@cox.net]
Sent: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 10:32 AM
To: Projects
Subject: Laveen 202 project

I believe Route W59 is the best route for the 202 freeway.
three minutes are up. If you have more comments we encourage you to go next door and speak to a court reporter. Thank you.

MR. STONE: Thank you.

THE FACILITATOR: We would like to welcome our next speaker, Carol Sampson.
Welcome, Ms. Sampson. You have three minutes.

MS. SAMPSON: Thank you. Where’s the time -- Oh, wait a minute, I have to get my glasses.

THE FACILITATOR: We’ll restart the timer.

Thank you.

MS. SAMPSON: Thank you. I received a postcard in the mail nearly two weeks ago announcing that a public hearing on May 21st was to provide an opportunity for the public to provide comments on the draft -- on the environmental impact statement on the proposed South Mountain freeway. None of my neighbors received the same postcard when I talked to them. Why were some of the public left out of the mailing? I don’t know. They may not have been informed of this public hearing, but I have some comments to make.

I was one of the first home buyers 25 years ago in 1988 and moved into the Ahwatukee Foothills area. At that time I was informed from my builder that there could possibly be a future freeway put in within two years.
Before 1992, it would go around South Mountain, but they didn't know when in the future it would happen, where it would be constructed, how it would be laid out, or even who would pay for it. Since then multiple builders were allowed to build and build all during the 1990s without regard or restrictions to any future freeway plans.

The building department of Phoenix, the State of Arizona, and ADOT have never given guidelines to locate, designate, or place restricted land boundaries for a future freeway on any of these builders. Now the Ahwatukee Foothills has a population of around 70,000 people, including thousands of homes, numerous schools, parks, shopping, and more. The lowest average home value starts at about $250,000. The Arizona environmental impact study states that there are over 733 to 1,304 homes and 30 to 41 businesses along the proposed freeway route that has to be removed before construction even starts. These homes and businesses have to be paid for. These properties will probably be purchased at taxpayer expense, which is around $75 to $130 million.

One of the two things that has not ever been investigated and that is the possibility of mines in the South Mountain area. No environmental study has ever been done to prove or disprove or rule out the possibility of past mining in the South Mountain area.

Driver and Nix Court Reporters - (602) 266-6525
www.drivernix.com
1 affecting this proposed freeway.
2 Also, the second issue is that this is a unique
3 freeway in that it connects the north part of I-10 to the
4 south, which is a bypass or a wraparound that makes all
5 interstate traffic and truckers going through the
6 Ahwatukee area and having congestion at the end of the
7 road, where there is already major congestion from the
8 202 freeway, and there's miles and miles of stop-and-go
9 traffic on the way to Maricopa, on the way to Sun City,
10 and to the casino at that location.
11 I have a much longer statement that I would like
12 to put into the information that's being collected today.
13 I greatly oppose this freeway.

THE FACILITATOR: Thank you, Ms. Sampson.
MS. SAMPSON: Thank you.
Did I pronounce your name right?
MS. ABEGG: Yes, you did.
THE FACILITATOR: Ms. Abegg, you have three
minutes, there's a timer right down here. Begin, please.
MS. ABEGG: I just wanted to say that I'm in
support of building the 202 freeway. I live in Laveen, I
have been there for about six or seven years, I think
that this would benefit our community in bringing more of
the amenities and things that our community is lacking

The Arizona Department of Transportation and Federal Highway Administration
identified several issues and concerns that were frequently noted by commenters.
Responses to these issues can be found in the Responses to Frequently Submitted
Public Comments beginning on page B733 of this appendix.
Carol Sampson  
Mountain Park Ranch  
2441 E. Granite View Drive  
Phoenix, Az. 85048  

ADOT Loop 202 S  
Mountain Freeway Study  
1655 W. Jackson Street  
MD 126F  
Phoenix, Az. 85007  

Date: June 7, 2013

Dear ADOT Planners,

I received a postcard in the mail several weeks ago announcing a public hearing on May 21, 2013 to provide an opportunity for the public to provide comments on the Draft on the Environmental Impact Study on the proposed South Mountain Freeway. None of my neighbors received the same postcard when I talked to them. Why were some of the public left out of the mailing? They may not have been informed of this Public Hearing but I have comments to make.

I was one of the first home buyers, 25 years ago in 1988, who moved into the Ahwatukee/Foothills area. At that time I was informed, from my builder, that there could possibly be a future freeway put in within two years before 1992. It would go around South Mountain but they didn’t know when in the future it would happen, where it would be constructed, how it would be laid out or even who would pay for it.

Since then, multiple builders were allowed to build and build all during the 1990’s without regard or restrictions to any future freeway plans. The city building department of Phoenix, the state of Arizona and ADOT has never given guidelines to locate, designate or place restricted boundaries for a future freeway on any of these builders.

Now the Ahwatukee/Foothills has a population well over 87,000 people and includes thousands of homes, numerous schools, parks, shopping centers, recreation facilities, a Post Office and several churches all forming a prestigious cul-de-sac community. The lowest average home value starts at about $250,000.

The Arizona ADOT/Governmental Draft of the Environmental Impact Study states that a total of between 733 to 1304 homes and 30 to 41 businesses along the proposed freeway route will have to be removed.

1

2

3
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Acquisitions and Relocation</td>
<td>The commenter appears to suggest that estimated costs for acquisition of right-of-way would be $260 million. The project team's estimated right-of-way costs (2013 dollars) are $650 million ($425 million for the W59 Alternative and $225 million for the E1 Alternative). Please see Draft Environmental Impact Statement Figures 3-36 and 3-41 on pages 3-59 and 3-67, respectively.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Geology</td>
<td>A search of the Arizona Mineral Industry Location System database, examination of aerial photographs and topographic maps, and field investigation were completed to identify mineral resources and mines in the Study Area. These efforts identified one gold mining claim, six unknown mining claims, and several mining features in the vicinity of the South Mountains. None of these mining claims or features are located within the proposed freeway alignment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Purpose and Need, Truck Bypass</td>
<td>The Arizona Department of Transportation and Federal Highway Administration identified several issues and concerns that were frequently noted by commenters. Responses to these issues can be found in the Responses to Frequently Submitted Public Comments beginning on page B733 of this appendix.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Before construction even starts, the removal of these homes and businesses has to be paid for first. These properties will have to be purchased at tax payer expense which is much higher that land costs were 25 years ago. Purchases of these homes and businesses all along the proposed freeway route will balloon the tax payer costs to 2.6 hundred million dollars!! The costs to just purchase the land required is enormous and outrageous.

There are two serious undisclosed adverse effects and information lacking in the Draft of the Environmental Impact Study that has not been included or addressed at all. The agency is required to make clear that such incomplete and unavailable information is lacking in their report and it does not.

1. The first issue deals with the amount of mining activity that went on in the South Mountain area. As elsewhere, Arizona is a huge mining state and there are years of discussions and speculations as the amount of mining activity that went on in the South Mountain area. There has not been any research or investigation into the possible mining activity in and around South Mountain.

   NO ENVIRONMENTAL STUDY HAS EVER BEEN DONE TO PROVE, OR DISPROVE, OR RULE OUT THE POSSIBILITY OF PAST MINING IN THE SOUTH MOUNTAIN AREA AFFECTING THIS PROPOSED FREEWAY.

   Are there old mines and mine openings in this area dug by individuals and/or mining companies during the "Turn of the Century" rush to find gold and other minerals? Are there underground tunnels, mine shafts and openings in the pathway of this freeway? If so, where are these undisclosed mine shafts, where are the unknown underground tunnels and other openings effecting the building of this freeway?

   Are we tax payers going to be responsible for millions of unknown costs to locate, fill and seal off these un-identified mines, tunnels and mine shafts?

   Could there be sink holes and other liabilities due to a possible unstable underground? Are these costs going to be another hidden expense to building this freeway? These questions were not even dealt with in the Draft of the Environmental Impact Study.

2. The second issue NOT addressed by the Draft of the Environmental Impact Study deals with the I-10 Interstate traffic.

   The Draft of the Environmental Impact Study stated that, "the South Mountain 202 freeway would be similar or the same as the other freeways in the valley such as the 101, 143, 202, 303 and the 60 freeways. The other...
The Arizona Department of Transportation and Federal Highway Administration identified several issues and concerns that were frequently noted by commenters. Responses to these issues can be found in the Responses to Frequently Submitted Public Comments beginning on page B733 of this appendix.

As discussed in the Noise Analysis Technical Report prepared for the Final Environmental Impact Statement, the proposed South Mountain Freeway was modeled in the latest version of the Traffic Noise Model (version 2.5). This is a three-dimensional model that factors in elements of the proposed freeway using x, y, and z coordinates. The model did account for the elevations of the freeway, nearby homes, which may be elevated above the roadway, and any recommended barriers between the homes and freeway. This is the same procedure and same model used for other freeway projects in the Valley and across the country.

According to the Arizona Department of Transportation, Air Quality Assessment South Mountain Freeway 202L Draft Report, review of wind data from the Gila River Indian Community monitoring site at St. Johns suggests that during the morning hours and associated with mountain-drainage air flows and stable atmospheric conditions, wind flows are from the southeast and follow the Gila River channel to the north. Locations to the east of St. Johns tend to flow from the east to the lower elevations along the Gila River. During the warmer hours’ improved mixing, flows typically follow the river channel and come from the north and northwest. Likewise, during a 1-month-long meteorological monitoring period (November 20, 2006, through December 21, 2006) at Pecos Road and 40th Street and a second 1-month-long monitoring period at Pecos Road and 24th and 40th streets (April 19, 2007, through May 21, 2007), winds during the morning hours typically were from the northeast. During the warmer hours, and with improved mixing, winds typically were from the west.

A review of the literature reveals few detailed and comprehensive analyses of the relationship between the transportation infrastructure and residential property values (Transportation Research Record: Journal of the Transportation Research Board, No. 2174, Transportation Research Board of the National Academies, Washington, D.C., 2010, pp. 138 -47; “Impact of Highways on Property Values: Case Study of the Superstition Freeway Corridor”). A recent study by the California Department of Transportation concluded that freeway facilities did not substantially affect sales prices in residential areas adjacent to the facility. The study concluded that it is the visibility of the freeway that may influence selling price and not distance or noise. As a result, the researchers generally concluded that the more the visibility of a new freeway is reduced, the less it would determine the sales price of homes sold in the area.
### Purpose and Need

Although the region’s freeways are now congested during the peak travel period, conditions in 2035 without the proposed freeway would be substantially worse with more congested areas and congested conditions for longer periods of time (see Final Environmental Impact Statement pages 1-21 and 1-22).Congestion relief resulting from the proposed freeway would provide localized reductions of delays on arterial streets and at interchanges. Reduced travel times would result in lower exposure to elevated concentrations of mobile source air toxics occurring in traffic. Other benefits of the proposed freeway in comparison to the No-Action Alternative are presented in Table 3-9 on page 3-38 of the Final Environmental Impact Statement.

### Purpose and Need, Old Plan or Use of Old Data

The Arizona Department of Transportation and Federal Highway Administration identified several issues and concerns that were frequently noted by commenters. Responses to these issues can be found in the Responses to Frequently Submitted Public Comments beginning on page B733 of this appendix.

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Purpose and Need</td>
<td>Although the region’s freeways are now congested during the peak travel period, conditions in 2035 without the proposed freeway would be substantially worse with more congested areas and congested conditions for longer periods of time (see Final Environmental Impact Statement pages 1-21 and 1-22). Congestion relief resulting from the proposed freeway would provide localized reductions of delays on arterial streets and at interchanges. Reduced travel times would result in lower exposure to elevated concentrations of mobile source air toxics occurring in traffic. Other benefits of the proposed freeway in comparison to the No-Action Alternative are presented in Table 3-9 on page 3-38 of the Final Environmental Impact Statement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Purpose and Need, Old Plan or Use of Old Data</td>
<td>The Arizona Department of Transportation and Federal Highway Administration identified several issues and concerns that were frequently noted by commenters. Responses to these issues can be found in the Responses to Frequently Submitted Public Comments beginning on page B733 of this appendix.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

Congestion today at the I-10 interstate and the 202 connection next to the Wild Horse Casino and new Outlet Discount stores is "stop and go" and gets worse for miles, in both directions and especially for those going to Chandler, Maricopa and Sun Lakes. Local traffic would be worse, especially during rush hours and holidays and could be the length or more of Pecos Road. Adding more International and Interstate I-10 traffic using the proposed South Mountain 202 freeway short cut or by-pass would trap even higher amounts of traffic, fumes and noise in the surrounding communities.

In conclusion, as a member of PARC, I find this proposed South Mountain 202 freeway extremely costly for tax payers and environmentally unsafe, and it is environmentally unjust to one area of the population, the residences of the Ahwatukee/Foothills. The Draft of the Environmental Impact Study is lacking, not legally complete and has not done a thorough job of answering many major questions. The proposed South Mountain 202 freeway has not been properly planned for over the last 25 years and there may be a certain amount of negligence and liability on the part of the City of Phoenix, the State of Arizona and ADO:

Sincerely,

Carol Sampson
**TELEPHONE CONVERSATION RECORD**
**SOUTH MOUNTAIN FREEWAY INFORMATION LINE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5/15/13</td>
<td>9:50 AM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CALLER:** MICHELLE SAMSON  
**CALLER ADDRESS:** 8324 W. HAMMOND LANE, TOLLESON AZ 85353  
**PHONE:** 623-478-8785  
**EMAIL:**

**CALLER REMARKS/QUESTIONS:**  
I do support the proposed South Mountain Freeway thank you.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Comment noted.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Comment Response Appendix**

**TELEPHONE CONVERSATION RECORD**

**SOUTH MOUNTAIN FREEWAY INFORMATION LINE**

- **DATE:** 5/31/13
- **TIME:** 12:22 AM
- **CALLER:** JASMINE SANCHEZ
- **CALLER ADDRESS:** 5914 W. ODEUM LANE, PHOENIX, AZ 85043
- **PHONE:** 602-403-0533

**CALLER REMARKS/QUESTIONS:**

I am leaving a message regarding the ADOT Loop 202 South. The reason I’m calling to give my input on the possible areas for the Loop 202. For the W-59 that would be very close to our home and that would create great hardship for us because both of our daughters go to the Riverside School District and it would be very difficult for us to then have to travel alternate routes to drop them off at school. According to this map it appears that the freeway would be going right by our home so we would not be able to take 59th Avenue north to drop them off at school, which is on S107 in between Buckeye and Lower Buckeye Road. So this will create great hardship for our family, as well as my husband works on 59th Avenue so he would have to go southbound rather than being able to take 59th straight northbound as he does every day. So it would be very difficult to take our children to school and it would cause us great hardship because of our work schedules and because the time it would take us to take alternate routes to drop them off because we would no longer be able to leave directly from our home, take 59th northbound to Lower Buckeye and drop the girls off at school. This would create great hardship. Please call me if you have any questions. Would you please consider another route for the Loop 202. Thanks very much for your time.

**1 Alternatives, W59 Alternative Versus W101 Alternative**

The Arizona Department of Transportation and Federal Highway Administration identified several issues and concerns that were frequently noted by commenters. Responses to these issues can be found in the Responses to Frequently Submitted Public Comments beginning on page B733 of this appendix.

**2 Design**

The proposed freeway would be located west of 59th Avenue and would not affect access to 59th Avenue south of Lower Buckeye Road (or to or from the commenter’s neighborhood). Aerial maps showing the proposed freeway (W59 and E1 Alternatives) are accessible through the project Web site, <azdot.gov/southmountainfreeway>.

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Alternatives, W59 Alternative Versus W101 Alternative</td>
<td>The Arizona Department of Transportation and Federal Highway Administration identified several issues and concerns that were frequently noted by commenters. Responses to these issues can be found in the Responses to Frequently Submitted Public Comments beginning on page B733 of this appendix.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Design</td>
<td>The proposed freeway would be located west of 59th Avenue and would not affect access to 59th Avenue south of Lower Buckeye Road (or to or from the commenter’s neighborhood). Aerial maps showing the proposed freeway (W59 and E1 Alternatives) are accessible through the project Web site, &lt;azdot.gov/southmountainfreeway&gt;.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As a resident of Ahwatukee since 1979, a member of PARC, and as a parent and grandparent, I would like to go on record as being adamantly opposed to the Loop 202 extension.

The proposed extension along the Pecos alignment will not alleviate the congestion on the I-10 into the downtown area, and will only serve as a truck bypass as part of the CANMEX route. If that occurs additional pollution from unregulated trucks and vehicles will increase the risk to health of those living nearby. This includes students attending nearby schools, families in homes, and senior citizen communities. In addition, the South Mountain and Estrella mountain ranges form a natural barrier to the north and west of the proposed route which will keep the pollution from dissipating and further endangering residents living nearby.

Aside from damaging sensitive cultural and ecological areas of Phoenix's crowning jewel, South Mountain Park, the decision to move forward based on what appears to be an incomplete EIS is troubling. If traffic is such an issue why aren't planners looking to finding more sustainable mass transit solutions, or alternative routes for traffic? The I-8 to SR 85 route for this proposed bypass is a much more cost effective solution, less invasive solution.

I strongly urge you to remove the Pecos Road alignment from consideration.

Thank you,

Irma Sandercock

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Comment Document</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Purpose and Need, Lack of Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Purpose and Need</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Purpose and Need, Truck Bypass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Trucks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Air Quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Health Effects</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Arizona Department of Transportation and Federal Highway Administration identified several issues and concerns that were frequently noted by commenters. Responses to these issues can be found in the Responses to Frequently Submitted Public Comments beginning on page B733 of this appendix.

In 2035, the average daily traffic on the proposed freeway is projected to range from 117,000 to 190,000 vehicles per day (see Final Environmental Impact Statement page 3-62). The estimated volume depends on location. The purpose and need for the South Mountain Freeway are not solely to relieve congestion on Interstate 10 (Maricopa Freeway). Facilitating mobility in the Maricopa Association of Governments region does not mean just relieving congestion on the Broadway Curve (see Final Environmental Impact Statement page 1-21). Among other criteria, the proposed freeway is to permit the entire Regional Freeway and Highway System to function as designed. Optimal function of that design includes completing all the segments of the State Route 202L system (see Final Environmental Impact Statement pages 3-35 and 3-37). With implementation of the South Mountain Freeway, many motorists would be able to get from Point A to Point B, a route that never included needing to use Interstate 10.

According to the project team's traffic analysis, without the proposed freeway, existing roads and planned road improvements would accommodate about 76 percent of the transportation demand projected for 2035, leaving 24 percent of the anticipated demand unmet. If one assumes better-than-expected performance of nonfreeway aspects of the transportation system, 13 additional percentage points of the 24 percent deficiency would be accommodated. This means that the transportation network would still have an 11 percent capacity deficiency. The same analysis with the proposed freeway in operation in 2035 concluded that the met demand would increase to 82 percent; better-than-planned scenarios noted above, if achieved, would reduce network deficiency to 5 percent. The proposed freeway would handle about half of the capacity deficiency not captured by other modes. (See Figure 3-14 on Final Environmental Impact Statement page 3-31).

The Arizona Department of Transportation and Federal Highway Administration identified several issues and concerns that were frequently noted by commenters. Responses to these issues can be found in the Responses to Frequently Submitted Public Comments beginning on page B733 of this appendix.

(Responses continue on next page)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Air Quality</td>
<td>According to the Arizona Department of Transportation, 2013, <em>Air Quality Assessment South Mountain Freeway 202L Draft Report</em>, review of wind data from the Gila River Indian Community monitoring site at St. Johns suggests that during the morning hours and associated with mountain-drainage air flows and stable atmospheric conditions, wind flows are from the southeast and follow the Gila River channel to the north. Locations to the east of St. Johns tend to flow from the east to the lower elevations along the Gila River. During the warmer hours’ improved mixing, flows typically follow the river channel and come from the north and northwest. Likewise, during a 1-month-long meteorological monitoring period (November 20, 2006, through December 21, 2006) at Pecos Road and 40th Street and a second 1-month-long monitoring period at Pecos Road and 24th and 40th streets (April 19, 2007, through May 21, 2007), winds during the morning hours typically were from the northeast. During the warmer hours, and with improved mixing, winds typically were from the west.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Cultural Resources</td>
<td>The Arizona Department of Transportation and Federal Highway Administration identified several issues and concerns that were frequently noted by commenters. Responses to these issues can be found in the Responses to Frequently Submitted Public Comments beginning on page B733 of this appendix.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Section 4(f) and Section 6(f)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Biology, Plants, and Wildlife</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Purpose and Need, Old Plan or Use of Old Data</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Alternatives</td>
<td>The study considered an alternative that would run along Interstate 8 in Casa Grande to State Route 85 from Gila Bend to Interstate 10 (see text on page 3-9 of the Final Environmental Impact Statement). State Route 85 is currently being reconstructed as a four-lane, divided highway with limited-access control, and Interstate 8 is a four-lane, divided Interstate freeway with full access control. Existing signs at each terminus designate the route as a truck bypass of the metropolitan Phoenix area. This route would continue to be available for interstate and interregional travel, but it would not meet the proposed action purpose and need as part of a regional transportation network and, therefore, was eliminated from further consideration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Alternatives, E1 Alternative</td>
<td>The Arizona Department of Transportation and Federal Highway Administration identified several issues and concerns that were frequently noted by commenters. Responses to these issues can be found in the Responses to Frequently Submitted Public Comments beginning on page B733 of this appendix.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
From: Sierra Club on behalf of John Sanders
To: Projects
Subject: Opposition to the South Mountain Freeway
Date: Thursday, June 06, 2013 3:48:27 PM

Jun 6, 2013
Arizona Department of Transportation South Mountain Study Team
1655 W Jackson St, MD 126F
Phoenix, AZ 85007

Dear South Mountain Study Team,

I am writing to express my opposition to the proposed South Mountain Freeway and to urge ADOT to select the No-Build Alternative.

Hello,

I’m writing to express my opposition to the proposed South Mountain Freeway. Building additional roads does not solve the obvious problem here – far too much reliance on automobiles. They needlessly burn fossil fuels, polluting the environment and increasing health hazards. They also continue to foster the USA’s reliance on fossil fuels, which is certainly not beneficial. 

Ozone levels would only increase in the long run, because additional freeways encourage urban sprawl, thereby increasing reliance on the automobile. The only way to reduce the Valley’s poor air quality is to have fewer automobiles and vehicles, not encouraging their proliferation. With a fraction of the funding earmarked for the freeway, real mass transit options could be offered, thereby decreasing overall pollutants.

Additionally, the freeway would also negatively affect our environment. South Mountain Park is the largest city park in our nation and a symbol of pride for Valley residents. What message does it send to future generations that we were willing to devastate this Park for something as ridiculous as another freeway? We should listen carefully to our neighbors to the south, the Gila Indian reservations and respect the land, not demolish it. They view this land as holy and we should carefully consider why. After doing so, why should be more respectful of it and revere it, not look to ruin it.

I understand this freeway was originally part of the Valley’s transportation plan decades ago. In the meantime, we have progressed in many ways as a society. Let’s keep that trend going by not just blindly following a poor plan that existed 25 plus years ago. Please help protect our communities, our health, and our environment by selecting the No Action Alternative. Thank you.

Sincerely,

Mr. John Sanders
16602 S Magenta Rd
Phoenix, AZ 85048-2073
(602) 309-1512

The Arizona Department of Transportation and Federal Highway Administration identified several issues and concerns that were frequently noted by commenters. Responses to these issues can be found in the Responses to Frequently Submitted Public Comments beginning on page B733 of this appendix.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Comment Document</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>From: Projects</td>
<td>To: ADOT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject: FW: No Build for South Mountain 202</td>
<td>Date: Tuesday, July 23, 2013 8:49:47 AM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thank you,
Salina Tovar
Community Relations Officer
1655 W. Jackson St.
MD 1206, Room 170
Phoenix, AZ 85007
602.712.4629
azdot.gov

From: Linda Sanders [mailto:sardermt@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, July 23, 2013 6:26 AM
To: Projects
Subject: No Build for South Mountain 202

To Whom it May Concern:

I do not support the building of the South Mountain Portion of the 202.

- If it is built this segment will become a part of the Canada to Mexico trucking system. A more economical and efficient solution would be to convert Hwy 85 as a viable connection between I-8 to I-10.

- Building the segment will contribute to urban sprawl. With Phoenix being a relatively young city, it has the opportunity to look at previous cities and communities and the reality that building out freeways simply results in these systems being filled and more freeway building being required.

- Building this segment will decrease the air quality and

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Purpose and Need, Truck Bypass</td>
<td>The Arizona Department of Transportation and Federal Highway Administration identified several issues and concerns that were frequently noted by commenters. Responses to these issues can be found in the Responses to Frequently Submitted Public Comments beginning on page B733 of this appendix.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Trucks</td>
<td>The study considered an alternative that would run along Interstate 8 in Casa Grande to State Route 85 from Gila Bend to Interstate 10 (see text on page 3-9 of the Final Environmental Impact Statement). State Route 85 is currently being reconstructed as a four-lane, divided highway with limited-access control, and Interstate 8 is a four-lane, divided Interstate freeway with full access control. Existing signs at each terminus designate the route as a truck bypass of the metropolitan Phoenix area. This route would continue to be available for interstate and interregional travel, but it would not meet the proposed action purpose and need as part of a regional transportation network and, therefore, was eliminated from further consideration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Alternatives</td>
<td>Unplanned growth is often termed &quot;urban sprawl.&quot; Generally, this term is used in the context of rapid and uncontrolled urban growth onto previously undeveloped land—usually on the outskirts of an existing urban area. Projects like the proposed freeway are often identified as contributors to urban sprawl. Freeway projects are often cited as making land at the urban fringe more accessible and, therefore, more attractive for development. However, examination of data comparing population and land use between 1975 and 2000 suggests major transportation projects like the proposed freeway do not induce growth in the region (see Final Environmental Impact Statement pages 4-170 through 4-174). The proposed freeway would be implemented in a historically quickly urbanizing area (most noticeably in the Western Section of the Study Area, although the nationwide recession which began in 2007 slowed growth). In the Eastern Section of the Study Area, the proposed freeway would abut public parkland, Native American land, and a near-fully developed area—therefore, any contribution to accelerated or induced growth would be constrained. The proposed freeway would be built in an area planned for urban growth as established in local jurisdictions’ land use plans for at least the last 25 years.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Neighborhoods/Communities</td>
<td>The Arizona Department of Transportation and Federal Highway Administration identified several issues and concerns that were frequently noted by commenters. Responses to these issues can be found in the Responses to Frequently Submitted Public Comments beginning on page B733 of this appendix.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Air Quality</td>
<td>The Arizona Department of Transportation and Federal Highway Administration identified several issues and concerns that were frequently noted by commenters. Responses to these issues can be found in the Responses to Frequently Submitted Public Comments beginning on page B733 of this appendix.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
quality of life for the Ahwautukee neighborhoods and the visitors to the South Mountain Hiking system, a truly remarkable urban park.

I encourage the Arizona Department of Transportation to think beyond the car/freeway option for a solutions to the transportation needs of the Phoenix metro area. I support a "no-build" decision for the South Mountain 202 segment.

Sincerely,
Linda Sanders
15405 S. 18th Ave.
Phoenix, AZ 85045
sardermt@gmail.com

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.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Comment Document</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Comment noted.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TELEPHONE CONVERSATION RECORD
SOUTH MOUNTAIN FREEWAY INFORMATION LINE

INCOMING CALL
DATE: 6/10/13
TIME: 12:07 PM

CALLER: JACK SANDHAGEN
PHONE: 602-531-1335

EMAIL:    

CALLER REMARKS/QUESTIONS:
Yes, I support the South Mountain Freeway.
CALLER REMARKS/QUESTIONS:
I approve the South Mountain freeway.

Comment noted.
To whom it may concern:

Please see the attached Word document regarding my thoughts and opinion regarding the South Mountain Freeway, Loop 202.

Sincerely,
Gary Sanuk
Ahwatukee/Phoenix resident
In the best-case scenario, a parkway would carry approximately 105,000 vehicles per day, well below the average daily traffic on the proposed freeway, which would range from 117,000 to 190,000 vehicles per day (see Final Environmental Impact Statement page 3-19). As a result, the Arizona Parkway would lack sufficient capacity to meet projected travel demand. The Arizona Parkway would not adequately address the projected transportation system capacity deficiency, would not remove a sufficient amount of traffic from arterial streets, and, therefore, would not meet the project’s purpose and need. For these reasons, the Arizona Parkway was eliminated from further consideration.

The Arizona Department of Transportation and Federal Highway Administration identified several issues and concerns that were frequently noted by commenters. Responses to these issues can be found in the Responses to Frequently Submitted Public Comments beginning on page B733 of this appendix. The proposed freeway would only have eight lanes (see page 3-58 of the Final Environmental Impact Statement).

The Maricopa Association of Governments regional travel demand model forecasts approximately 10 percent truck traffic on the South Mountain Freeway in 2035 (see Final Environmental Impact Statement page 3-64). This percentage is similar to current conditions on Interstate 10 between Loop 101 and Interstate 17 and on U.S. Route 60. Air quality and noise modeling for the Draft and Final Environmental Impact Statements used this forecast truck traffic (see Final Environmental Impact Statement pages 4-68 and 4-100, respectively). Noise mitigation is designed for this predicted noise level, including the noise from trucks.

I live near the intersection of 16th Street and Chandler Blvd. and I can hear the noise coming from Firebird Lake, soon to have a name change and expanded venues. I cannot imagine the noise that would come from a 10 lane freeway with big rig trucks running 24/7, all going 65-70 miles per hour. We in Ahwatukee sure don’t want part of the CANAMEX highway running through our backyards.

In my opinion, Pecos Road should be at most built out as a six (6) lane parkway, three (3) lanes each way running in each direction to the west side. There should be a provision that big rig semis cannot use this parkway, the big trucks need to stay on the interstate.

A parkway would be a better option as it opens up for cars and light trucks to travel from the East side of Phoenix to the West side using a shorter route saving time and mileage. This option would target the workforce that commutes from the East Valley to the West side. We don’t want a shortcut for the long haul truckers to run through our backyards for the sake of saving a few miles. It’s the same reason the Indians don’t want those big rigs motoring across their land. Although they know in the long run they would benefit from the exposure to their casino and shopping mall. The Indians are greedy. They know the road is in their favor no matter where they put it. The Indians are dependent on the Federal Government for support and they know it is in their best interest. They also know that no matter what the outcome, they come out on top. Too bad, they are all part of the Governments free program’s and they still won’t cooperate for the good of all.

While the E1 Alternative is adjacent to the largely residential areas of Ahwatukee Foothills Village (to the north), a freeway has been planned in this location for many years (see Final Environmental Impact Statement pages 4-17 and 4-21). Where existing residential uses are adjacent to the proposed freeway, noise mitigation would be implemented according to Arizona Department of Transportation policy (see Final Environmental Impact Statement page 4-91).

Responses to these issues can be found in the Responses to Frequently Submitted Public Comments beginning on page B733 of this appendix.

The proposed freeway would only have eight lanes (see page 3-58 of the Final Environmental Impact Statement).
The best option for big rig trucks is to make Route AZ 85 through Gila Bend to US Route 8 easier to use. That would divert hundreds of cars and trucks heading to or from Texas and California on Interstate 10 who only use our congested highways as a means to get from here to there. Everybody wins. Gila Bend wins. It would be a great place to live, similar to Casa Grande. Their economy would grow. They would be back on the map. They are close to Phoenix, San Diego, Mexico and all the other highways you would want to take to get places; Las Vegas, Nevada; Los Angeles, California and all up and down the West Coast.

These are my thoughts and my opinion.

Sincerely,
Gary Sanuik
Email: gsanuik@aol.com

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Comment Document</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 11   | The best option for big rig trucks is to make Route AZ 85 through Gila Bend to US Route 8 easier to use. That would divert hundreds of cars and trucks heading to or from Texas and California on Interstate 10 who only use our congested highways as a means to get from here to there. Everybody wins. Gila Bend wins. It would be a great place to live, similar to Casa Grande. Their economy would grow. They would be back on the map. They are close to Phoenix, San Diego, Mexico and all the other highways you would want to take to get places; Las Vegas, Nevada; Los Angeles, California and all up and down the West Coast.
These are my thoughts and my opinion.
Sincerely,
Gary Sanuik
Email: gsanuik@aol.com |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Neighborhoods/Communities</td>
<td>Prospective home buyers and members of the church built after the freeway was conceived, according to State law, should have been informed of the proposed facility. (Sellers are obligated by Arizona common law to disclose all known material facts about a property to the buyer.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Section 4(f) and Section 6(f)</td>
<td>The Arizona Department of Transportation and Federal Highway Administration identified several issues and concerns that were frequently noted by commenters. Responses to these issues can be found in the Responses to Frequently Submitted Public Comments beginning on page B733 of this appendix.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Alternatives</td>
<td>The study considered an alternative that would run along Interstate 8 in Casa Grande to State Route 85 from Gila Bend to Interstate 10 (see text on page 3-9 of the Final Environmental Impact Statement). State Route 85 is currently being reconstructed as a four-lane, divided highway with limited-access control, and Interstate 8 is a four-lane, divided Interstate freeway with full access control. Existing signs at each terminus designate the route as a truck bypass of the metropolitan Phoenix area. This route would continue to be available for interstate and interregional travel, but it would not meet the proposed action purpose and need as part of a regional transportation network and, therefore, was eliminated from further consideration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Comment Document</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Nandini Sarkar  
Not a good idea. Tukeee is a peaceful neighbourhood with great schools. People have worked hard to build this community. We do not a highway here. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Neighborhoods/Communities</td>
<td>While the E1 Alternative is adjacent to the largely residential areas of Ahwatukee Foothills Village (to the north), a freeway has been planned in this location for many years (see Final Environmental Impact Statement pages 4-17 and 4-21). Where existing residential uses are adjacent to the proposed freeway, noise mitigation would be implemented according to Arizona Department of Transportation policy (see Final Environmental Impact Statement page 4-91).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
May 28, 2013

Arizona Department of Transportation South Mountain Study Team
1655 W Jackson St, MD 126F
Phoenix, AZ 85007

Dear South Mountain Study Team,

I am writing to express my opposition to the proposed South Mountain Freeway and to urge ADOT to select the No-Build Alternative.

Please do invest in good public transport and keep thus keep the air cleaner and prevent more deterioration of the landscape and the environment. The proposed freeway would cause more problems than it would solve. In addition, it would only provide short-term congestion relief. As is evident by our numerous clogged roads and freeways, many of which have recently been built or widened, building more roads is not the answer. ADOT needs to instead focus on planning for and investing in long-term transportation solutions, including mass transit. The only way to effectively reduce congestion and mobilize people is by reducing the number of vehicles utilizing our roads, not by encouraging more to use them.

South Mountain Freeway would have incredible negative impacts on our communities. Despite what the DEIS claims, air quality in the region would worsen over time, increasing public health risks. As more vehicles fill the "uncongested" areas this freeway would temporarily provide, more pollution will be spewed into the air, exacerbating asthma, cancer, and other diseases.

The freeway would also negatively effect our environment. South Mountain Park is the largest city park in our nation. It was set aside to protect resources and to benefit our communities. By blasting a freeway through a portion of this park, wildlife and habitat will be destroyed, movement corridors will be cut off, valuable public spaces will be lost, and more. This would set a terrible precedent by demolishing what should remain a protected area.

The freeway will also exacerbate urban sprawl and further burden Arizona’s taxpayers. Its construction would continue ADOT’s trend of forcing residents to remain vehicle-dependent while paying for infrastructure so that others can live farther and farther from a city center.

Please help protect our communities, our health, and our environment by selecting the No Action Alternative. Thank you.

Sincerely,
Ms. Annmarie Sauer
Tennessee ave
Chandler, AZ 85241

Responses to Frequently Submitted Public Comments beginning on page B733 of this appendix.

1 Alternatives, No-Action (No-Build) Alternative
The Arizona Department of Transportation and Federal Highway Administration identified several issues and concerns that were frequently noted by commenters. Responses to these issues can be found in the Responses to Frequently Submitted Public Comments beginning on page B733 of this appendix.

2 Alternatives
Federal regulations stipulate that an environmental impact statement shall "rigorously explore and objectively evaluate all reasonable alternatives" (40 Code of Federal Regulations § 1502.14; see Final Environmental Impact Statement page 3-1). All alternatives were screened using a multidisciplinary set of criteria. Nonfreeway alternatives were considered (see Final Environmental Impact Statement pages 3-3 through 3-6). Among other things, the study took into account improving existing freeways, improving or expanding other travel modes, strategies to reduce travel demand, and various roadway configurations. This study examined not only the potential impacts from improvements, but also the consequences of building nothing, the No-Action Alternative. As proposed by the Maricopa Association of Governments, the South Mountain Freeway would be part of the Regional Freeway and Highway System. Other transportation improvements such as mass transit and local roads are specified in the Regional Transportation Plan and were considered during the evaluation of this proposed new freeway. As noted in the Final Environmental Impact Statement (see page 3-68), the proposed freeway would provide opportunities to enhance operation of future mass transit improvements.

3 Air Quality
The Arizona Department of Transportation and Federal Highway Administration identified several issues and concerns that were frequently noted by commenters. Responses to these issues can be found in the Responses to Frequently Submitted Public Comments beginning on page B733 of this appendix.

4 Purpose and Need
Although the region’s freeways are now congested during the peak travel period, conditions in 2035 without the proposed freeway would be substantially worse with more congested areas and congested conditions for longer periods of time (see Final Environmental Impact Statement pages 1-21 and 1-22). Congestion relief resulting from the proposed freeway would provide localized reductions of delays on arterial streets and at interchanges. Reduced travel times would result in lower exposure to elevated concentrations of mobile source air toxics occurring in traffic. Other benefits of the proposed freeway in comparison to the No-Action Alternative are presented in Table 3-9 on page 3-38 of the Final Environmental Impact Statement.

5 Health Effects
The Arizona Department of Transportation and Federal Highway Administration identified several issues and concerns that were frequently noted by commenters. Responses to these issues can be found in the Responses to Frequently Submitted Public Comments beginning on page B733 of this appendix.

6 Section 4(f) and Section 6(f)

7 Biology, Plants, and Wildlife

(Responses continue on next page)
Unplanned growth is often termed "urban sprawl." Generally, this term is used in the context of rapid and uncontrolled urban growth onto previously undeveloped land—usually on the outskirts of an existing urban area. Projects like the proposed freeway are often identified as contributors to urban sprawl. Freeway projects are often cited as making land at the urban fringe more accessible and, therefore, more attractive for development. However, examination of data comparing population and land use between 1975 and 2000 suggests major transportation projects like the proposed freeway do not induce growth in the region (see Final Environmental Impact Statement pages 4-170 through 4-174). The proposed action would be implemented in a historically quickly urbanizing area (most noticeably in the Western Section of the Study Area, although the nationwide recession which began in 2007 slowed growth). In the Eastern Section of the Study Area, the proposed freeway would abut public parkland, Native American land, and a near-fully developed area—therefore, any contribution to accelerated or induced growth would be constrained. The proposed freeway would be built in an area planned for urban growth as established in local jurisdictions’ land use plans for at least the last 25 years.
**TELEPHONE CONVERSATION RECORD**
**SOUTH MOUNTAIN FREEWAY INFORMATION LINE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>TIME</th>
<th>CALLER</th>
<th>CALLER ADDRESS</th>
<th>PHONE</th>
<th>EMAIL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5/18/13</td>
<td>3:42 PM</td>
<td>LINDA SCHEPP</td>
<td>1049 E. MCLELLAN BOULEVARD, PHOENIX AZ 85014</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CALLER REMARKS/QUESTIONS:**
Hello. I am in favor of the freeway and thank you for allowing me to add my name. Thank you.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Comment noted.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Comment Document

TELEPHONE CONVERSATION RECORD
SOUTH MOUNTAIN FREEWAY INFORMATION LINE

INCOMING CALL
DATE: 5/16/13
TIME: 5:19 PM

CALLER: LOIS SCHIER
CALLER ADDRESS: SUN LAKES, AZ
PHONE:
EMAIL:

CALLER REMARKS/QUESTIONS:
I support the Red Mountain Freeway. Thank you. Bye.

1

Comment noted.
From: Byron Schlomach [mailto:bschlomach@goldwaterinstitute.org]
Sent: Monday, May 20, 2013 1:57 PM
To: Projects; info@buildthe202.com
Subject: Need to build the 202

I've lived in Arizona for almost 6 years now. The whole time, I've lived in the west of Phoenix and, of necessity, must use Interstate 10 to commute every day. I've tried other routes but traffic control lights, school zones, local traffic, and trains all get in the way to significantly delay the commute more than I-10 even when I-10 is heavily congested. I have been on the highways in other areas of town. It is difficult to find anything more congested than I-10 on the west side. However, traffic would move immensely better if there were an alternative route for trucks and other traffic only passing through.

The congestion increases emissions as vehicles idle, often at a full stop, on the interstate. Very often, top speed over a 12 mile stretch of I-10 is 40 miles per hour with numerous stops and starts. This increases wear and tear on vehicles and increases the heat bubble over I-10 (I know since I ride a motorcycle).

The 202 Loop was designed to pull traffic from downtown and the tunnel (a poor design choice, by the way). This relief is badly needed, especially in the area of the I-17 interchange. The one problem with Loop 202 is that it is designed to intersect I10 at 55th Avenue when it should have been routed to intersect with Loop 101 on the west side. This poor design choice will cause problems on I-10 until it is widened between 99th Avenue and 55th Avenue. Nevertheless, Loop 202 should be built to provide the same sort of qualitative transportation service to the west side of Phoenix as the east valley already enjoys.

Byron Schlomach, PhD | Economist | Center for Economic Prosperity at the Goldwater Institute
www.goldwaterinstitute.org | o: (602) 462-5000

“The Goldwater Institute is simply in the liberty business — and there’s no institution in the country that performs that business better.” — Columnist, journalist and author George Will

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/proprietary 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.
I'm very disappointed with the process where a road is approved than changed to a major freeway 8 lanes. This will become a truck bypass and the noise levels will be horrific for the Ahwatukee Foothill residents.

1. Design
   The general location and facility type for this project has remained unchanged since the mid-1980s. See Final Environmental Impact Statement page 1-5 for information on the history of this project.

2. Purpose and Need, Truck Bypass
   The Arizona Department of Transportation and Federal Highway Administration identified several issues and concerns that were frequently noted by commenters. Responses to these issues can be found in the Responses to Frequently Submitted Public Comments beginning on page B733 of this appendix.

3. Noise

4. Neighborhoods/Communities
   While the E1 Alternative is adjacent to the largely residential areas of Ahwatukee Foothills Village (to the north), a freeway has been planned in this location for many years (see Final Environmental Impact Statement pages 4-17 and 4-21). Where existing residential uses are adjacent to the proposed freeway, noise mitigation would be implemented according to Arizona Department of Transportation policy (see Final Environmental Impact Statement page 4-91).
I feel the environmental impact with air, noise and water issues would affect my quality of living. I live in Lakewood which is very close to Pecos Road and we would suffer large noise issues with a truck bypass for Phoenix. In addition I don’t think water wells that feed our local lakes have even been looked into. We have a great ecosystem at these lakes and I don’t want that to be affected by the build.

Kelley Schneider

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Air Quality</td>
<td>The Arizona Department of Transportation and Federal Highway Administration identified several issues and concerns that were frequently noted by commenters. Responses to these issues can be found in the Responses to Frequently Submitted Public Comments beginning on page B733 of this appendix.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Noise</td>
<td>If a well were adversely affected by construction activities, the well might need to be abandoned or the well owner would be compensated by drilling a new well according to state regulations/standards. (See text box on Final Environmental Impact Statement page 4-108.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Groundwater</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Purpose and Need, Truck Bypass</td>
<td>The Arizona Department of Transportation and Federal Highway Administration identified several issues and concerns that were frequently noted by commenters. Responses to these issues can be found in the Responses to Frequently Submitted Public Comments beginning on page B733 of this appendix.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MR. SCHODT: Just that I prefer the 101 West Alignment, so that they don’t put a kink in our loop. That’s what I feel that they’re doing, you know, by bringing that I-10 onto I-10. It’s already a parking lot, in the evening. And they’re just putting more cars on top of that. It would just make it worse.

So when we do travel to the west side, we’re generally going to a sporting event in Glendale, and the 202/101 alignment would be much easier to get to those events to the north and would probably benefit Glendale a lot more by bringing more business from Gilbert, Chandler, Ahwatukee, up there.

So that’s how I feel about it. Thank you.

(The public hearing proceedings concluded at 2:00 p.m.)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Comment Document</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>TELEPHONE CONVERSATION RECORD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SOUTH MOUNTAIN FREEWAY INFORMATION LINE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>6/15/13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>12:57 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caller</td>
<td>HERMAN SCHREIBER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caller Address</td>
<td>13825 N. SAHARA, SUN CITY, ARIZONA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caller Remarks/Questions</td>
<td>I support the freeway.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Comment noted.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
From: William Schrepple [mailto:william.schrepple@hotmail.com]
Send: Tuesday, May 21, 2013 1:04 PM
To: Projects
Subject: In support of extending route 202 for economic development of Laveen

I would like to voice my support for the extension of the 202 for economic development to the Laveen area of Phoenix. It would help to create jobs, alleviate traffic on Baseline Rd and the 10, and make services more accessible to the people of Laveen. It would need to be built correctly with sound barriers, etc in respect of nearby neighborhood housing. I wouldn’t mind if there was a toll on it to help support the costs of construction and to benefit local indian tribes.

-Bill Schrepple
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Comment Document</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TELEPHONE CONVERSATION RECORD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SOUTH MOUNTAIN FREEWAY INFORMATION LINE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5/15/13</td>
<td>3:45 PM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Caller</th>
<th>Caller Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SHIRLEY SCHUESTER</td>
<td>SUN LAKES, AZ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CALLER REMARKS/QUESTIONS:**
I support the extension of the 202 Freeway, south of South Mountain and Pecos Road. Thank you.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Comment noted.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
From: Rusty Crerand  
To: ADOT  
Subject: 202 S. Mt Opinion #1319541836  
Date: Monday, July 15, 2013 7:43:06 AM  
Attachments: image001.png

From: Rusty Crerand  
To: ADOT  
Subject: 202 S. Mt Opinion #1319541836  
Date: Monday, July 15, 2013 7:43:06 AM  
Attachments: image001.png

7/14/2013 11:32:48 AM
The South Mountain Freeway, Loop 202 Extension... I am totally against the 202 Extension coming through Ahwatukee Foothills. I have seen the 215 Beltway go through Las Vegas and yes it does relieve traffic but it also grows and grows a desert with houses and stores and changes the face of the land forever. Ahwatukee Foothills has pollution as it is. But it also has beauty and a community feel. No no no on this extension.

Alice Schultze
roseypetunia@cox.net

Rusty Crerand  
Constituent Services Officer  
206 S. 17th Ave  
ND 118A Room 101  
Phoenix, AZ 85007  
dcrerand@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 all copies plus attachments.
The Arizona Department of Transportation and Federal Highway Administration identified several issues and concerns that were frequently noted by commenters. Responses to these issues can be found in the Responses to Frequently Submitted Public Comments beginning on page B733 of this appendix.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Alternatives, W59 Alternative Versus W101 Alternative</td>
<td>The Arizona Department of Transportation and Federal Highway Administration identified several issues and concerns that were frequently noted by commenters. Responses to these issues can be found in the Responses to Frequently Submitted Public Comments beginning on page B733 of this appendix.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Alternatives, Gila River Indian Community Alignment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Comment Document</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Better utilization of this portion of the freeway? Every afternoon I hear about how congested the San Tan portion is, so it seems like the South Mountain freeway will just increase congestion on this roadway, or is that what ADOT considers to be better utilization, more congestion and increased travel time. Overall, this freeway is not worth the cost. It will destroy a portion of South Mountain Park, an area that was set aside to protect natural resources and to provide public benefit. It will destroy wildlife habitat and movement corridors. It will exacerbate air quality concerns and climate change. It will endanger public health, and it will do all of this without any real added benefit to our communities, so we should not build the South Mountain freeway. Thank you.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>THE FACILITATOR: Thank you. Ana Morago?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>If you’d like to speak and are not yet registered, please go out to the front desk registration. Steve Schwab. Please feel free to use either microphone.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>MR. SCHWAB: Good afternoon. My name is Steve Schwab. I’ve been in the Valley for 31 years and I have witnessed a lot of freeway growth here and I strongly, strongly urge you to accept the action alternative here.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comment noted.
I support the South Mountain freeway. I've seen a lot of economic development and an enhanced community as a result of the freeways that have been built here. I think they're beautiful the way ADOT does it and I strongly encourage acceptance of this. Thank you.

THE FACILITATOR: Thank you.

I'll try Ana Morago again.

MS. MORAGO: Hi, my name is Ana Morago, I am from Gila River Indian Community. Well, this is kind of -- I've been doing this for two years now, urging ADOT not to build the freeway at all, because we hold the South Mountain sacred to four tribes, actually: Akimel Aukede, Akimel O'odham, Tohono O'odham, and Ak Chin. These tribes all hold this ground sacred, and if you blast through this mountain you're going to be dealing with four tribes trying to save the mountain as well as the wildlife and the plant life that live on there.

I read the EIS last night talking -- or trying to get ideas for talking points, and one that we really need to look at is the water. Water is the source of all life. When I read it, there's hazardous materials are going to be going underground, water wells, lots of wells, surface water is going to be contaminated as well as polluted, as well as our Sonoran Desert tortoise as a newly endangered species list now, as well the Mexican
From: raschwa@juno.com [mailto:raschwa@juno.com]
Sent: Saturday, May 18, 2013 8:30 AM
To: Projects
Subject: South Mountain Expressway L-202

Please build this freeway and soon (whichever alignment works best)! It is long overdue!!

Thanks,
Ron Schwartz

Confidentiality and Nondisclosure Notice: This email transmission and any attachments are intended for use by the persons/organizations 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 cancel the forward by email, and delete or destroy all copies plus attachments.
I am writing to oppose the construction of the Loop 202 extension. I believe the increased traffic and pollution in the area will be destructive to my neighbors’ way of life in Laveen, the Gila River Indian Community, and surrounding areas.

Specifically, I am very concerned that the DEIS is not accurate. It does not identify the displacement of Gila River homes, does not identify an evacuation route in the event of a biohazard accident, does not depict the loss of agriculturally zoned lands in the Laveen and Gila River areas, and does not visually display prehistoric and sacred sites potentially impacted from construction.

I demand that ADOT thoroughly analyze these impacts and provide visuals such as aerial photography where needed.

I also urge ADOT to release a revised Environmental Impact Statement that takes into account public health concerns and related issues.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Health Effects</td>
<td>The Arizona Department of Transportation and Federal Highway Administration identified several issues and concerns that were frequently noted by commenters. Responses to these issues can be found in the Responses to Frequently Submitted Public Comments beginning on page B733 of this appendix.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Comment Document</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 1    | TELEPHONE CONVERSATION RECORD  
SOUTH MOUNTAIN FREEWAY INFORMATION LINE  
INCOMING CALL  
DATE: 5/18/13  
TIME: 2:50 PM  
CALLER: JENNY SCRIBNER  
CALLER ADDRESS: 3313 N. 60TH STREET, PHOENIX, AZ  
PHONE: EMAIL:  
CALLER REMARKS/QUESTIONS:  
I am calling in support of the South Mountain Freeway Extension. Thank you very much. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Comment noted.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TELEPHONE CONVERSATION RECORD
SOUTH MOUNTAIN FREEWAY INFORMATION LINE

INCOMING CALL
DATE: 7/24/13
TIME: 10:57 AM

CALLER: THERESA SEELANDER
CALLER ADDRESS: 184 EAST LAGUNA ROYALE, LITCHFIELD PARK, AZ
PHONE: EMAIL:

CALLER REMARKS/QUESTIONS:
I am in very much support of the South Mountain freeway and I'm just voicing my opinion and I think it would be a great advantage for our already busy, busy freeways and highways. And always in support for new jobs and helping out our economy. So I am definitely for it. Thank you.

1 Comment noted.
**TELEPHONE CONVERSATION RECORD**

**SOUTH MOUNTAIN FREEWAY INFORMATION LINE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Incoming Call Date</th>
<th>Incoming Call Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>04/25/13</td>
<td>2:29 PM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Caller:**  
SHANNON SELBY  
**Caller Address:**  
AHWATUKEE, AZ  
**Phone:**  
602-908-3400  
**Email:**

**Caller Remarks/Questions:**
I have a few questions about the proposed South Mountain Freeway. I am an Ahwatukee resident but work for the City of Tempe.

**Response:**
Message left on 4/25 at 2:50 p.m.
Message left on 4/26 at 9:30 a.m.
Message left on 4/29 at 9:30 a.m.

**Response Date:**  
APRIL 12, 2013  
**Response Time:**  
1:45 PM  
**HDE Staff Initial:**  
MEB

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Comment noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Issue</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Comment noted.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TELEPHONE CONVERSATION RECORD**
**SOUTH MOUNTAIN FREEWAY INFORMATION LINE**

**INCOMING CALL**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>TIME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5/18/16</td>
<td>4:20 PM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CALLER:** BEVERLY SEMPER  
**CALLER ADDRESS:** 16415 NORTH 39TH PLACE PHOENIX AZ  
**EMAIL:**

**CALLER REMARKS/QUESTIONS:**

Please, I do support the freeway. Thank you.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Comment Document</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TELEPHONE CONVERSATION RECORD**  
**SOUTH MOUNTAIN FREEWAY INFORMATION LINE**

**INCOMING CALL**
- **DATE:** 5/17/13  
- **TIME:** 5:16 PM  
- **CALLER:** KATHRYN SERANTE  
- **CALLER ADDRESS:** 2449 EAST LINCOLN CIRCLE, PHOENIX 85016  
- **PHONE:**  
- **EMAIL:**

**CALLER REMARKS/QUESTIONS:**
- I do support the South Mountain Freeway. Thank you.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Comment noted.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
From: Sharon A Service
To: Projects
Subject: Build the South Mountain Freeway
Date: Tuesday, May 14, 2013 9:37:43 AM

-----Original Message-----
From: Sharon A Service [mailto:sharonadsharon@yahoo.com]
Sent: Sunday, May 12, 2013 3:13 PM
To: Projects
Cc: info@buildthe202.com
Subject: Build the South Mountain Freeway

I support building the 202 Freeway. I hope you will.

Sharon S.
Sent from my iPad

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.

Code | Issue | Response
---|---|---
1 | | Comment noted.
Comment noted.
MR. SHANKER: My name is Howard Shanker. I live in Ahwatukee in Club West. I would like to personally point out that I think the draft EIS is inadequate in a number of reasons. I don’t think it addresses the air impacts adequately, especially with schools and residences so close or the noise impacts. What else? I don’t know that they’ve done an adequate socioeconomic analysis, adequately interpreted the impacts thereof. It seems to me that this was really a foregone conclusion, that they made their mind up 20 or 30 years ago when the demographics were very different. And to maintain this exact same location for the freeway just doesn’t make any sense anymore. What else? I think -- Did I talk about the 4F analysis briefly already? That’s about all for now. This is all sort of impromptu, but I’m glad to get this on the record. I anticipate submitting a written response hopefully.

MR. DAD: I’m in favor of the freeway because of the traffic congestion that’s coming into Laveen. I’ve had this property since 1961, so it’s come a long ways. But the people bring traffic and we can’t
**TELEPHONE CONVERSATION RECORD**  
**SOUTH MOUNTAIN FREEWAY INFORMATION LINE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>TIME</th>
<th>CALLER</th>
<th>CALLER ADDRESS</th>
<th>PHONE</th>
<th>EMAIL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6/15/13</td>
<td>1:18 PM</td>
<td>SANDRA SHABIONAL</td>
<td>13401 W. RUMMOCK STREET, SURPRISE, ARIZONA 85374</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CALLER REMARKS/QUESTIONS:**  
I support the South Mountain freeway.

**Response:**  
Comment noted.
I am a resident of Ahwatukee and want the freeway built. It is difficult to leave or enter Ahwatukee on any weekday during "rush hour". But even not at the peak of "rush hour" traffic volume has increased. Weekend traffic has not diminished either. If there is an accident on the I-10 in either direction we are held hostage with no way to leave or get back to Ahwatukee, it is a total ROAD BLOCK NIGHTMARE. If there were an emergency that required an evacuation of this area this presents a potential tragedy just waiting to happen.

I respect and understand where the GRIC is coming from in their wish to preserve South Mountain and their land. However, they are major contributors and will continue to be major contributors to the increased traffic, pollution and gridlock on I-10. They now have major public attractions; Casino, Resort Hotel, Rawhide, and now the Outlet Mall. They don't have a problem building commercial entities on their land and reaping the benefits of such entities and I'm sure they have plans to continue to expand. Is the GRIC's progress for the "good of the community" and what community are we talking about. The freeway would be for the good of the community....the GRIC AND the Phoenix/Ahwatukee community.

The GRIC can not be allowed to be a part of the problem (increased traffic to the area—I-10) to reap the benefits of their commercialization of the area and not be a part of the solution. They should either allow part of their land to be used for the freeway, as they have used for their commercial endeavors. This can/will offer more opportunities for them to further build income producing enterprises along the route and contribute to access to the area in and around Ahwatukee.

BUILD THE FREEWAY! People need to travel from the west side of town and will continue to do so on I-10 what a future gridlock nightmare if nothing is done.
**Draft Environmental Impact Statement**

**COMMENT FORM**

Thank you for participating in the South Mountain Freeway Draft Environmental Impact Statement public comment process. ADOT encourages all interested parties to submit written comments on any project phase. ADOT will consider all comments in preparing the Final EIS, which will include responses to all comments, final conclusions of potential impacts, and ADOT’s final recommendation. When submitting comments, please be as specific as possible and substantiate your concerns and recommendations.

Comments must be received or postmarked by July 24, 2013.

PLEASE BUILD Loop 202:

I live in Laveen near Baseline and 79th and our neighbors and I are tired of being bottled up. The only way to get to these routes – Baseline to 91, Baseline to 67 or Baseline to one of the more heavily developed areas – is difficult. The average time it takes to get from one end of the area to the other is about 1 hour. The problem is that there are too many people who don’t realize that the roads were designed for cars, not people.

I believe that there will be more people and the downtown area should be not only where the people live but also where the businesses are located.

I think that the city should consider building a new highway that runs through the middle of the city.

A. Sheriff

Comments must be received or postmarked by July 24, 2013. Comments can be deposited at today’s meeting, emailed to projects@adot.gov or mailed to: ADOT Loop 202 South Mountain Freeway Study, 1855 W. Jackson Street, MD 1307, Phoenix, AZ 85027

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Comment noted.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I am concerned that the DEIS does not identify the displacement of Gila River homes, does not identify an evacuation route in the event of a biohazardous accident, does not depict the loss of agriculturally zoned lands in the Laveen and Gila River areas, or visually display prehistoric sites potentially impacted from construction. ADOT needs to analyze these impacts and provide visuals such as aerial photography where needed.

The proposed freeway would not use any Gila River Indian Community land therefore would not displace any Gila River Indian Community homes or convert any Gila River Indian Community farmlands to a freeway.

The Arizona Department of Transportation and Federal Highway Administration identified several issues and concerns that were frequently noted by commenters. Responses to these issues can be found in the Responses to Frequently Submitted Public Comments beginning on page B733 of this appendix.

Existing agriculture is depicted in Figure 4-3, on page 4-6, of the Draft Environmental Impact Statement. While not an aerial photograph, it outlines the parcels that are currently under agricultural production. Table 4-4, on page 4-7, summarizes existing zoning by land use for the entire Study Area. In addition, Figure 4-4, on page 4-8, reveals how much of the existing agricultural land along the W59 Alternative is already slated for commercial and residential development. Implementation of the E1 Alternative would cause no conversion of agricultural uses on Gila River Indian Community land. Urbanization will continue with or without implementation of the proposed freeway (see Final Environmental Impact Statement pages 4-161 and 4-162).

Maps showing locations of cultural sites are kept confidential to protect the sites.

Aerial photographs are used throughout the Draft and Final Environmental Impact Statements. Long, detailed, roll plots of the alternatives were available to the public at the Public Meeting in May 2013 and were extensively used.
The Arizona Department of Transportation and Federal Highway Administration identified several issues and concerns that were frequently noted by commenters. Responses to these issues can be found in the "Responses to Frequently Submitted Public Comments" beginning on page B733 of this appendix.

Federal regulations stipulate that an environmental impact statement shall "rigorously explore and objectively evaluate all reasonable alternatives" (40 Code of Federal Regulations § 1502.14; see Final Environmental Impact Statement page 3-1). All alternatives were screened using a multidisciplinary set of criteria. Nonfreeway alternatives were considered (see Final Environmental Impact Statement pages 3-3 through 3-6). Among other things, the study took into account improving existing freeways, improving or expanding other travel modes, strategies to reduce travel demand, and various roadway configurations. This study examined not only the potential impacts from improvements, but also the consequences of building nothing, the No-Action Alternative. As proposed by the Maricopa Association of Governments, the South Mountain Freeway would be part of the Regional Freeway and Highway System. Other transportation improvements such as mass transit and local roads are specified in the Regional Transportation Plan and were considered during the evaluation of this proposed new freeway.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Design</td>
<td>A double deck freeway would cost more to construct and maintain than a freeway alternative that would be at grade.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Good morning,

I am against the building of the South Mountain/Loop 202 along its current trajectory through Laveen at 59th Avenue. My husband and I made a choice eight years ago to build our home in Laveen after looking in different areas of the valley. We were drawn to Laveen’s rural feel, the mountain vistas and the cultural opportunities for our children being so close to the Gila River Reservation. When many bailed out on their agreement to build their home in Laveen (our area of 67th Avenue/Baseline apparently had zoning issues that took many months to resolve) we waited almost 18 months to move from north Phoenix (16th Street/Loop 101) to Laveen.

Laveen is not and was not meant to be a metropolis. People who moved out here with limited transportation options and then demanded public transportation have turned a quiet little town into a transient and not terribly rural community. People who moved out here and then complained that there are no sit down restaurants and not a wide variety of businesses do not seem to understand the concept that not all land must be developed. Yes, we took advantage of a beautiful area in which to build our home. However we did not expect infrastructure at the expense of the environment, native landscapes and small town feel.

I do agree that traffic congestion is an issue that needs to be addressed in the valley. It is not completely up to the state and federal government to solely address the issue. Citizens must do their part to reduce their trips in their cars that creates that congestion. It is very nice to live outside the city and have some space and be able to see the stars at night. Nevertheless the onus is also on every citizen to make sensible choices about where they live to ensure that all factors are considered. The introduction of a new high-speed roadway is not ever going to guarantee movie theaters, big box stores, and medical centers. Those things may very well come to the area if the roadway is indeed built although at what cost? Is there a guarantee that the businesses will be willing to pay what I am sure will be a premium space cost for proximity to the roadway? No. Is there a guarantee that Laveen will not become a roadway with two high schools and a grocery store? No. Is it an intelligent choice to destroy – no matter whether it’s a blast or a small cut – mountains that have existed long before any of us and will be here long after? No. Do I take advantage of the I-17, knowing that blasts were done to get that roadway built? Yes, I do. However if I read the information correctly that roadway was built because there were no other roadways heading north and south. The current plan for Loop 202 does not fulfill a singular need where there are no other options.

From: DeAnne Shaw [mailto:shawsomes@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, May 20, 2013 11:26 AM
To: Projects
Cc: DeAnne Shaw
Subject: No on Loop 202/South Mountain

Good morning,

I am against the building of the South Mountain/Loop 202 along its current trajectory through Laveen at 59th Avenue. My husband and I made a choice eight years ago to build our home in Laveen after looking in different areas of the valley. We were drawn to Laveen’s rural feel, the mountain vistas and the cultural opportunities for our children being so close to the Gila River Reservation. When many bailed out on their agreement to build their home in Laveen (our area of 67th Avenue/Baseline apparently had zoning issues that took many months to resolve) we waited almost 18 months to move from north Phoenix (16th Street/Loop 101) to Laveen.

Laveen is not and was not meant to be a metropolis. People who moved out here with limited transportation options and then demanded public transportation have turned a quiet little town into a transient and not terribly rural community. People who moved out here and then complained that there are no sit down restaurants and not a wide variety of businesses do not seem to understand the concept that not all land must be developed. Yes, we took advantage of a beautiful area in which to build our home. However we did not expect infrastructure at the expense of the environment, native landscapes and small town feel.

I do agree that traffic congestion is an issue that needs to be addressed in the valley. It is not completely up to the state and federal government to solely address the issue. Citizens must do their part to reduce their trips in their cars that creates that congestion. It is very nice to live outside the city and have some space and be able to see the stars at night. Nevertheless the onus is also on every citizen to make sensible choices about where they live to ensure that all factors are considered. The introduction of a new high-speed roadway is not ever going to guarantee movie theaters, big box stores, and medical centers. Those things may very well come to the area if the roadway is indeed built although at what cost? Is there a guarantee that the businesses will be willing to pay what I am sure will be a premium space cost for proximity to the roadway? No. Is there a guarantee that Laveen will not become a roadway with two high schools and a grocery store? No. Is it an intelligent choice to destroy – no matter whether it’s a blast or a small cut – mountains that have existed long before any of us and will be here long after? No. Do I take advantage of the I-17, knowing that blasts were done to get that roadway built? Yes, I do. However if I read the information correctly that roadway was built because there were no other roadways heading north and south. The current plan for Loop 202 does not fulfill a singular need where there are no other options.

From: DeAnne Shaw [mailto:shawsomes@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, May 20, 2013 11:26 AM
To: Projects
Cc: DeAnne Shaw
Subject: No on Loop 202/South Mountain

Good morning,

I am against the building of the South Mountain/Loop 202 along its current trajectory through Laveen at 59th Avenue. My husband and I made a choice eight years ago to build our home in Laveen after looking in different areas of the valley. We were drawn to Laveen’s rural feel, the mountain vistas and the cultural opportunities for our children being so close to the Gila River Reservation. When many bailed out on their agreement to build their home in Laveen (our area of 67th Avenue/Baseline apparently had zoning issues that took many months to resolve) we waited almost 18 months to move from north Phoenix (16th Street/Loop 101) to Laveen.

Laveen is not and was not meant to be a metropolis. People who moved out here with limited transportation options and then demanded public transportation have turned a quiet little town into a transient and not terribly rural community. People who moved out here and then complained that there are no sit down restaurants and not a wide variety of businesses do not seem to understand the concept that not all land must be developed. Yes, we took advantage of a beautiful area in which to build our home. However we did not expect infrastructure at the expense of the environment, native landscapes and small town feel.

I do agree that traffic congestion is an issue that needs to be addressed in the valley. It is not completely up to the state and federal government to solely address the issue. Citizens must do their part to reduce their trips in their cars that creates that congestion. It is very nice to live outside the city and have some space and be able to see the stars at night. Nevertheless the onus is also on every citizen to make sensible choices about where they live to ensure that all factors are considered. The introduction of a new high-speed roadway is not ever going to guarantee movie theaters, big box stores, and medical centers. Those things may very well come to the area if the roadway is indeed built although at what cost? Is there a guarantee that the businesses will be willing to pay what I am sure will be a premium space cost for proximity to the roadway? No. Is there a guarantee that Laveen will not become a roadway with two high schools and a grocery store? No. Is it an intelligent choice to destroy – no matter whether it’s a blast or a small cut – mountains that have existed long before any of us and will be here long after? No. Do I take advantage of the I-17, knowing that blasts were done to get that roadway built? Yes, I do. However if I read the information correctly that roadway was built because there were no other roadways heading north and south. The current plan for Loop 202 does not fulfill a singular need where there are no other options.
I would indeed support a more logical trajectory of the 202 to connect at the 101-I-10 interchange. There is minimal commercial development on the southeast corner of 99th Avenue/101 therefore with some mutually agreed upon concessions from both sides – public and private sector – I believe the necessary flyovers and other roadways could be developed. If the only option will remain the 59th Avenue trajectory then I cannot support continued development of this roadway. Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,
DeAnne M. Shaw
Laveen, AZ
480-201-2867
shawsomes@gmail.com
Arizona Resident since 2002
Laveen Resident since 2005

The Arizona Department of Transportation has designated the 59th Avenue connection (W59 Alternative) with Interstate 10 (Papago Freeway) as the Preferred Alternative for the proposed freeway in the Western Section of the Study Area. The W101 Alternative would connect with State Route 101, but would also result in substantial impacts on the community of Tolleson. The South Mountain Citizen’s Advisory Team recommended the W101 Alternative. The project team considered the input of all stakeholders—including regional leaders, municipalities, members of the public, and members of the South Mountain Citizen’s Advisory Team—before identifying the W59 Alternative as the Preferred Alternative (see Final Environmental Impact Statement pages 3-65 and 3-68). The W59 Alternative was seen as the best option to balance fiscal responsibility, regional mobility needs, community sensitivity, and additional considerations such as consistency with long-range planning goals, economic and environmental impacts, and public and agency input.
The Arizona Department of Transportation and Federal Highway Administration identified several issues and concerns that were frequently noted by commenters. Responses to these issues can be found in the Response to Frequently Submitted Public Comments beginning on page B333 of this appendix.

The direct impacts of adjacent development, whether in the City of Phoenix or on Gila River Indian Community land are not considered in the scope of this study.
### Purpose and Need, Truck Bypass

The Arizona Department of Transportation and Federal Highway Administration identified several issues and concerns that were frequently noted by commenters. Responses to these issues can be found in the Responses to Frequently Submitted Public Comments beginning on page B733 of this appendix.

### Trucks

### Air Quality

### Noise

### Neighborhoods/Communities

While the City of Phoenix Police Department reported in 2005 that it did not have any statistics specific to crime adjacent to freeways, the Police Department did note that, based on its experience, there does not appear to be a correlation between crime rates and freeways. See Final Environmental Impact Statement sidebar on page 4-21.

### Hazardous Materials

The Arizona Department of Transportation and Federal Highway Administration identified several issues and concerns that were frequently noted by commenters. Responses to these issues can be found in the Responses to Frequently Submitted Public Comments beginning on page B733 of this appendix.

### Health Effects

### Noise

Noise walls would range in height from 8 feet to 20 feet tall in the Ahwatukee Foothills area. As mentioned in the sidebar on page 4-91, the Final Environmental Impact Statement is based on preliminary design and traffic information. As the design progresses to the Final Design phase, noise barrier locations and heights will be refined and finalized. During Final Design, more detailed information on the location, actual height, and distance from the property line of each noise barrier will become available.

### Hazardous Materials

### Health Effects

### Noise

As discussed in the Noise Analysis Technical Report prepared for the Final Environmental Impact Statement, the proposed South Mountain Freeway was modeled in the latest version of the Traffic Noise Model (version 2.5). This is a three-dimensional model that factors in elements of the proposed freeway using x, y, and z coordinates. The model did account for the elevations of the freeway, nearby homes, which may be elevated above the roadway, and any recommended barriers between the homes and freeway. This is the same procedure and same model used for other freeway projects in the Valley and across the country.

### Traffic

On arterial streets with traffic interchange connections with the proposed freeway, daily traffic volumes would increase near the freeway. This statement is supported by the traffic information presented in Figure 3-37 on page 3-61 of the Final Environmental Impact Statement; for example Van Buren Street between 59th and 51st Avenues). However, the freeway would provide wide-ranging reductions in overall travel on Study Area arterial streets. As shown in Figure 3-13 on page 3-30 of the Final Environmental Impact Statement, the total volume removed from the arterial street network with the proposed freeway in place in 2035 would be 277,000 vehicles per day.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Comment Document</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Traffic</td>
<td>The statement related to reductions on arterial streets considers those arterials streets in and around the entire Study Area, not just in Ahwatukee Foothills Village. The traffic projections for Chandler Boulevard (see Figure 3-12 on page 3-29 of the Final Environmental Impact Statement) do show a reduction with the proposed freeway when compared with conditions without the proposed freeway. The travel time comparison shown in Figure 3-17 on page 3-34 of the Final Environmental Impact Statement included a trip from Ahwatukee Foothills Village to Downtown Phoenix using Interstate 10, not the proposed freeway. This trip would take 5 or 6 minutes less with the proposed freeway in place when compared with conditions without the proposed freeway. The duration of level of service E or F (represents stop-and-go traffic) for the existing conditions and future conditions without the proposed freeway are shown in Figure 1-9 and 1-10 in the Final Environmental Impact Statement. In both conditions there are more than 3 hours of congested conditions during the morning and evening commuting periods on a number of the region's freeways, especially Interstate 10.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Purpose and Need</td>
<td>The Arizona Department of Transportation and Federal Highway Administration identified several issues and concerns that were frequently noted by commenters. Responses to these issues can be found in the Responses to Frequently Submitted Public Comments beginning on page B733 of this appendix.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Neighborhoods/Communities</td>
<td>While the E1 Alternative is adjacent to the largely residential areas of Ahwatukee Foothills Village (to the north), a freeway has been planned in this location for many years (see Final Environmental Impact Statement pages 4-17 and 4-21). Where existing residential uses are adjacent to the proposed freeway, noise mitigation would be implemented according to Arizona Department of Transportation policy (see Final Environmental Impact Statement page 4-91).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Neighborhoods/Communities</td>
<td>While the City has some ability to control development through its zoning ordinances, the City does not have the authority to stop private land from being developed. The Arizona Department of Transportation was able to acquire large tracts of land along the Pecos Road alignment in the 1980s, but funding shortfalls kept the Arizona Department of Transportation from acquiring all of the needed land. Developers were aware of the potential freeway and made the decision to develop the land based on the risk that the freeway would eventually be built. Citizens were also aware of the potential and chose to buy homes near the freeway despite the same risk. Information related to freeway awareness and the responsibilities of the City of Phoenix, developers, and the Arizona Department of Transportation related to disclosure of the planning for the freeway is presented on page 4-13 of the Final Environmental Impact Statement.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
B3004 - Comment Response Appendix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Comment Document</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>MR. SHEEHAN: Where do I start? I had a nice little thing typed up, actually. Basically, I feel that this is a ruse, to -- that's being suggested, that it's going to be just to relieve traffic. But it's actually going to become a glorified truck route, with the traffic to Canada, highways that we're talking about, and the fact that they're going to -- that you're going to be having vehicles that are not -- not under the same emissions standards that we have. So it's going to be emitting all kinds of -- all kinds of diesel fumes, Jake brake noise, tires, and large engines that's going to be going up and down this -- our community. This -- Am I going too fast? COURT REPORTER: No. MR. SHEEHAN: Okay. This whole thing is 30 years too late. Back when it was first voted in there, by the -- by the populous here, there wasn't 85,000 people living here and all kinds of houses and people that have moved into a highly sought-after area, like Ahwatukee is. It's a really great community. And they -- They went in here because it is the world's largest cul-de-sac and nobody wanted to -- people wanted to move in there to have the good schools, to have the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>The Arizona Department of Transportation and Federal Highway Administration identified several issues and concerns that were frequently noted by commenters. Responses to these issues can be found in the Responses to Frequently Submitted Public Comments beginning on page B733 of this appendix.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3  Air Quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4  Noise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5  Purpose and Need, Old Plan or Use of Old Data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Comment Document</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>clean air, to have the relief from the city and from the high ways.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>And now we're going to have a glorified truck route, running up past -- past our community. It's going to bring in more crime, lots of noise, lots of emissions, not to mention the fact that the -- we're going to have to cut through a mountain and our State Park. And it's going to change all the wildlife that's living there, as well as the people that use it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>I feel that it's over, it's -- The cost for it, you know, the Proposition 400, when it was -- when it was pushed through, was -- it was kind of lumped together in the middle of a bunch of other projects. Most of the Valley that voted for it didn't even realize that they were voting for it to extend the taxes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>So that means we're just adding more and more money to it. And then having to tear down houses that the planning commission probably should have never allowed to build there, anyway, because this has always been such a long-term plan. They should have done something to stop those houses from going in there, so we didn't have millions of dollars having to be spent to take over people's property there.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>So I'm -- I say: No action or look towards the 85, to put the route way far south of where the city is, anyway. I think that would be a better -- a better route to take, that</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While the City of Phoenix Police Department reported in 2005 that it did not have any statistics specific to crime adjacent to freeways, the Police Department did note that, based on its experience, there does not appear to be a correlation between crime rates and freeways. See Final Environmental Impact Statement sidebar on page 4-21.

The Arizona Department of Transportation and Federal Highway Administration identified several issues and concerns that were frequently noted by commenters. Responses to these issues can be found in the Responses to Frequently Submitted Public Comments beginning on page B733 of this appendix.

The Southwest Loop Highway—the South Mountain Freeway predecessor—was integral to the Regional Freeway and Highway System approved by Maricopa County voters in 1985. Although other facilities were considered a higher priority early in development of the Regional Freeway and Highway System, the South Mountain Freeway has been included in every subsequent update. The same route was approved by the State Transportation Board in 1988. In 2004, Maricopa County voters approved Proposition 400, which was designed to fund completion of the remaining segments of the Regional Freeway and Highway System, including the proposed South Mountain Freeway (Final Environmental Impact Statement page 1-21).

Prospective home buyers and members of the church built after the freeway was conceived, according to State law, should have been informed of the proposed facility. (Sellers are obligated by Arizona common law to disclose all known material facts about a property to the buyer.)

While the City has some ability to control development through its zoning ordinances, the City does not have the authority to stop private land from being developed. The Arizona Department of Transportation was able to acquire large tracts of land along the Pecos Road alignment in the 1980s, but funding shortfalls kept the Arizona Department of Transportation from acquiring all of the needed land. Developers were aware of the potential freeway and made the decision to develop the land based on the risk that the freeway would eventually be built. Citizens were aware of the potential and chose to buy homes near the freeway despite the same risk. Information related to freeway awareness and the responsibilities of the City of Phoenix, developers, and the Arizona Department of Transportation related to disclosure of the planning for the freeway is presented on page 4-13 of the Final Environmental Impact Statement.

The Arizona Department of Transportation and Federal Highway Administration identified several issues and concerns that were frequently noted by commenters. Responses to these issues can be found in the Responses to Frequently Submitted Public Comments beginning on page B733 of this appendix.
The study considered an alternative that would run along Interstate 8 in Casa Grande to State Route 85 from Gila Bend to Interstate 10 (see text on page 3-9 of the Final Environmental Impact Statement). State Route 85 is currently being reconstructed as a four-lane, divided highway with limited-access control, and Interstate 8 is a four-lane, divided Interstate freeway with full access control. Existing signs at each terminus designate the route as a truck bypass of the metropolitan Phoenix area. This route would continue to be available for interstate and interregional travel, but it would not meet the proposed action purpose and need as part of a regional transportation network and, therefore, was eliminated from further consideration.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Comment noted.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TELEPHONE CONVERSATION RECORD**  
**SOUTH MOUNTAIN FREEWAY INFORMATION LINE**

- **DATE:** 05/10/13  
- **TIME:** 9:31 AM  
- **CALLER:** RON SHERMAN  
- **CALLER ADDRESS:** 10433 E. EAST DRIVE, SUN LAKES, AZ 85248  
- **PHONE:**  
- **EMAIL:**  

**CALLER REMARKS/QUESTIONS:**  
I support the Loop 202 South Mountain Freeway project. Thank you.
**TELEPHONE CONVERSATION RECORD**  
**SOUTH MOUNTAIN FREEWAY INFORMATION LINE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Caller</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Phone</th>
<th>Email</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5/15/13</td>
<td>6:30 PM</td>
<td>ARATHI SHETTY</td>
<td>6921 W. MALDONADO ROAD, LAVEEN, AZ 85339</td>
<td>623-385-6518</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CALLER REMARKS/QUESTIONS:**
I support the South Mountain Freeway. Thank you.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Comment noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Comment Document</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 1    | TELEPHONE CONVERSATION RECORD  
SOUTH MOUNTAIN FREEWAY INFORMATION LINE  
INCOMING CALL  
DATE: 6/13/13  
TIME: 4:35 PM  
CALLER: MIKE SHIELDS  
PHONE: EMAIL  
CALLER REMARKS/QUESTIONS:  
Yes, I'm in favor of the freeway going behind South Mountain and I think it's a very good thing and it would help Phoenix a whole bunch. Bye. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Comment noted.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Arizona Department of Transportation and Federal Highway Administration identified several issues and concerns that were frequently noted by commenters. Responses to these issues can be found in the Responses to Frequently Submitted Public Comments beginning on page B733 of this appendix.

Because Pecos Road is already a four-lane arterial street and is in approximately the same location as the proposed E1 Alternative, viewers would not be seeing any phenomena they do not already see (see Final Environmental Impact Statement page 4-169). The proposed freeway would have eight lanes of traffic and carry more vehicles, but what park users and residents would see would not be substantively different from what they already see along Pecos Road. Page 4-169 in the Final Environmental Impact Statement lists measures that should help to avoid, reduce, or mitigate aesthetic impacts. Larger saguaro cacti, mature trees, and large shrubs that would likely survive the transplanting and sitting-in period would help in visually sensitive or critical roadway areas.

The Arizona Department of Transportation and Federal Highway Administration identified several issues and concerns that were frequently noted by commenters. Responses to these issues can be found in the Responses to Frequently Submitted Public Comments beginning on page B733 of this appendix.

The study has considered concepts for parallel multiuse paths, however the main Visual Resources

Because Pecos Road is already a four-lane arterial street and is in approximately the same location as the proposed E1 Alternative, viewers would not be seeing any phenomena they do not already see (see Final Environmental Impact Statement page 4-169). The proposed freeway would have eight lanes of traffic and carry more vehicles, but what park users and residents would see would not be substantively different from what they already see along Pecos Road. Page 4-169 in the Final Environmental Impact Statement lists measures that should help to avoid, reduce, or mitigate aesthetic impacts. Larger saguaro cacti, mature trees, and large shrubs that would likely survive the transplanting and sitting-in period would help in visually sensitive or critical roadway areas.

The alignment goes right up Pecos. On any given Saturday or Sunday morning there are hundreds of cyclists that use Pecos to ride up and down. Arizona was just ranked 10th out of 50 states for bike friendliness in 2013 by the League of American Bicyclists. With that much usage on Pecos where are we cyclists supposed to go? Ahwatukee is full of parkland for peace, nature and its sheer beauty.

The proposed freeway system may help some but will take away much more that can’t be given back.

Kimberly Shirley
As an urban planning product, it is widely known that regardless of highway addition, it will not reduce traffic in the long run; only serve to create more car travelers. If this money were spent on public transit, walking and bike infrastructure; that has been shown to provide long term traffic reduction. Think not only about the traffic, but also the livability lessons of Portland, Minneapolis, etc. vs. Los Angeles and Houston.

The Arizona Department of Transportation and Federal Highway Administration identified several issues and concerns that were frequently noted by commenters. Responses to these issues can be found in the Responses to Frequently Submitted Public Comments beginning on page B733 of this appendix.
From: Projects
To: ADOT
Subject: FW: South mountain freeway
Date: Monday, May 20, 2013 8:45:33 AM

-----Original Message-----
From: ROY SID [mailto:roysid2@aol.com]
Sent: Friday, May 17, 2013 4:58 PM
To: Projects
Subject: South mountain freeway

We need this freeway for our state to expand in the right direction.

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/confidential 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.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Comment Document</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TELEPHONE CONVERSATION RECORD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SOUTH MOUNTAIN FREEWAY INFORMATION LINE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>INCOMING CALL</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DATE: 6/15/13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TIME: 11:50 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CALLER: STEVE SIDOWSKY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CALLER ADDRESS: 11630 N. RIO VISTA DRIVE, SUN CITY, ARIZONA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PHONE: EMAIL:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>CALLER REMARKS/QUESTIONS:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I am ecstatic over this Loop 202 to connect to the 10 South of Ahwatukee. It's long awaited and long overdue. Thank you very much. Still a working person using freeways, highways all the time. Thank you very much.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Comment noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Issue</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Traffic</td>
<td>The determination to not include an interchange at 32nd Street was made in coordination with the City of Phoenix (see Figure 3-8 on page 3-15 of the Final Environmental Impact Statement). The interchange would have required the displacement of over 100 homes and would have been located in close proximity to an existing high school. The City recommended that based on these impacts, the interchange be removed from the study. In 2006, the City of Phoenix conducted a traffic circulation study to evaluate the impacts of the proposed freeway on the local street system, including the shift of access to Foothills Reserve and Calabrea from Pecos Road to Chandler Boulevard. The City study found no adverse effects on the local street system from the freeway (see Appendix 3-1 in the Final Environmental Impact Statement).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Air Quality</td>
<td>The Arizona Department of Transportation and Federal Highway Administration identified several issues and concerns that were frequently noted by commenters. Responses to these issues can be found in the Responses to Frequently Submitted Public Comments beginning on page B733 of this appendix.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Health Effects</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I have on the proposed bridge to close off 32nd street along with specific concerns:

1. **BIOHAZARDS:**
   - Flying debris over homes, people
   - Chemical spills, gas, etc
   - Heavy traffic trucking – if crash or traffic – waiting times causes more pollution
   - Increase air pollution to our area thru 40th street/32nd street Dead End
   - Crash
   - Destroy HOA private roads
   - Destroy to the property homes by shaking, foundation, etc
   - Schools – kids can't play ground outside due to health
   - Causing great loss of life, damage, hardship to homes, kids, schools
   - Threat to humans or to the environment

2. **DISASTER:** We can’t escape to Desert Vista HS area - E. Liberty Lane to 32nd street/Pecos Road from E. Redwood Lane, 31st Way, 30th Place, 29th Way:
   - Fire
   - Emergency
Meteors
Weather
School Events
Crash
Traffic
No entrance to 32nd Street for Schools
Sport Events
Parking from School events

TRAFFIC:
No entrance to Loop 202 east from E. Chandler Blvd
No entrance to 32nd Street/Pecos Road
Delay Timing – 10-20 minutes
Bad Traffic thru E. Chandler Blvd, 40th Street and private roads – E. Liberty Lane to S. Lakewood Parkway W. to E. Brianwood Way

Schools
Increase air pollution – waiting times, etc
Building a freeway, highway, or any other project on a site sacred to Native peoples in Arizona would be a violation of the internationally recognized human rights of Indigenous peoples. Thus, not only is the freeway unnecessary, and not only will its construction destroy a portion of the environment, but it runs contrary to international human rights laws to which the US has bound itself. Is this the way you want the rest of the country to view your project? Rather than build on the land, the land should be returned to the Native peoples from whom it was taken, according to UN Special Rapporteur S. James Anaya. See for example: http://unsr.jamesanaya.org/notes/special-rapporteur-publishes-report-on-the-situation-of-indigenous-peoples-in-the-united-states-of-america

To the South Mountain Study Team:

The Draft Environmental Impact Statement describes a decade-long consultation and coordination effort led by the Arizona Department of Transportation and the Federal Highway Administration with the Gila River Indian Community and other Native American tribes. As a result of the consultation, the cultural importance of the South Mountains is acknowledged in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement in several locations, notably page 5-26. The proposed project would accommodate and preserve (to the fullest extent possible from the available alternatives) access to the South Mountains for religious practices.

Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act requires a government-to-government relationship between the Federal Government and Indian tribes as described beginning on page 4-140 of the Final Environmental Impact Statement. Section 106 requires federal agencies take into account the effects of their undertakings on historic properties and requires consultation with tribal authorities. Consultation has occurred with Gila River Indian Community government officials, the Tribal Historic Preservation Officer, the Cultural Resource Management Program, other tribes, and the State Historic Preservation Office on National Register of Historic Places eligibility recommendations (including traditional cultural properties like the South Mountains), project effects, and proposed mitigation and measures to minimize harm. This consultation has been ongoing and will continue until any commitments in a record of decision are completed.

The section entitled Title VI and Environmental Justice, beginning on page 4-29 in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement, presents acceptable methods, data, and assumptions to assess the potential for disproportionately high and adverse effects from the proposed action on environmental justice populations and disparate impacts to populations protected under Title VI. Based on the content of the section, no such effects would result from the action alternatives.

In light of comments received on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement, the above-referenced conclusions were confirmed in the preparation of the Final Environmental Impact Statement. To provide further clarity, the discussions of environmental justice and Title VI were separated and additional text explaining the relationship of environmental justice and Title VI to various environmental elements was added throughout Chapter 4, Affected Environment, Environmental Consequences, and Mitigation, as exemplified by the inserted text on page 4-29 of the Final Environmental Impact Statement.

The Arizona Department of Transportation and Federal Highway Administration identified several issues and concerns that were frequently noted by commenters. Responses to these issues can be found in the Responses to Frequently Submitted Public Comments beginning on page B733 of this appendix.

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. 

Sincerely,

Dr. Shana Siegel
136 8th Street
Brooklyn, NY 11215
The Federal Highway Administration and Arizona Department of Transportation have consulted with all interested agencies and Native American tribes. Consulting parties for this project include Federal Highway Administration, Arizona Department of Transportation, the Arizona State Historic Preservation Office, the Arizona State Land Department, the Arizona State Museum, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, the Bureau of Land Management, the Bureau of Indian Affairs, the Bureau of Reclamation, the Western Area Power Administration, the Salt River Project, the Maricopa County Department of Transportation, the Flood Control District of Maricopa County, the Roosevelt Irrigation District, the City of Avondale, the City of Chandler, the City of Glendale, the City of Phoenix, and the City of Tolleson. (See Draft Environmental Impact Statement pages 2-4 through 2-7, 4-133 through 4-145, 4-147, and 5-29 through 5-30.)

The Federal Highway Administration and Arizona Department of Transportation have consulted with the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation following National Historic Preservation Act Section 106 procedures. Strict adherence to Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act not only preceded the preparation and issuance of a Draft Environmental Impact Statement, but is ongoing and will continue in the future. The Draft and Final Environmental Impact Statements comply with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act. All Native American tribes with cultural affiliation (as claimed at that time) with the Study Area were consulted about the project in 2001. All Arizona tribes were consulted in 2005. In 2001, the Federal Highway Administration and Arizona Department of Transportation initiated National Historic Preservation Act Section 106 consultations with all Native American tribes that claimed cultural affiliation to the Study Area. Consultations were initiated with the Ak-Chin Indian Community, Gila River Indian Community, the Hopi Tribe, the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community, the Tohono O’odham Nation, the Yavapai-Apache Tribe, and the Yavapai-Prescott Indian Tribe.

In 2005, the Federal Highway Administration and Arizona Department of Transportation consulted with all Native American tribes in Arizona to ensure all interested Native American were included in the process and had the opportunity to communicate their concerns. These tribes were 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 Havasupai Tribe, the Hopi Tribe, the Hualapai Tribe, the Kaibab-Paute Tribe, the Navajo Nation, the Pascua 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-Apache Tribe, and the Yavapai-Prescott Indian Tribe. Most of these tribes did not express an interest in the proposed project.

The proposed South Mountain Freeway project meets requirements of the National Environmental policy Act, Section 4(f) of the Department of Transportation Act, the National Historic Preservation Act, the Archaeological Resource Protection Act, the Religious Freedom Restoration Act, the Religious Land Use and Institutionalized Persons Act, and the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples.

The reader is referred to Chapter 2, Gila River Indian Community Coordination, and Table 4-48, “Record of Section 106 Consultation”, on page 4-133, to illustrate the extensive outreach with Native American communities.
Ms. Ann Sierra  
Sincerely,

Please do not destroy any more of what Phoenix used to be. Are you planning on paving every piece of country there is? Your slogan should be PAVE EVERY PART OF NATURE WE CAN. Please help protect our communities, our health, and our environment by selecting the No Action Alternative. Thank you.

Sincerely,  
Ms. Ann Sierra
Unplanned growth is often termed “urban sprawl.” Generally, this term is used in the context of rapid and uncontrolled urban growth onto previously undeveloped land—usually on the outskirts of an existing urban area. Projects like the proposed freeway are often identified as contributors to urban sprawl. Freeway projects are often cited as making land at the urban fringe more accessible and, therefore, more attractive for development. However, examination of data comparing population and land use between 1975 and 2000 suggests major transportation projects like the proposed freeway do not induce growth in the region (see Final Environmental Impact Statement pages 4-170 through 4-174). The proposed action would be implemented in a historically quickly urbanizing area (most noticeably in the Western Section of the Study Area, although the nationwide recession which began in 2007 slowed growth). In the Eastern Section of the Study Area, the proposed freeway would abut public parkland, Native American land, and a near-fully developed area—therefore, any contribution to accelerated or induced growth would be constrained. The proposed freeway would be built in an area planned for urban growth as established in local jurisdictions’ land use plans for at least the last 25 years.
MR. SIIXI: Jiivik Siiki. Well, I'm from here. I was born and raised in the Gila River Indian community, and I'm 48 years old and I'm an enrolled member of the community. I also do a lot of the cultural work in the community. And the reason why I'm here is to oppose the freeway being placed not only on tribal land, but the desecration of this mountain, and in our language we call it Mohdahk. And so this mountain is one of the centers of our cultural knowledge. It's -- we still use it a lot today and I'll go into that. And so one of the -- I've always worked for the community, and in one of those jobs I had was as an environmental control, or also did hazmat for the fire department. And in the documents that I read, there's no information regarding safety and how the community will be protected. I know that the fire department has a hazmat team, and they also have limited response equipment, but primarily they depend on the Arizona Department of Emergency Management and the other mutual aid cities. So Ahwatukee or Phoenix Fire Department would have to be in coordination with the tribe's fire department on response should the freeway be placed on tribal land.

Alternatives

The proposed freeway would not use any Gila River Indian Community land.

Cultural Resources

The Arizona Department of Transportation and Federal Highway Administration identified several issues and concerns that were frequently noted by commenters. Responses to these issues can be found in the Responses to Frequently Submitted Public Comments beginning on page B733 of this appendix.

Hazardous Materials

Alternatives, Gila River Indian Community Alignment
And from what I heard and talked with some of the fire department crew at the fire station, they haven't received anything. So that needs to be justified, why the tribe isn't being involved in any of the negotiation or the discussion. Meaning, community members. Not talking about a limited number of people on a committee.

So my big concern is the lack of protection of community members and our land. I used to do a lot of response on I-10 with semis, and there's a lot of hazardous material coming through and that's pretty dangerous to everyone. So that's one of the jobs I had. Another job I had was, I was a preschool teacher in District 7 which is in the community, and it's in the area of 83rd Avenue and Baseline. And during the wintertime, a lot of kids would get sick from all the smog from Phoenix that came and sat in between South Mountain and Estrella Mountain and that's tribal land. It wasn't pollution that we created, but the kids, you know, of course, asthma and all of those ailments.

And, again, in the documentation I've seen, there's nothing specifying the health hazards and the effects that it will have on the community from this freeway. That needs to be included.
The Draft Environmental Impact Statement describes a decade-long consultation and coordination effort led by the Arizona Department of Transportation and the Federal Highway Administration with the Gila River Indian Community and other Native American tribes. As a result of the consultation, the cultural importance of the South Mountains is acknowledged in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement in several locations, notably page 5-26. The proposed project would accommodate and preserve (to the fullest extent possible from the available alternatives) access to the South Mountains for religious practices.

Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act requires a government-to-government relationship between the Federal Government and Indian tribes as described beginning on page 4-140 of the Final Environmental Impact Statement. Section 106 requires federal agencies take into account the effects of their undertakings on historic properties and requires consultation with tribal authorities. Consultation has occurred with Gila River Indian Community government officials, the Tribal Historic Preservation Officer, the Cultural Resource Management Program, other tribes, and the State Historic Preservation Office and has led to concurrence from the Gila River Indian Community Tribal Historic Preservation Office and the State Historic Preservation Office on National Register of Historic Places eligibility recommendations (including traditional cultural properties like the South Mountains), project effects, and proposed mitigation and measures to minimize harm. This consultation has been ongoing and will continue until any commitments in a record of decision are completed.

The section entitled Title VI and Environmental Justice, beginning on page 4-29 in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement, presents acceptable methods, data, and assumptions to assess the potential for disproportionately high and adverse effects from the proposed action on environmental justice populations and disparate impacts to populations protected under Title VI. Based on the content of the section, no such effects would result from the action alternatives.

In light of comments received on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement, the above-referenced conclusions were confirmed in the preparation of the Final Environmental Impact Statement. To provide further clarity, the discussions of environmental justice and Title VI were separated and additional text explaining the relationship of environmental justice and Title VI to various environmental elements was added throughout Chapter 4, Affected Environment, Environmental Consequences, and Mitigation, as exemplified by the inserted text on page 4-29 of the Final Environmental Impact Statement.
So, again, this freeway's the same thing. Nontribal people see supposedly empty land that doesn't have grass and cookie cutter homes and they think they can use it, but that's not going to happen anymore. We put a stop to the freeway on tribal land. We should be able to put a stop to desecrating the mountain which, again, is central to our culture.

Environmental racism again is a big factor. It needs to be -- we need to defend against it. The Civil Rights Act, again, we are protected under that and that's a federal law. It's not a tribal law. It's a federal law affecting everyone. And so that hasn't been included in the documentation that has been provided to anyone, and so I'd like that to be brought up.

Finally, I mentioned that I do a lot of culture work, and I'm not going to go into details as far as what I do, but South Mountain is central to what we do. Has a lot of teachings. It has its own song, it has its own prayers, it has its own connection to us, the story that we use today. Not only that, it has a -- as a runner, we do a lot of running even today from the east side of South Mountain to the west side. There's trails that we follow. And we also take our young people up there.
1 and show them what needs to be protected. This, 
2 again, is a big part of our culture. Especially 
3 during the winter time, we go up there a lot and 
4 teach them what it means, what the name of the 
5 mountain means, why we need to take care of it. 
6 And so all the running that we do in that 
7 mountain strengthens us, and we can't continue that 
8 if it keeps getting disrupted, you know, our culture 
9 continues to be disrupted, and we can't have that. I 
10 think that's all I have.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Biology, Plants, and Wildlife</td>
<td>The Arizona Department of Transportation and Federal Highway Administration identified several issues and concerns that were frequently noted by commenters. Responses to these issues can be found in the Responses to Frequently Submitted Public Comments beginning on page B733 of this appendix.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Neighborhoods/ Communities</td>
<td>While the E1 Alternative is adjacent to the largely residential areas of Ahwatukee Foothills Village (to the north), a freeway has been planned in this location for many years (see Final Environmental Impact Statement pages 4-17 and 4-21). Where existing residential uses are adjacent to the proposed freeway, noise mitigation would be implemented according to Arizona Department of Transportation policy (see Final Environmental Impact Statement page 4-91).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Purpose and Need, Old Plan or Use of Old Data</td>
<td>The Arizona Department of Transportation and Federal Highway Administration identified several issues and concerns that were frequently noted by commenters. Responses to these issues can be found in the Responses to Frequently Submitted Public Comments beginning on page B733 of this appendix.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Purpose and Need</td>
<td>The proposed project is part of the Regional Transportation Plan for the Maricopa Association of Governments region. In 2004, the voters of Maricopa County approved the Regional Transportation Plan and the extension of a half-cent sales tax to fund its projects. The funding for the right-of-way acquisition and construction of the proposed project would come from a combination of federal (National Highway Performance Program) and County (half-cent sales tax, also known as Regional Area Road Funds) sources. Use of these funds for construction of the proposed freeway would not affect available funds for statewide projects nor would not constructing this facility make available additional funds for other statewide projects.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From: Projects
To: ADOT
Subject: FW: Loop 202 South Mountain
Date: Monday, July 15, 2013 11:55:36 AM
Attachments: image001.png

Thank you,
Matthew Eberhart
Community Relations Officer
1655 W Jackson St. MD 126F
Phoenix, AZ 85007
602-712-2060
azdot.gov

From: Michael Silver [mailto:Michael.Silver@asu.edu]
Sent: Monday, July 15, 2013 11:52 AM
To: Projects
Subject: Loop 202 South Mountain

There is ample evidence that the Environmental Impact Study conducted for the extension of the loop 202 is both incomplete and misleading (i.e., biased toward its support of the current build option). This freeway project is both disruptive to the ecology and economy of the Ahwatukee Foothills and damaging to the overall quality of life for more than 100,000 nearby residents. What was true 30 years ago, when the project was first proposed, is no longer valid. I strongly oppose the departments pursuit of this project when, in fact, the resources it would command could be expended in a more suitable and beneficial manner.

Michael Silver
Phoenix
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Comment Document</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**TELEPHONE CONVERSATION RECORD**  
**SOUTH MOUNTAIN FREEWAY INFORMATION LINE**

- **DATE:** 5/15/13  
- **TIME:** 8:02 PM  
- **CALLER:** TONY SIMMONS  
- **CALLER ADDRESS:** 4901 W. FRIEND STREET, CHANDLER, AZ 85226  
- **PHONE:** 480-705-9281  
- **EMAIL:**  

**CALLER REMARKS/QUESTIONS:**  
I support of South Mountain Freeway.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Comment noted.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
From: Simon, Harvey B., M.D. [mailto:HSIMON@PARTNERS.ORG]
Sent: Tuesday, June 25, 2013 3:12 PM
To: Projects
Subject: Route 202

I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the proposed extension of Route 202. Like many other Phoenix residents, I support the road for its ability to facilitate travel to remote parts of the Valley and for its role in easing vehicular congestion. As a resident of Ahwatukee, I am also concerned about the extension’s potential impact on our community. I urge you to make every effort to preserve the architecture, quiet streets, and especially the small lakes in the region. I believe this is of great importance for both the quality of life and for our property values.

Thank you.

Harvey B. Simon
16013 S Desert Foothills Parkway

The information in this e-mail is intended only for the person to whom it is addressed. If you believe this e-mail was sent to you in error and the e-mail contains patient information, please contact the Partners Compliance HelpLine at http://www.partners.org/complianceline. If the e-mail was sent to you in error but does not contain patient information, please contact the sender and properly dispose of the e-mail.

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.

1

Comment noted.
From: Projects
To: ADOT
Subject: FW: South Mountain Freeway.
Date: Thursday, May 23, 2013 12:57:00 PM

From: JSimons4109@aol.com [mailto:JSimons4109@aol.com]
Sent: Thursday, May 23, 2013 11:56 AM
To: Projects
Subject: South Mountain Freeway.

I would to tell ADOT that myself and my wife are OPPOSED to the building of the freeway if it is located on what is now Pecos Parkway. There are better options including an I-8 to I-10 connector or the Gila river alignment. The highway plan is now 25 years out of date. The city of Phoenix, unlike Chandler and Gilbert did not set aside the land and has allowed both private and public improvements on what should be city easements. The building of this freeway will increase pollution to the immediate area as well as cause a drop in property values. I urge ADOT to stop the consideration of the Pecos parkway alignment until a better alternative is found.

Thank you for your consideration

James and Carolyn Simons

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.
Thank you,
Matthew Eberhart
Community Relations Officer
1655 W Jackson St. MD 126F
Phoenix, AZ 85007
602-712-2060
azdot.gov

From: Mike Simonton [mailto:msimonton@cox.net]
Sent: Sunday, June 30, 2013 10:44 AM
To: Projects
Subject: South Mountain 202 Freeway Comment

South Mountain Study Team,

I am a Chandler resident that works at 43rd Ave. and Van Buren in Phoenix. Most times the I-10 or I-101 to I-10 routes to the west side of town are too congested to consider taking. I predominantly take the beltline route across the reservation to access 51st Avenue in Laveen to and from work. I have occasionally checked into the status of this the South Mountain 202 Freeway project over the last 7 or so years. It seems to me that this project was contemplated and I thought even funded in the 80’s. It is apparent that the need and desire of metro Phoenix area for this project is self-evident; however, I believe the State’s transportation engineers and planners have a much more sound and analytical handle on this need than my general presumption. I understand there are a multitude of competing interests and significant obstacles that have presented themselves since the project’s origins, but I implore you as a concerned citizen, desperate commuter, and commentor in this public process to please diligently and expeditiously work through all issues to get this freeway built. I understand that obstacles are presented by homeowners and businesses in the Ahwatukee area that built up and settled in after this freeway was originally planned. Conversely, there are people like myself that moved to the Chandler area 7 years ago with eager anticipation that this freeway would come to fruition in a timely manner as was indicated on the ADOT website. Having experience in conducting sensitive public processes myself, I empathize with the challenges you are facing, however, this project is long overdue for shovels hitting dirt. It seems like no option makes a majority happy, in fact, your most successful outcome is likely if everyone is just a little unhappy. Simply put, my comment in this process is to build it. Build it now! I appreciate the hard work and diligence ADOT has put into this effort for years to satisfy as many competing interests as possible. Unfortunately, regardless of anyone’s best efforts there will be disgruntled parties. For the benefit of the metro Phoenix area, this project must move forward as expeditiously as possible. Thank you for the opportunity to provide this comment.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Comment Document</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mike Smorton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30+ Year Arizona Resident</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7 Year Chandler Resident</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14 Year Frustrated Commuter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>124 W. Oriole Way</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chandler, AZ 85286</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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.
I believe this project would be great for the valley and would reduce in-town traffic and commute times.

Joel Simpson

Comment noted.
which had its own issues with highways, into Laveen, where when I bought my house, this highway was one of the reasons we bought, not knowing it would take this long to even be at this point. We've since relocated from Laveen; one of the reasons is due to the issues getting to and from. We had two kids, one with special needs, and getting in and out of Laveen became very difficult up in that 51st Avenue with truck traffic, getting to the I-10, getting to Central Phoenix through the tunnel and that sort of thing, so we actually sold our home and relocated. Knowing that it's going to be built is kind of bittersweet in the fact that if we still had our house there I think it would be a huge benefit. And I believe it's going to bring a lot of businesses and revenues to Laveen; particularly, when we left there was a Target that may have been put in and some movie theaters and such, which never came about because it was just stagnant. So I'd like to say I'd like to approve the build. Thank you.

THE FACILITATOR: Thank you.

MR. SIMPSON: Hello, Joel Simpson here. I've been a resident of the Valley for about 14 years now and I've had the displeasure of driving the I-10 for the same amount, and the traffic, you can definitely tell where

Driver and Nix Court Reporters - (602) 266-6525 www.drivernix.com

(Comment codes begin on next page)
the stops are, as everybody's -- all the traffic, the semi-trucks are coming from the west, California or wherever, and it all kind of bottlenecks at about 75th and doesn't clean up until about past the I-10 truck route, which is about 27th or whatever Avenue, so I can definitely see a need for this, and I'd like to see it happen, just because I'm stuck in my house out in the West Valley and have to commute to the East Valley, so that's all I have to say. Thank you.

THE FACILITATOR: Thank you.

MR. LINES: Hello. Are you ready for me? I don't think I have three minutes' worth of stuff to say, but I just want to come down and put in my two cents' worth. My name is Wes Lines and I live in Laveen, I live at 51st Avenue, and I have seen -- I've lived there since 2001 and I have seen the traffic along 51st Avenue increase and increase and increase the whole time going south onto the Indian reservation and into the town of Komatke, and the road is completely overburdened and overwhelmed.

It's a county farm road, it doesn't have sidewalks or anything like that. That road is being used as a highway for people to go all the way to Tucson. You see people hitchhiking along with signs that say all the
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Issue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Section 4(f) and Section 6(f)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Arizona Department of Transportation and Federal Highway Administration identified several issues and concerns that were frequently noted by commenters. Responses to these issues can be found in the Responses to Frequently Submitted Public Comments beginning on page B733 of this appendix.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Issue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Cultural Resources</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

From: Kay [mailto:azlady13@hotmail.com]
Sent: Sunday, July 21, 2013 7:50 PM
To: Projects
Subject: South Mountain Freeway

Please do NOT put a freeway through the mountain. You can never get back what is lost. Please go listen to Big Yellow Taxi. This desert has already been destroyed. Don’t destroy this sacred mountain. I wouldn’t want it destroyed if it wasn’t sacred. The people who work or live on the south side of the mountain knew it was there when they moved there or took the job. They should either move or change jobs if they don’t want to drive around what was always there. Don’t tear down the mountain and put up a ‘parking lot’.
Kay Simpson
602-513-6963

Confidentiality and Nondisclosure Notice: This email transmission and any attachments are intended for use by the party(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.
TELEPHONE CONVERSATION RECORD
SOUTH MOUNTAIN FREEWAY INFORMATION LINE

INCOMING CALL
DATE: 5/15/13
TIME: 5:38 PM
CALLER: SHAWN SINGLETON
CALLER ADDRESS: 4909 W. BEHREND DRIVE, GLENDALE, AZ 85308
PHONE: EMAIL:

CALLER REMARKS/QUESTIONS:
I do support the extension of the 202 South Mountain Freeway to the 10 in the west valley. It would be great for the community and reduce traffic. Thank you.

1

Comment noted.
### TELEPHONE CONVERSATION RECORD
#### SOUTH MOUNTAIN FREEWAY INFORMATION LINE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>TIME</th>
<th>CALLER</th>
<th>CALLER ADDRESS</th>
<th>PHONE</th>
<th>EMAIL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6/10/13</td>
<td>11:21 AM</td>
<td>AVA SIWEK</td>
<td>6034 N. 33RD STREET, PARADISE VALLEY, ARIZONA 85253</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CALLER REMARKS/QUESTIONS:**

Yes, I am in support of the South Mountain freeway. I think it's an excellent idea, and it's time to do that now before things continue to get more crowded. And I think it's great idea for growth of our city and for economic growth. It follows the population growth that's happening. I think it's a smart move and I'm all for it. I think it's awesome that Phoenix is being progressive and staying ahead of the curve. I think it's great, so congratulations on letting our city grow in the correct direction.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Comment noted.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Why does Pecos Road need to be changed into a freeway/interstate? Grand Avenue works just fine as it is. If Laveen wants an interstate through their community fine. The simple solution would be to build the freeway through Laveen as planned, connecting it to Pecos road and leave Pecos Road as is. No homes will need to be torn down, no mountains need to be destroyed, no damage to the environment. Then lets just see how much the South Mountain Loop 202 is used.

### Alternatives, E1

1. **Alternatives, E1**
   - **Alternative**
   - The Arizona Department of Transportation and Federal Highway Administration identified several issues and concerns that were frequently noted by commenters. Responses to these issues can be found in the Responses to Frequently Submitted Public Comments beginning on page B733 of this appendix.

2. **Alternatives**
   - According to 23 Code of Federal Regulations §771.111(f), "the action evaluated in the environmental impact statement must connect logical termini and be of sufficient length to address environmental matters on a broad scope." The proposed action should satisfy the project need and should be considered in the context of the local area socioeconomics and topography, the future travel demand, and other infrastructure improvements in the area. A partial freeway from Interstate 10 (Papago Freeway) to Laveen Village is not feasible because it would not meet the proposed freeway’s identified purpose and need.

3. **Neighborhoods/Communities**
   - Prospective home buyers and members of the church built after the freeway was conceived, according to State law, should have been informed of the proposed facility. (Sellers are obligated by Arizona common law to disclose all known material facts about a property to the buyer.)

4. **Section 4(f) and Section 6(f)**
   - The Arizona Department of Transportation and Federal Highway Administration identified several issues and concerns that were frequently noted by commenters. Responses to these issues can be found in the Responses to Frequently Submitted Public Comments beginning on page B733 of this appendix.

5. **Biology, Plants, and Wildlife**
**Comment Response Appendix**

1. **Design**
   
   In response to lower-than-anticipated sales tax revenues, beginning in 2008, the Maricopa Association of Governments began evaluating methods of cutting project costs while still delivering the major elements of the Regional Transportation Plan. Through the process described on Final Environmental Impact Statement page 3-19, and beginning in 2008, the Arizona Department of Transportation responded with the lane reduction and constrained right-of-way. These design changes were made public shortly thereafter and have been known for several years.

2. **Acquisitions and Relocations**
   
   The Arizona Department of Transportation and Federal Highway Administration identified several issues and concerns that were frequently noted by commenters. Responses to these issues can be found in the Responses to Frequently Submitted Public Comments beginning on page B733 of this appendix.

3. **Noise**
   
   Noise walls would range in height from 8 feet to 20 feet tall in the Ahwatukee Foothills area. As mentioned in the sidebar on page 4-91, the Final Environmental Impact Statement is based on preliminary design and traffic information. As the design progresses to the Final Design phase, noise barrier locations and heights will be refined and finalized. During Final Design, more detailed information on the location, actual height, and distance from the property line of each noise barrier will become available.

---

MS. SLAPKE: I just got a wake-up call. They never told us that when they changed the alignment from ten lanes to eight, that our house was no longer in line of demolition. We were never notified. We would have gotten out five, ten years ago when they changed that, but none of the homeowners, I know for a fact, none of us know this because I know everybody on our entire street. We weren't notified.

So here I sit and now I'm going to have a wall right behind my house when we were anticipating, okay, ADOT's going to have to buy our house. We'll sit tight. There's nothing we can do. We've lost all the value in our home, but at least we know ADOT's going to buy our home. I just found out, guess what, we're screwed. So put that into writing.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Comment Document</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>I don't know how to put it. We were never notified that our house was no longer in the line of demolition. And so what's ADOT's recourse to those of us homeowners who all these years had thought that our home was going to be purchased by ADOT because we couldn't sell them. And now all of the sudden, we're not in the alignment anymore, our house is not going to be bought by ADOT, and I'm faced with a house that's going to be worthless. And if they had told us, given us a written statement, something that notified us, your home is not in the line of demolition anymore, you know, we would have taken action at that time. Either get out somehow, and now we've lost all of that in our home and we have to move. Now what do I do? We've been in limbo for years, but we were reassured, just sit tight, the freeway goes through, it's no big deal because they're going to have to take our house. At least we'll be able to get out and be recouped. Now we lost everything, everything. I don't know what we're going to do. My name is Erica Slapke, 3119 East Redwood Court in Phoenix, 85048.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>MR. ROSE: My name's Scott Rose, R-o-s-e,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Acquisitions and Relocations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Agencies may acquire only those properties located entirely or partly within the project right-of-way limits (see Final Environmental Impact Statement page 4-45).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Economics, Socioeconomics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>A review of the literature reveals few detailed and comprehensive analyses of the relationship between the transportation infrastructure and residential property values (Transportation Research Record: Journal of the Transportation Research Board, No. 2174, Transportation Research Board of the National Academies, Washington, D.C., 2010, pp. 138 -47; “Impact of Highways on Property Values: Case Study of the Superstition Freeway Corridor”). A recent study by the California Department of Transportation concluded that freeway facilities did not substantially affect sales prices in residential areas adjacent to the facility. The study concluded that it is the visibility of the freeway that may influence selling price and not distance or noise. As a result, the researchers generally concluded that the more the visibility of a new freeway is reduced, the less it would determine the sales price of homes sold in the area.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Comment Response Appendix**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Comment Document</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
|      | **TELEPHONE CONVERSATION RECORD**  
      | SOUTH MOUNTAIN FREEWAY INFORMATION LINE |
|      | **INCOMING CALL**  
      | DATE: 7/23/13  
      | TIME: 2:12 PM  
      | CALLER: NANCY SLAWN  
      | CALLER ADDRESS: 2702 EAST MICHIGAN AVENUE, PHOENIX, AZ  
      | PHONE: EMAIL: |
|      | **CALLER REMARKS/QUESTIONS:**  
<pre><code>  | I am for the freeway, thank you, we need it. |
</code></pre>
<p>| 1    | | Comment noted. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Comment noted.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From: Projects  
To: ADOT  
Subject: FW: Build the South Mountain Freeway  
Date: Tuesday, May 14, 2013 9:39:17 AM

-----Original Message-----
From: Ed [mailto:edaz04@yahoo.com]
Sent: Saturday, May 11, 2013 3:04 AM
To: Projects
Cc: info@buildthe202.com; kathleenski@yahoo.com
Subject: Build the South Mountain Freeway

As a resident of the great state of Arizona I implore you to adhere to the citizens multiple requests to build the loop 202.

Enough with the delays. With all of the benefits this freeway provides it should have been built a decade ago!

It is time to move this project forward at last.

Ed Smith  
Laveen, Az

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/confidential 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.
From: Tracy Smith [mailto:tracyb19@aim.com]
Sent: Friday, May 17, 2013 8:37 AM
To: Projects
Subject: Southmountain Freeway

I am not able to make the public hearing but I would like to show my support of it. I live in Laveen where this freeway would provide so much for our community. I live close to 51st Ave (the main drive to the casinos). There is so much traffic that speeds through our quaint community. We need this freeway to alleviate that congestion.

We need more accessibility; we need more medical facilities, we need MORE!

Please get this going. When I moved to Laveen 10 years ago, we were told it is on the way. When I was in high school in Ahwatukee, my family was told, it is coming... Why so long? Get it moving!

Thank you for your time.

Tracy Smith
6114 S 46th Ave
Laveen

Confidentiality and Nondisclosure Notice: This email transmission and any attachments are intended for use by the persons/entitie(s) 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Comment noted.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
From: Todd W. Smith [mailto:twsmith23@gmail.com]
Sent: Friday, April 26, 2013 1:14 PM
To: Projects
Subject: South Mountain 202

Hello,

I am writing to express my support for the approval and funding of the South Mountain 202. The freeway is a vital part of Laveen, Ahwatukee, and the entire SW Valley going forward.

There are many reasons for my support of the freeway. The first and simplest reason is for traffic alone. I live in Laveen and work in Chandler, at the intersection of I-10 and Chandler Blvd. And though I will probably be long gone from either my home or work by the time the freeway is finished, it will save thousands of hours on commuting for thousands of people in the future.

The second reason is for development in Laveen. It's no secret that Laveen has struggled mightily since the housing crash in 2008. Laveen was promised to many as 'The next Ahwatukee' when the many housing developments started popping up in the mid-2000's. Since the housing crash, it's been virtually untouched by development, and mostly ignored by the City of Phoenix. It has finally started to turn things around in the last year, with new businesses coming in and being very successful (Jersey Mike's, Barro's, etc.). Laveen needs more businesses and more development. There are several projects already in the works and ready to go at the first word that the freeway has been approved. See this proposed development at 59th Ave and Baseline as an example (and note the hospital pad as well).

Lastly, it's an important part to the overall infrastructure of the entire Valley. It is a freeway that has been proposed and on the books since 1985. That's almost 30 years! Meanwhile we've seen the development and building of the 303 (an area not at all vital to commuters or truck routes), the 153 (which subsequently was shut down and turned into a city street), an on/off ramp for a street that doesn't exist (46th St and the 101 - which has been 'temporarily closed' for four years because there isn't actually a street there), and countless other highways and roads built that will not be as important to the city as the South Mountain 202.

It is time we stop ignoring and pushing back this freeway. The longer you wait to approve and build it, the harder and more expensive it will, and the easier it will be to come up with excuses not to do it. The time is now.

Thank you,

Todd W. Smith
Laveen Resident

Comment noted.

1
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Comment noted.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From: Kathleen Smith [mailto:kathleenski@yahoo.com]
Sent: Friday, May 17, 2013 4:10 PM
To: Projects
Subject:

I would really like to see the South Mountain Freeway (FINALLY) be built. I've lived in the valley for 16 years and it's been talked about for that long. Also, it's been approved for almost as long. I'm not sure what the delay is. We already know about all the benefits we would encounter from this. Are there disadvantages that outweigh the advantages??? Please, let's get the ball rolling on this project!

Kathleen Smith
I live in Laveen. I work in Tempe. That is not only my story, but the story of the majority of people that live in Laveen. We all drive 30-40 minutes minimum to get to work every day. The only way we have to get to work is via city streets that are littered with stoplights. I sit idle in traffic that is stop and go. My husband works in South Chandler. He does the same thing. I dream of a day where my husband can take the 202 freeway and be at work in a matter of minutes. I dream of a day where I won’t have to sit on Baseline Rd as long, because much of the west to east traffic will be diverted to the 202.

I work with many people that live in the West Valley (Avondale, Goodyear, Glendale). They drive to Tempe via I10. Actually, anyone that lives in the West Valley and works in Central, or South Phoenix, or the East Valley, sits in traffic on the I10 every day. Or what about those that live in the East Valley/Chandler and work downtown? The are stuck in traffic on the I10 as well, only the other direction. This sitting is wasting hours of our lives every day. It is wasting vehicle emissions that are expended by idle cars, or cars that take much longer to get to their destination than necessary. All of this wastes hours of people’s lives, wastes extra gas and causes more pollution. This city is not shrinking, it is growing. This traffic problem on the I10 will only get worse. Laveen is also not shrinking; it is still growing. Additional home construction is taking place in multiple areas of Laveen right now. Laveen is going to grow and there will be even more vehicles sitting on city streets, wasting idle gasoline and causing additional pollution. We need a better way to transport ourselves and goods through the south part of Phoenix. Every time there is a major accident on the I10, or the I17, traffic almost always gets diverted to south to Laveen. This causes extreme commute times and extreme amounts of traffic. Why? Because the I10 is already too congested. This affects us in Laveen, but also affects ANYONE travelling to work on the I10. We need this freeway!

With this freeway comes additional jobs. Not just the obvious construction jobs, but the economic growth that would include the addition of future office buildings, corporate office, even a hospital. If I had the chance to have a job in Laveen, I wouldn’t even need to really commute. Imagine if a lot of people in Laveen had the chance to work in Laveen. Those same cars would be cutting down on pollution even more. Our local economy cannot grow properly without the 202. I can assure you, it WILL grow. Laveen will get larger, as will all of Phoenix. We can either make this a better, more environmentally friendly place to live, by building the 202, or we can stay with what we have and only increase the amount of cars commuting, stuck in traffic, sitting idle, and causing pollution.

Please, I’m beggin you, build the 202!!!!
While it would be more convenient for a connection around the southwest side of South Mountain for accessing work in the Capitol District of Phoenix, the negative impact of a freeway extension of the 202 would not be worth it. It seems to make little sense to put a large freeway through a residential area prized for the serenity and mountain views when I-10 exists for the very traffic that the freeway would aim to redirect. The I-10 freeway is surrounded by business and industry which relies on those trucks coming through and isn’t disrupted by them coming through. On the other hand, bringing the freeway and that type of traffic through Ahwatukee would absolutely ruin the village for all the reasons that people want to be here and invest in properties here. Currently, we are planning to purchase a home in Ahwatukee where we have already become established with our family since moving here. We came here for the peace, the mountains and the sense that it is a secret treasure of Phoenix with great schools and community. However, we have already had to hold off on choosing from homes we really like because of the threat of this freeway being right in the backyard. A wall does NOT solve the problem this will create. We are willing to continue putting up with the busy commute if it means keeping the blessings that exist in Ahwatukee undisturbed. This proposal is economically a horrible idea that will drive away the people that have come here to invest their families in this village.

1. **Neighborhoods/Communities**
   - While the E1 Alternative is adjacent to the largely residential areas of Ahwatukee Foothills Village (to the north), a freeway has been planned in this location for many years (see Final Environmental Impact Statement pages 4-17 and 4-21). Where existing residential uses are adjacent to the proposed freeway, noise mitigation would be implemented according to Arizona Department of Transportation policy (see Final Environmental Impact Statement page 4-91).

2. **Economics, Socioeconomics**
   - There is no evidence that the proposed facility would cause people to leave the area. The regions’ benefits would remain, and improved access to residences and businesses would make them more desirable.
Hello,

I am a resident and live off of Liberty and 15th street in Phoenix. I do not support the freeway plan as it stands, being built along Pecos Road. The impact on home values, schools, safety and quality of life would be immeasurable. No study can tell us the damage it will do. Please consider an alternate route south on the Gila reservation or Riggs Road. Do not build on Pecos.

Thank you,

Lisa Smith

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Comment Document</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Economics, Socioeconomics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Health Effects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Hazardous Materials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Neighborhoods/ Communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Alternatives, Gila River Indian Community Alignment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Alternatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Alternatives, E1 Alternative</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A review of the literature reveals few detailed and comprehensive analyses of the relationship between the transportation infrastructure and residential property values (Transportation Research Record: Journal of the Transportation Research Board, No. 2174, Transportation Research Board of the National Academies, Washington, D.C., 2010, pp. 138–47; “Impact of Highways on Property Values: Case Study of the Superstition Freeway Corridor”). A recent study by the California Department of Transportation concluded that freeway facilities did not substantially affect sales prices in residential areas adjacent to the facility. The study concluded that it is the visibility of the freeway that may influence selling price and not distance or noise. As a result, the researchers generally concluded that the more the visibility of a new freeway is reduced, the less it would determine the sales price of homes sold in the area.

The Arizona Department of Transportation and Federal Highway Administration identified several issues and concerns that were frequently noted by commenters. Responses to these issues can be found in the Responses to Frequently Submitted Public Comments beginning on page B733 of this appendix.

While the E1 Alternative is adjacent to the largely residential areas of Ahwatukee Foothills Village (to the north), a freeway has been planned in this location for many years (see Final Environmental Impact Statement pages 4-17 and 4-21). Where existing residential uses are adjacent to the proposed freeway, noise mitigation would be implemented according to Arizona Department of Transportation policy (see Final Environmental Impact Statement page 4-91).

The Arizona Department of Transportation and Federal Highway Administration identified several issues and concerns that were frequently noted by commenters. Responses to these issues can be found in the Responses to Frequently Submitted Public Comments beginning on page B733 of this appendix.

A Riggs Road Alternative was considered. It would replace 51st Avenue south of its connection to Interstate 10 (Papago Freeway) for approximately 21 miles. It would then replace approximately 4 miles of Belview Road in an easterly direction. At the Riggs Road/State Route 347 intersection, the alternative would replace approximately 3 miles of Riggs Road before connecting to Interstate 10 (Maricopa Freeway) (see Final Environmental Impact Statement page 3-9). While the Riggs Road Alternative would serve regional mobility needs, particularly of those living in the Maricopa area, meeting this travel demand would not address specific planning goals for an integrated regional transportation network. The Regional Transportation Plan identifies the proposed South Mountain Freeway as a critical link in the Regional Freeway and Highway System. The Riggs Road Alternative would not complete the Phoenix metropolitan area’s loop system as part of State Route 202, thereby causing substantial out-of-direction travel for motorists. Therefore, the Riggs Road Alternative would not meet the project’s purpose and need criteria and was eliminated from further study.

In addition, nearly two-thirds of any alternative using Riggs Road would be on Gila River Indian Community land. Tribal sovereignty is based in the inherent authority of Native American tribes to govern themselves. While this notion of sovereignty is manifested in many areas, generally Native American land is held in trust by the United States. Native American communities have the authority to regulate land uses and activities on their lands. States have very limited authority over activities within tribal land (see page 2-1 of the Final Environmental Impact Statement). From a practical standpoint, this means that the Arizona Department of Transportation and Federal Highway Administration do not have the authority to survey tribal land, make land use (including transportation) determinations directly affecting tribal land, or condemn tribal land for public benefit through an eminent domain process.
This environmental impact draft study doesn't seem to think that it will worsen the air quality on the sensor that's on 43rd Avenue, which will be two to three miles away from this construction. So it really needs to be understood that it could risk Arizona losing its federal funds. And then the City and our citizens will have to pay the bill. This could turn into one of the more expensive highways. And I think a separate study of that impact is very, very important before we go to the final phase of the environmental study.

So thank you very much for your time. I appreciate the opportunity to comment.

MR. SMITH: They've already spent a lot of money studying this thing, right? And they might as well finish the project or a lot of people's work has been wasted already.

And as far as alignments go, I think, even though the one that's more expensive, that would link up to the 101, is probably a better option in the long run, even though it looks like it might be more expensive now. I don't think I have anything else to say.

MR. STROOP: Well, I just wanted to say that I am a Laveen resident and that I am for the proposal to build the freeway in any of the capacities that I saw today. I don't really have a preference on an alternative, but I would prefer it to get built as soon as possible.

MR. ALLEN: I don't know what ADOT's plans for...
1 that you register. Thank you.
2 Another reminder, if anyone wishes to speak,
3 please make sure that you register at the front desk.
4 Your name will appear on the screen and we will call you
5 in the order that you registered.
6 Todd Smith.
7 Mr. Smith, you have three minutes, here's your
8 timer. Please begin.
9 MR. SMITH: Thank you. I'm sure you’ve heard
10 many different versions of pretty much the same speech
11 today. I'm here in support of the 202. There are many,
12 many reasons I believe it should be built, not the least
13 of which is I live on 51st Avenue and Baseline, I work at
14 I-10 and Chandler Boulevard. Just like the last
15 gentlemen and the woman before him, I'm on Baseline for
16 12 miles every day; makes me want to gouge my eyeballs
17 out. It would cut my commute time in half or probably
18 more to do that.
19 Beyond just the selfish reasons of the commute,
20 look at what happened to Gilbert with the San Tan 202.
21 There was nothing out there. They approved the freeway,
22 they built it up, developments everywhere. Same thing is
23 going to happen in Laveen, and if you guys are from
24 Laveen or have been to Laveen, we desperately need things
25 like shopping and restaurants and hospitals. There's
already a planned shopping center with restaurants,
shopping and a hospital on 59th Avenue and Baseline,
literally just waiting for the approval of the 202;
doesn't need to be started, doesn't need to be built, it
gets approved, they start working on this development.

Other things -- excuse me. It's not often you
get the opportunity to build something that will not only
benefit the people that will use the 202, but the people
that won't use the 202. There are thousands of commuters
every day that will never use the 202, but they're using
the 10 that'll get the benefit of that 202 because of
less cars on that. So you're not only benefitting the
people that are going to be using it, but people that
won't be using it get the same benefit we're going to
get.

I'm 32 years old, this freeway, just like the
last gentleman spoke about, was approved when I was four
year old; 1985. It was approved again in 2004. It's
been approved twice, this will be the third time.
Phoenix is not getting any smaller at all, we all know
that it is just going to continue to grow and grow and
grow. This freeway has been in the plan before the 303,
like the last gentleman said, and many other projects in
the city, my personal favorite of which is the
interchange at Loop 101 and 64th Street in Scottsdale
they built five years ago to a street that literally does not exist; it's an onramp interchange to a street that is not there and hasn't been there since they built it five years ago.

We're spending money on those projects when we could be spending money on the freeway that the Valley desperately, desperately needs. It's time to do it, and again, I'm just here to throw my support in, I think it's time to do this. Thank you.

THE FACILITATOR: Thank you, sir.

If there's anyone else in the auditorium that would like to speak, please register at the front desk. Your name will be called and be placed on the screen and we'll take you in the order in which you registered.

Also, a reminder for those of you who may be speaking and there's an opportunity that you will go beyond the three minutes, there are court reporters in the next room that will take your comments beyond the three minutes.

We're going to take a five-minute break as we change off panelists. We will return at exactly five minutes. Thank you.

(The proceeding was at recess from 6:02 p.m. to 6:07 p.m.)

THE FACILITATOR: Good evening, everybody.
PLEASE PLEASE PLEASE BUILD THE SOUTH MOUNTAIN FREEWAY EXTENSION. Building the South Mountain freeway is a necessary addition to the Valley of the Sun. It will make commutes between the East and West Valley very reasonable. It has the ability to positively affect the economy of Arizona. It will allow for positive growth of Arizona and the Phoenix metropolitan area. There are very few negatives about the freeway extension (South Mountain and South Mountain Park will still look beautiful and the freeway may just add to the number of visitors that traverse the park).

Matthew Smith

Comment noted.
Matthew Smith

I recommend the W59 Alternative as your favorite route. W71 in a distant second

Comment noted.
The Arizona Department of Transportation and Federal Highway Administration identified several issues and concerns that were frequently noted by commenters. Responses to these issues can be found in the Responses to Frequently Submitted Public Comments beginning on page B733 of this appendix.

Prospective home buyers and members of the church built after the freeway was conceived, according to State law, should have been informed of the proposed facility. (Sellers are obligated by Arizona common law to disclose all known material facts about a property to the buyer.)

While the E1 Alternative is adjacent to the largely residential areas of Ahwatukee Foothills Village (to the north), a freeway has been planned in this location for many years (see Final Environmental Impact Statement pages 4-17 and 4-21). Where existing residential uses are adjacent to the proposed freeway, noise mitigation would be implemented according to Arizona Department of Transportation policy (see Final Environmental Impact Statement page 4-91).

The Arizona Department of Transportation and Federal Highway Administration identified several issues and concerns that were frequently noted by commenters. Responses to these issues can be found in the Responses to Frequently Submitted Public Comments beginning on page B733 of this appendix.
No public vote was held as part of the Draft Environmental Impact Statement review process. Members of the public were encouraged to participate and submit their comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement during the 90-day comment period.

The proposed South Mountain Freeway has been a critical part of the Maricopa Association of Governments' Regional Freeway and Highway System since it was first included in funding approved by Maricopa County voters in 1985. It was also part of the Regional Transportation Plan funding passed by Maricopa County voters in 2004 through Proposition 400.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Comment Document</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**TELEPHONE CONVERSATION RECORD**  
**SOUTH MOUNTAIN FREEWAY INFORMATION LINE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>TIME</th>
<th>CALLER</th>
<th>ADDRESS</th>
<th>PHONE</th>
<th>EMAIL</th>
<th>CALLER REMARKS/QUESTIONS:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5/16/13</td>
<td>4:48 PM</td>
<td>RICK SMITH</td>
<td>4211 EAST SILVERWOOD DRIVE, PHOENIX, AZ 85048</td>
<td>480-759-1875</td>
<td></td>
<td>I do support the freeway.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Comment noted.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Arizona Department of Transportation and Federal Highway Administration identified several issues and concerns that were frequently noted by commenters. Responses to these issues can be found in the Responses to Frequently Submitted Public Comments beginning on page B733 of this appendix.

1 Alternatives, No-Action (No-Build) Alternative

The proposed freeway would cause more problems than it would solve. In addition, it would only provide short-term congestion relief. As is evident by our numerous clogged roads and freeways, many of which have recently been built or widened, building more roads is not the answer. ADOT needs to instead focus on planning for and investing in long-term transportation solutions, including mass transit. The only way to effectively reduce congestion and mobile people is by reducing the number of vehicles utilizing our roads, not by encouraging more to use them.

South Mountain Freeway would have incredible negative impacts on our communities. Despite what the DEIS claims, air quality in the region would worsen over time, increasing public health risks. As more vehicles fill the "uncongested" areas this freeway would temporarily provide, more pollution will be spewed into the air, exacerbating asthma, cancer, and other diseases.

The freeway would also negatively affect our environment. South Mountain Park is the largest city park in our nation. It was set aside to protect resources and to benefit our communities. By blading a freeway through a portion of this park, wildlife and habitat will be destroyed, movement corridors will be cut off, valuable public spaces will be lost, and more. This would set a terrible precedent by demolishing what should remain a protected area.

DISCONTINUE THE DESTRUCTION OF THE DESERT!
Phyllis M. Smith
Phoenix, AZ 85007

I grew up in South Phoenix and spent the majority of my life in and around the area. I can personally attest to the destructive nature of this proposed freeway project. Not only is it environmentally unsound, the path that it would take crosses directly over Native American tribal lands that hold significant meaning both spiritually and in the way of artifacts and historical sites. This project will, in no way, positively impact the traffic patterns of the South Phoenix Valley. It can only cause more gridlock, pollution and destruction of our beautiful South Mountain Preserve.

I am a former Soil Conservation Service employee and have worked the entire area and documented the facts that were previously stated for the USDA.

PHILOSOPHY, ARTS, CULTURE, SCIENCE, ENVIRONMENT, HEALTH, AND WILDLIFE

2 Cultural Resources

Although the region’s freeways are now congested during the peak travel period, conditions in 2035 without the proposed freeway would be substantially worse with more congested areas and congested conditions for longer periods of time (see Final Environmental Impact Statement pages 1-21 and 1-22). Congestion relief resulting from the proposed freeway would provide localized reductions of delays on arterial streets and at intersections. Reduced travel times would result in lower exposure to elevated concentrations of mobile source air toxics occurring in traffic. Other benefits of the proposed freeway in comparison to the No-Action Alternative are presented in Table 3-9 on page 3-38 of the Final Environmental Impact Statement.

3 Purpose and Need

The Arizona Department of Transportation and Federal Highway Administration identified several issues and concerns that were frequently noted by commenters. Responses to these issues can be found in the Responses to Frequently Submitted Public Comments beginning on page B733 of this appendix.

4 Air Quality

The Arizona Department of Transportation and Federal Highway Administration identified several issues and concerns that were frequently noted by commenters. Responses to these issues can be found in the Responses to Frequently Submitted Public Comments beginning on page B733 of this appendix.

4 Section 4(f) and Section 6(f)

Federal regulations stipulate that an environmental impact statement shall "rigorously explore and objectively evaluate all reasonable alternatives" (40 Code of Federal Regulations § 1502.14; see Final Environmental Impact Statement page 3-1). All alternatives were screened using a multidisciplinary set of criteria. Nonfreeway alternatives were considered (see Final Environmental Impact Statement pages 3-3 through 3-6). Among other things, the study took into account improving existing freeways, improving or expanding other travel modes, strategies to reduce travel demand, and various roadway configurations. This study examined not only the potential impacts from improvements, but also the consequences of building nothing, the No-Action Alternative. As proposed by the Maricopa Association of Governments, the South Mountain Freeway would be part of the Regional Freeway and Highway System. Other transportation improvements such as mass transit and local roads are specified in the Regional Transportation Plan and were considered during the evaluation of this proposed new freeway.

6 Alternatives

The freeway would also negatively affect our environment. South Mountain Park is the largest city park in our nation. It was set aside to protect resources and to benefit our communities. By blading a freeway through a portion of this park, wildlife and habitat will be destroyed, movement corridors will be cut off, valuable public spaces will be lost, and more. This would set a terrible precedent by demolishing what should remain a protected area.

7 Health Effects

The region's freeways are now congested during the peak travel period, conditions in 2035 without the proposed freeway would be substantially worse with more congested areas and congested conditions for longer periods of time (see Final Environmental Impact Statement pages 1-21 and 1-22). Congestion relief resulting from the proposed freeway would provide localized reductions of delays on arterial streets and at intersections. Reduced travel times would result in lower exposure to elevated concentrations of mobile source air toxics occurring in traffic. Other benefits of the proposed freeway in comparison to the No-Action Alternative are presented in Table 3-9 on page 3-38 of the Final Environmental Impact Statement.

8 Biology, Plants, and Wildlife
The freeway will also exacerbate urban sprawl and further burden Arizona’s taxpayers. Its construction would continue ADOT’s trend of forcing residents to remain vehicle-dependent while paying for infrastructure so that others can live farther and farther from a city center.

Please help protect our communities, our health, and our environment by selecting the No Action Alternative. Thank you.

Sincerely,
Ms. Phyllis Smith
914 Paso Dr
Lake Havasu City, AZ 86406-8216

Unplanned growth is often termed “urban sprawl.” Generally, this term is used in the context of rapid and uncontrolled urban growth onto previously undeveloped land—usually on the outskirts of an existing urban area. Projects like the proposed freeway are often identified as contributors to urban sprawl. Freeway projects are often cited as making land at the urban fringe more accessible and, therefore, more attractive for development. However, examination of data comparing population and land use between 1975 and 2000 suggests major transportation projects like the proposed freeway do not induce growth in the region (see Final Environmental Impact Statement pages 4-170 through 4-174). The proposed freeway would be implemented in a historically quickly urbanizing area (most noticeably in the Western Section of the Study Area, although the nationwide recession which began in 2007 slowed growth). In the Eastern Section of the Study Area, the proposed freeway would abut public parkland, Native American land, and a near-fully developed area—therefore, any contribution to accelerated or induced growth would be constrained. The proposed freeway would be built in an area planned for urban growth as established in local jurisdictions’ land use plans for at least the last 25 years.
Thank you,
Matthew Eberhart
Community Relations Officer
1655 W Jackson St. MD 126F
Phoenix, AZ 85007
602-712-2060
azdot.gov

From: Sandra Smith [mailto:SSmith@aamaz.com]
Sent: Tuesday, July 23, 2013 3:40 PM
To: Barbara Russell; Projects
Cc: SMF@aol.com
Subject: RE: Draft Environmental Impact Study for the South Mountain Freeway

Wonderful email - thank you Zacc and Barbara.
Please be advised that I have also forwarded to the Lakewood Board of Directors for their information.
We appreciate your written support and concern for the Lakewood Community!
Thank you
Sandra L. Smith, CMCA(r), AMS(tm), CAAM(r)
Community Manager
AAM, LLC
(602) 674-4343 (direct line)
(602) 480-821-2334
(602) 957-9191 (main line)

--- Original Message ---
From: Barbara Russell [mailto:bsuerussell@cox.net]
Sent: Tuesday, July 23, 2013 3:30 PM
To: projects@azdot.gov
Cc: SMF@aol.com
Subject: Draft Environmental Impact Study for the South Mountain Freeway

To Whom It May Concern:

My husband and I have been residents for ten years in the Lakewood Community in Ahwatukee. As you are aware, the Lakewood Community was established in June 1985. The lakes are fed by a “well” or “spring”. Our grave concern is the protection of these existing wells or springs to continue as the source for the two lakes in our community.

We respectfully request that ADOT protect these existing wells as they review the route for construction of the South Mountain Loop 202 Freeway. We recognize the importance of the freeway to the city of Phoenix and State of Arizona. We also recognize the importance of our community, lakes and our property including the wells that feed and sustain our community lakes. Any negative change to the lakes would have a devastating impact on our community, residents and our future children.

We are proud citizens of our community and will be long term residents well into our retirement in Lakewood Community.

Sincerely,
Zacc & Barbara Russell
3421 E Wildwood Dr
Phoenix, AZ 85048

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.
**TELEPHONE CONVERSATION RECORD**  
**SOUTH MOUNTAIN FREEWAY INFORMATION LINE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Incoming Call Date</th>
<th>Incoming Call Time</th>
<th>Caller</th>
<th>Caller Address</th>
<th>Caller Remarks/Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7/23/13</td>
<td>4:51 PM</td>
<td>MARYBETH SMITH</td>
<td></td>
<td>I'm in favor of it. Thank you.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Response:**  
Comment noted.
TELEPHONE CONVERSATION RECORD
SOUTH MOUNTAIN FREEWAY INFORMATION LINE

INCOMING CALL
DATE: 7/24/13
TIME: 12:24 PM

CALLER: GAYLE SNEED
CALLER ADDRESS: 3613 WEST MARSHALL, PHOENIX, ARIZONA
PHONE: EMAIL:

CALLER REMARKS/QUESTIONS:
I strongly support the 202 [unclear]. I live in Chandler, I mean I work in Chandler. Live in West Phoenix and the bottle neck on I-10 is significant. I support the 202.

Code Comment Document

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Comment Document</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Comment noted.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Comment Document</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>TELEPHONE CONVERSATION RECORD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SOUTH MOUNTAIN FREEWAY INFORMATION LINE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DATE</td>
<td>5/15/13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TIME</td>
<td>3:57 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CALLER</td>
<td>CAROL SOBO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADDRESS</td>
<td>2230 EAST BEL AIR LANE, GILBERT, AZ 85234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHONE</td>
<td>480-926-2364</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMAIL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CALLER REMARKS/QUESTIONS:</td>
<td>I would like to voice my support for the new move around South Mountain.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comment noted.**
Good Day,

I propose that a bridge be built over the railway track. The traffic from the railway system causes a lot of hardship to commuters, and it has also made a lot home buyers to focus their home search away from communities after the railway track.

Ayodele A. Sodimu Esq. LLB, BL, CIPP/US
Thank you for participating in the South Mountain Freeway Draft Environmental Impact Statement public comment process.

ADOT encourages all interested parties to submit written comments on any aspect of the Draft EIS. ADOT will consider all comments in preparing the Final EIS, which will include responses to all comments, final conclusions on potential impacts, and ADOT’s final recommendations.

When submitting comments, please be as specific as possible and substantiate your concerns and recommendations.

Comments must be received or postmarked by July 24, 2013.

I'm all for the freeway to be built. This will reduce a lot of traffic. We live in Laveen, and that will bring a hospital and other great things to our community. Build, build, build please!

Dorina Seda
dorinas444@hotmail.com

1

Comment noted.
TELEPHONE CONVERSATION RECORD
SOUTH MOUNTAIN FREEWAY INFORMATION LINE

INCOMING CALL
DATE: 7/23/13
TIME: 6:06 PM

CALLER: ALBERT SORENSON
CALLER ADDRESS: 15855 WEST EVANS DRIVE, SURPRISE, ARIZONA 85379
PHONE: EMAIL:

CALLER REMARKS/QUESTIONS:
I support the South Mountain freeway. Thank you.

Code  Issue  Response
1  Comment noted.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Comment Document</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
|      | **TELEPHONE CONVERSATION RECORD**  
**SOUTH MOUNTAIN FREEWAY INFORMATION LINE**  
**INCOMING CALL**  
DATE: 7/23/13  
TIME: 5:43 PM  
**CALLER:** PEGGY SORONSON  
**CALLER ADDRESS:** 9642 WEST DIANA AVENUE, PEORIA, ARIZONA 85345  
**PHONE:** EMAIL: |
|      | **CALLER REMARKS/QUESTIONS:**  
Hello, I support the 202 freeway, South Mountain. It will be very helpful, I travel that way. So please, um I'll put in a vote for the approval of the freeway. Thank you goodbye. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Comment noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Comment Document</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>MR. LIPPEY: Mario Lippey.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>So my comment would be I was concerned</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>about -- I'm for the highway. However, where I live,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>which is the freeway -- the Foothills reserve area,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>right at the very end of Pecos, that's really close to</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>the mountain.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>And right now it's very quiet unless there are</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>parties or loud vehicles that go through there. And</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>those small noises bounce off the highway.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>And with the highway coming so close to that</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>area, my concern is that the noise levels will increase</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>even if they put a barrier up. It will just bounce off</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>the mountain.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>In addition, the air pollution, again, we're</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>right up against the mountain. The winds usually come</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>from the south to north, anecdotally. I don't have any</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>research.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>But I'm concerned about the air quality being</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>trapped right where we're located right up against the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>mountain. And I didn't read everything on the air</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>quality, but those are my two main concerns, the air</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>quality and the noise.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>MR. SOSA: My name is Jesse Sosa, and I live</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>right in the pathway of the freeway, and I'm really,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>obviously, in opposition to losing my home.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
And, really, I don't even know if I'm going to lose my home, because I'm not sure where, you know. ADOT plans to actually build. But I'd be right in front of it. That's for sure. And I really feel that this would impact tremendously my family, my children, the building of it.

It's -- and I don't think that eminent domain is a fair thing to do. People struggle all their lives. They buy their homes. They take their -- take care of their homes. And I really don't understand, you know, the need to build something like this.

I get that all of this here is for that purpose, to demonstrate the need, to demonstrate the amount of pollution, supposedly, that it would decrease, the amount of money saved, the decrease in congestion of traffic. I get all of that.

But when we're talking to a certain little family that actually has a home, that cares for their home, that has, again, saved money all their lives to purchase a home, not to just say, well, this is going away because of progress, if you will, it just, you know, really upsets me, so ... And, obviously, I oppose it. And whoever it goes to, hopefully they can kind of -- and I'm not the only one. I know that.
But that's my statement.

MS. BRENNAN: Catherine Brennan.

So I'm just -- I'm for the Loop 202 because it's going to help with economic development in Laveen and help bridge the two communities of the East and West Valley.

MR. RODARTE: My name is Randall, R-a-n-d-a-l. Last name is Rodarte, R-o-d-a-r-t-e. I live on 51st Avenue and Baseline, and I'm really looking forward to the preferred freeway. I believe it's the 59 and the E1. I believe that's what they're called.

Wait a minute. Let me double check here.

Yep, W59 and E1 alternative.

I'm in favor of them, and I really was looking forward to another way to get to the East Valley besides going through Baseline or Southern, because it's horrible, the traffic, you know, the backup. It just takes so long.

There's only one lane each way on Southern Road, and that's sometimes impossible to get through. And Baseline, over the last 10 years, I've seen it just really get bogged down, especially on the weekends. Takes about 40 minutes to get to Arizona Mills.
1 multi-modal network, so we need commuter rail. I hope eventually we will have light rail coming up to Baseline and then to -- to connect with this freeway, so we do need all forms of public transportation, but we need this freeway.

Thank you.

THE FACILITATOR: Thank you.

Alexander Soto.

If you’d like to speak, please go out to the registration desk, get registered, and we’ll have your name up here.

Thank you.

MR. SOTO: I’m Alex. So go?

(Speaks in foreign language) Alex Soto, (speaks in foreign language), I’m from the community cells of the Tohono O’odham Nation. I currently live here in Phoenix, Arizona, and I’m here to comment against this freeway.

Overall, this South Mountain Freeway is an attack on my civil rights as an indigenous person. And the lack of cultural consideration that is in this EIS is shocking. It is a fact that, I know there's a lot of civil rights statutes and protocol that an EIS would include towards communities of color, in particular ones that have been historically
1 oppressed.
2 So this mountain is sacred to us as
3 O’odham, and myself Tohono O’odham, you know, I may
4 come from south of southern Arizona, but this
5 freeway is -- this mountain is sacred to me. And all
6 these mountains in Phoenix are sacred, so I just
7 wanted to make that very clear that this is an attack
8 of who I am as an indigenous person, let alone the
9 generations to come. And overall with EIS, the lack
10 of consideration for potential hazardous spills on
11 this freeway is also shocking. There’s really not
12 any great detail in the EIS that pertains to
13 what-ifs, you know, regarding hazardous waste.
14 And another consideration, which I actually
15 wrote down, was also that back in 2005 the Joint Air
16 Toxic Assessment Program Study that was done, was not
17 considered in the EIS as well. And that’s -- the
18 report clearly shows that there’s already toxic
19 chemicals in the air in this area already, so of
20 course, the freeways would add more to that. So I
21 would hope that that would also be addressed in the
22 EIS.
23 And the last one, on a bigger level, is the
24 amount of semitrucks that will also be going towards
25 the community as well. Of course, we all know, this

The Arizona Department of Transportation and Federal Highway Administration identified several issues and concerns that were frequently noted by commenters. Responses to these issues can be found in the Responses to Frequently Submitted Public Comments beginning on page B733 of this appendix.

Summary information about the findings of the Joint Air Toxics Assessment Project study is provided as background information in the Draft and Final Environmental Impact Statements, but the study itself is not relevant to the type of analysis done pursuant to the Federal Highway Administration’s mobile source air toxics guidance, which is an emissions analysis. Monitored ambient concentrations of mobile source air toxics (the focus of the Joint Air Toxics Assessment Project) do not inform this type of analysis. While monitoring data can be useful for defining current conditions in the affected environment (to the extent that the monitoring data are current), they don’t tell us anything about future conditions, or the impacts of the project itself, which is why an emissions analysis was performed. The mobile source air toxic analysis presented beginning on page 4-77 of the Final Environmental Impact Statement is an estimated inventory of mobile source air toxic emissions for the entire Study Area for 2025 and 2035. This approach was used because the inventory estimate accounts for changes in traffic and emissions on all roadways affected by a proposed project, and would, therefore, be a more reliable predictor of changes in exposure to mobile source air toxics.

The mobile source air toxics emission modeling developed for the project (which factored in the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency’s recent rules for the 2035 analyses) and discussed beginning on page 4-77 of the Final Environmental Impact Statement found little difference in total annual emissions of mobile source air toxics between the Preferred and No-Action Alternatives (less than a 1 percent difference) in 2025 and 2035. With the Preferred Alternative in 2035, modeled mobile source air toxics emissions would decrease by 57 percent to more than 90 percent, depending on the pollutant, despite a 47 percent increase in vehicle miles traveled in the Study Area compared with 2012 conditions.

The Arizona Department of Transportation and Federal Highway Administration identified several issues and concerns that were frequently noted by commenters. Responses to these issues can be found in the Responses to Frequently Submitted Public Comments beginning on page B733 of this appendix.

The Arizona Department of Transportation and Federal Highway Administration identified several issues and concerns that were frequently noted by commenters. Responses to these issues can be found in the Responses to Frequently Submitted Public Comments beginning on page B733 of this appendix.
is part of a bigger transportation program, the Sun Corridor, which is part of the CanaMex indirectly or directly, depending on how your website wants to entail that, but this is bringing more trade to Mexico and Canada and back and forth, and the Gila River happens to be in the middle of it.

And due to my friends, my family, my relatives that lay at rest there, that's why I'm here today to comment against this. And I would hope that ya'll would consider that compared to, you know, holding Laveen residents hostage to have a hospital or more retail shops there.

As O'odham, we were the first people of this area, and I would hope that you would consider that. And a lot of people ask, well, why don't we concede or compromise, and we've been compromising for over 520 years. So I hope that ya'll would include this in your report because you're attacking who I am as an indigenous person. And, yeah, civil rights need to be addressed, because just like any other community of color, East L.A. or, you know, South Bronx, I mean, we all know freeways are meant to be biased, we call them borders, going back to the border on my reservation, the U.S.-Mexico border, so I hope you're able to address my concerns.
1 So thank you.

2 THE FACILITATOR: Thank you.

3 If you'd like to speak, please register up front.

4 If you'd like to speak, please go to the registration desk out front.

5 Please feel free to use either microphone when you come up.

6 Thank you. Eric Cylwik.

7 Eric, could I ask you to use this mic over here, please.

8 MR. CYLWIK: Good morning. My name is Eric Cylwik. I first of all want to thank you so much to voice my opinion to you guys here that are here to listen to us today. I just wanted to say also, great job on pronouncing the name. That is correct.

9 So I grew up in Phoenix, kind of at the top of what is now the 51, and I remember growing up there, and my dad would have to fly out of town every single weekend, and the commute to the airport was awful. But then after the 51 was built, it made the rest of the town so much more accessible and it just made living up there a so much nicer place.

10 I’ve now moved to Tempe after graduating from ASU, and a lot of my friends are now moving away.
1 MR. SOTO: My name is Alexander Soto.
2 Address 7211 West Alta Vista Road, Laveen, 85339.
3 And, yeah, I'm here today to make a comment against
4 this freeway. I'm not in favor of it. I'm in
5 opposition of it. As a Tohono O'odham, this freeway
6 will attack my civil rights because this freeway is
7 going to blast through South Mountain, and South
8 Mountain is a sacred site to all O'odham, the O'odham
9 in Gila River, the O'odham in Salt River, the O'odham
10 in Ak-Chin, and the O'odham in Mexico.
11 So my spiritual connection to this
12 mountain will be attacked if the freeway comes
13 anywhere in this area, let alone blasts through the
14 mountain which is current proposal that ADOT has,
15 will do. So my civil liberties, my freedom of
16 religion, all these things are being threatened.
17 And as a citizen of the United States, a
18 citizen of Arizona, citizen of my tribe, I feel I
19 have that right to keep my cultural practices going
20 and this freeway stops that. So that's why I'm in
21 opposition for it on a cultural level, but I'm also
22 in opposition because this freeway's overall
23 construction, it doesn't have any clear plan B for a
24 biohazardous spill if anything happens in the
25 community. So if it even was to be built, there's no

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Comment Document</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>MR. SOTO: My name is Alexander Soto. Address 7211 West Alta Vista Road, Laveen, 85339. And, yeah, I'm here today to make a comment against this freeway. I'm not in favor of it. I'm in opposition of it. As a Tohono O'odham, this freeway will attack my civil rights because this freeway is going to blast through South Mountain, and South Mountain is a sacred site to all O'odham, the O'odham in Gila River, the O'odham in Salt River, the O'odham in Ak-Chin, and the O'odham in Mexico. So my spiritual connection to this mountain will be attacked if the freeway comes anywhere in this area, let alone blasts through the mountain which is current proposal that ADOT has, will do. So my civil liberties, my freedom of religion, all these things are being threatened. And as a citizen of the United States, a citizen of Arizona, citizen of my tribe, I feel I have that right to keep my cultural practices going and this freeway stops that. So that's why I'm in opposition for it on a cultural level, but I'm also in opposition because this freeway's overall construction, it doesn't have any clear plan B for a biohazardous spill if anything happens in the community. So if it even was to be built, there's no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>The Draft Environmental Impact Statement describes a decade-long consultation and coordination effort led by the Arizona Department of Transportation and the Federal Highway Administration with the Gila River Indian Community and other Native American tribes. As a result of the consultation, the cultural importance of the South Mountains is acknowledged in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement in several locations, notably page 5-26. The proposed project would accommodate and preserve (to the fullest extent possible from the available alternatives) access to the South Mountains for religious practices. Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act requires a government-to-government relationship between the Federal Government and Indian tribes as described beginning on page 4-140 of the Final Environmental Impact Statement. Section 106 requires federal agencies take into account the effects of their undertakings on historic properties and requires consultation with tribal authorities. Consultation has occurred with Gila River Indian Community government officials, the Tribal Historic Preservation Officer, the Cultural Resource Management Program, other tribes, and the State Historic Preservation Office and has led to concurrence from the Gila River Indian Community Tribal Historic Preservation Office and the State Historic Preservation Office on National Register of Historic Places eligibility recommendations (including traditional cultural properties like the South Mountains), project effects, and proposed mitigation and measures to minimize harm. This consultation has been ongoing and will continue until any commitments in a record of decision are completed. The section entitled Title VI and Environmental Justice, beginning on page 4-29 in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement, presents acceptable methods, data, and assumptions to assess the potential for disproportionately high and adverse effects from the proposed action on environmental justice populations and disparate impacts to populations protected under Title VI. Based on the content of the section, no such effects would result from the action alternatives. In light of comments received on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement, the above-referenced conclusions were confirmed in the preparation of the Final Environmental Impact Statement. To provide further clarity, the discussions of environmental justice and Title VI were separated and additional text explaining the relationship of environmental justice and Title VI to various environmental elements was added throughout Chapter 4, Affected Environment, Environmental Consequences, and Mitigation, as exemplified by the inserted text on page 4-29 of the Final Environmental Impact Statement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>The Arizona Department of Transportation and Federal Highway Administration identified several issues and concerns that were frequently noted by commenters. Responses to these issues can be found in the Responses to Frequently Submitted Public Comments beginning on page B733 of this appendix.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td><strong>Environmental Justice/Lifestyle</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td><strong>Cultural Resources</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td><strong>Hazardous Materials</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
alternative for people if something bad happens with hazardous waste.
So it's not in the EIS. I'd like to note that it's not in the EIS. And on that level, this is a horrible freeway. And another level, in 2006 there was a transportation plan that came out, a study that clearly noted all the environmental impacts of this freeway at that time, all the chemicals and so on. And this current draft EIS, it's not in there, and this was conducted by the State of Arizona and other environmental agencies.
So I feel, you know, that's not transparent. You know, it's not, you know, not -- it clearly shows the bias in the project, you know. And also the state, this is a $2 billion freeway. Why do we need this? There's a lot of other things $2 Billion can go to.
And the last one is a vision under the U.N. -- the United Nations indigenous people's declaration of human rights and business rights. This goes against that as well. So there's a variety of statutes and policies and things that are on record that this freeway's attacking, and I just want that to be known to be clear and, yeah, no 202.
From: Nancy Spano
To: Projects
Subject: South Mountain Freeway
Date: Friday, May 17, 2013 9:20 PM

I am against placing the South Mountain freeway along the Pecos Road route through South Mountain Park. I am only in favor of placing it on the Indian Reservation.

Nancy Spano
Although the region’s freeways are now congested during the peak travel period, congestion relief resulting from the proposed freeway would provide localized reductions of delays on arterial streets and at interchanges. Reduced travel times would result in lower exposure to elevated concentrations of mobile source air toxics occurring in traffic. Other benefits of the proposed freeway in comparison to the No-Action Alternative are presented in Table 3-9 on page 3-38 of the Final Environmental Impact Statement.

The Arizona Department of Transportation and Federal Highway Administration identified several issues and concerns that were frequently noted by commenters. Responses to these issues can be found in the Responses to Frequently Submitted Public Comments beginning on page B733 of this appendix.
Alternative. Thank you.

Sincerely,

Ms. Deb Sparrow  
1715 S La Rosa Dr  
Tempe, AZ 85281-6820  
(480) 968-7908

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.
It's time to build the 202! Let's get out in front of this need. The traffic is getting worse and worse by the day. If we don't continue to develop our freeway systems it will only become worse. Our freeway systems are one of the most important yet under appreciated assets to our community. They allow us to move around the Metro area freely, get to work so we can make a living and support our families, as well as enjoy what the valley has to offer for recreation. Our infrastructure is also one of the most important aspects to attracting potential employers to our community which creates great economic gains for the entire state.

After reviewing the EIS documents I think it is abundantly clear that the benefits far outweigh any potential risk of impacts and this freeway should be built!

Comment noted.
1 say.
2 THE FACILITATOR: Thank you.
3 MR. NEELY: Thank you.
4 THE FACILITATOR: Vicky Oliver.
5 MS. OLIVER: HI, my name is Vicky Oliver and I'm
6 for the 202 project because I think it will bring
7 employment opportunities to our area, which we definitely
8 need, and also will help the commute for a lot of people
9 coming in the area. And also, it’s been proven that
10 freeways cut down pollution and also traffic accidents,
11 and it’ll keep some of the traffic off of our city
12 streets.
13 THE FACILITATOR: Thank you.
14 Jake Speck.
15 MR. SPECK: Good afternoon. My name is Jake
16 Speck, I’m here in support of the 202. I think this
17 project is a great benefit to the community for a lot of
18 different reasons: Reducing traffic, revitalizing
19 economy, bringing over 30,000 jobs to the community, as
20 well as a significant investment. I think it will
21 attract potential employers as well, which would be great
22 for growing the economy going forward.
23 After looking at the EIS, I think the potential
24 impacts are vastly outweighed by the benefits this
25 project brings, and I believe that now is the time to go
ahead and proceed with this project. This project has been approved several times and has the overwhelming support, based on recent polls, and I think it'll be a great benefit to our community. Thank you.

THE FACILITATOR: Thank you.

Ana Morago?

Tiffany Reddy.

MS. REDDY: Good afternoon. My name is Tiffany Reddy and I just wanted to come and show my support for South Mountain freeway. The congestion for the commuters in Phoenix has long been a problem for our community and I think it would greatly help our residents in Phoenix. Also, I love the idea of bringing 30,000 jobs to our community and to our people here in Phoenix, so we're in big support. Thank you.

THE FACILITATOR: Thank you.

If you'd like to speak and have not yet registered, please go out to the front registration table.

Chris Pattock. Could I ask you to use this microphone, please.

MR. PATTOCK: Sure. Thank you. My name is Chris Pattock, I'm a Tempe resident, I work downtown, I'm a lawyer. I'm not prepared to do this, I just got a phone call last night, apparently someone knew that I was
### Comment Document

**From:** Projects  
**To:** ADOT  
**Subject:** FW: DEIS on South Mountain Freeway  
**Date:** Wednesday, May 15, 2013 8:37:47 AM

-----Original Message-----  
From: Steve Speight [mailto:stevesp8@cox.net]  
Sent: Tuesday, May 14, 2013 8:35 PM  
To: Projects  
Cc: PARCtheSMF@aol.com  
Subject: DEIS on South Mountain Freeway  

Dear ADOT,

I am a PARC member and I am opposed to the South Mountain Freeway on Pecos Road. I have lived in Ahwatukee since 1992. I think it is wrong for you to try and run a "Truck By Pass" through my backyard. It's going to be bad for my air, my property values, and quality of life.

Steve Speight  
538 E. Brookwood Ct  
Phoenix, Az 85048

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.
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### Code Issue Response Appendix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Purpose and Need, Truck Bypass</td>
<td>The Arizona Department of Transportation and Federal Highway Administration identified several issues and concerns that were frequently noted by commenters. Responses to these issues can be found in the Responses to Frequently Submitted Public Comments beginning on page B733 of this appendix.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Air Quality</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Economics, Socioeconomics</td>
<td>A review of the literature reveals few detailed and comprehensive analyses of the relationship between the transportation infrastructure and residential property values ([Transportation Research Record: Journal of the Transportation Research Board, No. 2174, Transportation Research Board of the National Academies, Washington, D.C., 2010, pp. 138–47; “Impact of Highways on Property Values: Case Study of the Superstition Freeway Corridor”]). A recent study by the California Department of Transportation concluded that freeway facilities did not substantially affect sales prices in residential areas adjacent to the facility. The study concluded that it is the visibility of the freeway that may influence selling price and not distance or noise. As a result, the researchers generally concluded that the more the visibility of a new freeway is reduced, the less it would determine the sales price of homes sold in the area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Neighborhoods/Communities</td>
<td>While the E1 Alternative is adjacent to the largely residential areas of Ahwatukee Foothills Village (to the north), a freeway has been planned in this location for many years (see Final Environmental Impact Statement pages 4-17 and 4-21). Where existing residential uses are adjacent to the proposed freeway, noise mitigation would be implemented according to the Arizona Department of Transportation policy (see Final Environmental Impact Statement page 4-91).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Jul 24, 2013
Arizona Department of Transportation South Mountain Study Team
1655 W Jackson St, MD 126F
Phoenix, AZ 85007

Dear South Mountain Study Team,

I am writing to express my opposition to the proposed South Mountain Freeway and to urge ADOT to select the No-Build Alternative.

I agree that the proposed freeway would cause more problems than it would solve.

Please help protect our communities, our health, and our environment by selecting the No Action Alternative. Thank you.

Sincerely,
Mr. Jerry Spellman
648 S Grand
Mesa, AZ 85210-2430
Dear Freeway Planners,

First, I must say that I support a loop 202 but I am adamantly opposed to the path that you have proposed. After reading all of your statements and attending a discussion that you held, I am still opposed to you planned route.

I do not believe that the planners have done everything possible to make the best freeway with the least amount of impact. I was astounded at the supposed environmental impact study. It was very poorly done to say the least. The wildlife will die out and the South Mountain Preserve will suffer for the lack of wildlife and diversity.

The amount of land taken from South Mountain Preserve is deplorable! I know that given the right incentives a route could be done that would not impact the Preserve land. Working with GRIC and local land owners to push further south and west would be in the best interest of all.

I hope you reconsider your position.

Respectfully Yours,
Leslie Spencer-Snider

The Arizona Department of Transportation and Federal Highway Administration identified several issues and concerns that were frequently noted by commenters. Responses to these issues can be found in the Responses to Frequently Submitted Public Comments beginning on page B733 of this appendix.
June 20, 2013
South Mountain Study Team
Arizona Department of Transportation
1655 West Jackson Street, MD 126F
Phoenix, AZ 85007

I am writing to state my strong opposition for the proposed expansion of Loop 202/South Mountain Freeway, in particular the Pecos Road alignment.

As a resident of Ahwatukee/Foothills, I believe the Pecos Road alignment would severely hurt our quality of life and cause damage to our community. Area residents would ultimately be affected by air and noise pollution. The proposed freeway would invite new traffic into the area, including large commercial vehicles that run day and night.

The Sierra Club’s recent report “50 Best and Worst Transportation Projects in the United States”, dated November 2012, lists the Loop 202/South Mountain Freeway as one of the worst projects in the United States based on oil, environmental, health, economic, and land use impacts. The findings and conclusions of this report need to be taken into serious consideration by the South Mountain Study Team.

I currently have enough highway access to all the facilities needed for a great quality of life. The South Mountain Freeway would forever change this area in the worst way. The Arizona Department of Transportation surely can produce alternatives to the destructive Pecos Road alignment that are better suited for our health and environment.

I advocate the “No Action” alternative as the best option that preserves the environment, quality of life, and health of residents.

Sincerely,

Elyse Spielman
3069 W Silver Fox Way
Phoenix, AZ 85045

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Comment Document</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Alternatives, E1 Alternative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Neighborhoods/Communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Air Quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Noise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Traffic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Purpose and Need, Truck Bypass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Sierra Club Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Alternatives, No-Action (No-Build) Alternative</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Alternatives, E1 Alternative</td>
<td>The Arizona Department of Transportation and Federal Highway Administration identified several issues and concerns that were frequently noted by commenters. Responses to these issues can be found in the Responses to Frequently Submitted Public Comments beginning on page B733 of this appendix.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Neighborhoods/Communities</td>
<td>While the E1 Alternative is adjacent to the largely residential areas of Ahwatukee Foothills Village (to the north), a freeway has been planned in this location for many years (see Final Environmental Impact Statement pages 4-17 and 4-21). Where existing residential uses are adjacent to the proposed freeway, noise mitigation would be implemented according to the Arizona Department of Transportation policy (see Final Environmental Impact Statement page 4-91).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Air Quality</td>
<td>The Arizona Department of Transportation and Federal Highway Administration identified several issues and concerns that were frequently noted by commenters. Responses to these issues can be found in the Responses to Frequently Submitted Public Comments beginning on page B733 of this appendix.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Noise</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Traffic</td>
<td>The determination to not include an interchange at 32nd Street was made in coordination with the City of Phoenix (see Figure 3-8 on page 3-15 of the Final Environmental Impact Statement). The interchange would have required the displacement of over 100 homes and would have been located near an existing high school. The City recommended that, based on these impacts, the interchange be removed from the study. In 2006, the City of Phoenix conducted a traffic circulation study to evaluate the impacts of the proposed freeway on the local street system, including the shift of access to Foothills Reserve and Calabrea from Pecos Road to Chandler Boulevard. The City study found no adverse effects on the local street system from the freeway (see Appendix 3-1 in the Final Environmental Impact Statement).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Purpose and Need, Truck Bypass</td>
<td>The Arizona Department of Transportation and Federal Highway Administration identified several issues and concerns that were frequently noted by commenters. Responses to these issues can be found in the Responses to Frequently Submitted Public Comments beginning on page B733 of this appendix.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Sierra Club Report</td>
<td>The Arizona Department of Transportation and the Federal Highway Administration respectfully disagree with the referenced Sierra Club Report. As noted in the Final Environmental Impact Statement, when compared with the No-Action Alternative, the Preferred Alternative would result in less energy consumption (page 4-172), regional improvements to air quality (page 4-74) that would be expected to produce health benefits, and economic benefits of reducing regional traffic congestion (page 4-65), and would be consistent with local and regional long-range planning efforts (page 4-18).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Alternatives, No-Action (No-Build) Alternative</td>
<td>The Arizona Department of Transportation and Federal Highway Administration identified several issues and concerns that were frequently noted by commenters. Responses to these issues can be found in the Responses to Frequently Submitted Public Comments beginning on page B733 of this appendix.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
June 4, 2013

South Mountain Study Team
Arizona Department of Transportation
1615 West Jackson Street, MD 1260
Phoenix, AZ 85007

I am writing to state my opposition for the proposed expansion of Loop 202/South Mountain Freeway.

As a new resident of Arizona, I believe it would be a poor choice to build this freeway through one of the most beautiful areas of Phoenix. Every day I see many bikers and joggers using Pecos Road. If the freeway were built, area residents would ultimately be affected by air and noise pollution. The proposed freeway would invite new traffic into the area, including large commercial vehicles that run day and night. In addition, South Mountain is sacred for the local Native Americans; a freeway would be harmful and disrespectful to their traditional culture.

The Sierra Club’s recent report “50 Best and Worst Transportation Projects in the United States”, dated November 2012, lists the Loop 202/South Mountain Freeway as one of the worst projects in the United States based on off, environmental, health, economic, and future impacts. Hopefully, the findings and conclusions of this report are being taken into consideration by the South Mountain Study Team.

In the short time I have lived here, I have found that I currently have enough highway access to all the facilities needed for a great quality of life. The South Mountain Freeway would forever change this area in the worst way. The Arizona Department of Transportation surely can produce alternative options that are better suited for our health and environment.

I advocate the “No Action” alternative as the best option that preserves the environment, health of residents, and respect for Native American culture.

Sincerely,

[Signature]
John Spielman
3009 W Silver Fox Way
Phoenix, AZ 85045

The Arizona Department of Transportation and Federal Highway Administration identified several issues and concerns that were frequently noted by commenters. Responses to these issues can be found in the Responses to Frequently Submitted Public Comments beginning on page B733 of this appendix.

2 Noise

The determination to not include an interchange at 32nd Street was made in coordination with the City of Phoenix (see Figure 3-8 on page 3-15 of the Final Environmental Impact Statement). The interchange would have required the displacement of over 100 homes and would have been located near an existing high school. The City recommended that, based on these impacts, the interchange be removed from the study. In 2006, the City of Phoenix conducted a traffic circulation study to evaluate the impacts of the proposed freeway on the local street system, including the shift of access to Foothills Reserve and Calabrea from Pecos Road to Chandler Boulevard. The City study found no adverse effects on the local street system from the freeway (see Appendix 3-1 in the Final Environmental Impact Statement).

4 Purpose and Need, Truck Bypass

The Arizona Department of Transportation and Federal Highway Administration identified several issues and concerns that were frequently noted by commenters. Responses to these issues can be found in the Responses to Frequently Submitted Public Comments beginning on page B733 of this appendix.

5 Cultural Resources

The Arizona Department of Transportation and the Federal Highway Administration respectfully disagree with the referenced Sierra Club Report. As noted in the Final Environmental Impact Statement, when compared with the No-Action Alternative, the Preferred Alternative would result in less energy consumption (page 4-172), regional improvements to air quality (page 4-74) that would be expected to produce health benefits, and economic benefits of reducing regional traffic congestion (page 4-65), and would be consistent with local and regional long-range planning efforts (page 4-18).

7 Neighborhoods/Communities

While the E1 Alternative is adjacent to the largely residential areas of Ahwatukee Foothills Village (to the north), a freeway has been planned in this location for many years (see Final Environmental Impact Statement pages 4-17 and 4-21). Where existing residential uses are adjacent to the proposed freeway, noise mitigation would be implemented according to the Arizona Department of Transportation policy (see Final Environmental Impact Statement page 4-91).

8 Alternatives

The Arizona Department of Transportation and Federal Highway Administration identified several issues and concerns that were frequently noted by commenters. Responses to these issues can be found in the Responses to Frequently Submitted Public Comments beginning on page B733 of this appendix.
From: Robert Spiller [mailto:respiller1@yahoo.com]  
Sent: Saturday, May 18, 2013 9:57 AM  
To: Projects  
Subject: Scare Tactics

Why does my state have to follow the rest of the friggin democrats and use scare tactics for everything. "your commute times will get longer and the air quality will get worse". Bull Shit.

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.
Bailly, Becky

From: Sierra Club <information@sierraclub.org> on behalf of Eric & Cedra Spragett
Sent: Wednesday, May 29, 2013 5:20 PM
To: Projects
Subject: Comments in opposition to South Mountain Freeway

May 29, 2013
Arizona Department of Transportation South Mountain Study Team
1655 W Jackson St, M0 126F
Phoenix, AZ 85007

Dear South Mountain Study Team,

I am writing to express my opposition to the proposed South Mountain Freeway and urge ADOT to select the No-Build Alternative.

The proposed freeway would cause more problems than it would solve. In addition, it would only provide short-term congestion relief. As is evident by our numerous clogged roads and freeways, many of which have recently been built or widened, building more roads is not the answer. ADOT needs to instead focus on planning for and investing in long-term transportation solutions, including mass transit. The only way to effectively reduce congestion and mobilize people is by reducing the number of vehicles utilizing our roads, not by encouraging more to use them.

South Mountain freeway would have incredible negative impacts on our communities. Despite what the DEIS claims, air quality in the region would worsen over time, increasing public health risks. As more vehicles fill the "uncongested" areas this freeway would temporarily provide, more pollution will be spewed into the air, exacerbating asthma, cancer, and other diseases.

The freeway would also negatively affect our environment. South Mountain Park is the largest city park in our nation. It was set aside to protect resources and to benefit our communities. By blasting a freeway through a portion of this park, wildlife and habitat will be destroyed, movement corridors will be cut off, valuable public spaces will be lost, and more. This would set a terrible precedent by demolishing what should remain a protected area.

The freeway will also exacerbate urban sprawl and further burden Arizona's taxpayers. Its construction would continue ADOT's trend of forcing residents to remain vehicle-dependent while paying for infrastructure so that others can live farther and farther from a city center.

Please help protect our communities, our health, and our environment by selecting the No Action Alternative. Thank you.

Sincerely,
Mr. Eric & Cedra Spragett
4035 E Bloomfield Rd
Phoenix, AZ 85032-7411
(602) 283-4700

The Arizona Department of Transportation and Federal Highway Administration identified several issues and concerns that were frequently noted by commenters. Responses to these issues can be found in the Responses to Frequently Submitted Public Comments beginning on page B733 of this appendix.

1 Alternatives, No-Action (No-Build) Alternative

2 Purpose and Need

Although the region’s freeways are now congested during the peak travel period, conditions in 2035 without the proposed freeway would be substantially worse with more congested areas and congested conditions for longer periods of time (see Final Environmental Impact Statement pages 1-21 and 1-22). Congestion relief resulting from the proposed freeway would provide localized reductions of delays on arterial streets and at interchanges. Reduced travel times would result in lower exposure to elevated concentrations of mobile source air toxics occurring in traffic. Other benefits of the proposed freeway in comparison to the No-Action Alternative are presented in Table 3-9 on page 3-38 of the Final Environmental Impact Statement.

3 Alternatives

Federal regulations stipulate that an environmental impact statement shall "rigorously explore and objectively evaluate all reasonable alternatives" (40 Code of Federal Regulations § 1502.14; see Final Environmental Impact Statement page 3-1). All alternatives were screened using a multidisciplinary set of criteria. Nonfreeway alternatives were considered (see Final Environmental Impact Statement pages 3-3 through 3-6). Among other things, the study took into account improving existing freeways, improving or expanding other travel modes, strategies to reduce travel demand, and various roadway configurations. This study examined not only the potential impacts from improvements, but also the consequences of building nothing, the No-Action Alternative. As proposed by the Maricopa Association of Governments, the South Mountain Freeway would be part of the Regional Freeway and Highway System. Other transportation improvements such as mass transit and local roads are specified in the Regional Transportation Plan and were considered during the evaluation of this proposed new freeway. As noted in the Final Environmental Impact Statement (see page 3-60), the proposed freeway would provide opportunities to enhance operation of future mass transit improvements.

4 Air Quality

The Arizona Department of Transportation and Federal Highway Administration identified several issues and concerns that were frequently noted by commenters. Responses to these issues can be found in the Responses to Frequently Submitted Public Comments beginning on page B733 of this appendix.

5 Health Effects

6 Section 4(f) and Section 6(f)

7 Biology, Plants, and Wildlife

(Responses continue on next page)
Unplanned growth is often termed “urban sprawl.” Generally, this term is used in the context of rapid and uncontrolled urban growth onto previously undeveloped land—usually on the outskirts of an existing urban area. Projects like the proposed freeway are often identified as contributors to urban sprawl. Freeway projects are often cited as making land at the urban fringe more accessible and, therefore, more attractive for development. However, examination of data comparing population and land use between 1975 and 2000 suggests major transportation projects like the proposed freeway do not induce growth in the region (see Final Environmental Impact Statement pages 4-170 through 4-174). The proposed action would be implemented in a historically quickly urbanizing area (most noticeably in the Western Section of the Study Area, although the nationwide recession which began in 2007 slowed growth). In the Eastern Section of the Study Area, the proposed freeway would abut public parkland, Native American land, and a near-fully developed area—therefore, any contribution to accelerated or induced growth would be constrained. The proposed freeway would be built in an area planned for urban growth as established in local jurisdictions’ land use plans for at least the last 25 years.
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- Comment Document

TELEPHONE CONVERSATION RECORD
SOUTH MOUNTAIN FREEWAY INFORMATION LINE

INCOMING CALL
DATE: 05/9/13
TIME: 3:03 PM

CALLER: MERRILEY SPRAGUE
CALLER ADDRESS: 2407 N. 123rd DRIVE, AVONDALE, AZ 85392
PHONE: EMAIL:

CALLER REMARKS/QUESTIONS:
I support the planning and construction of the South Mountain Freeway and the proposed alignment. My husband is a commercial truck driver and the proposed route will allow trucks to bypass the city. The freeway will keep traffic away from congested Downtown Phoenix.

1

Comment noted.
1 curve. At times it's -- well, every morning and every
2 afternoon it's nearly a parking lot. I would very much
3 appreciate -- well, I believe it's also a bit of a
4 hazard, there's been several accidents on the 10 recently
5 that have shut down the 10. Having other means to
6 commute around that would definitely be beneficial.
7 And also, the economic impacts that come along
8 with a new freeway, property values go up and the person
9 before me just mentioned the social and economic impact
10 for Laveen would be enormous, so I support the
11 construction of the 202. Thank you again for your time.
12
13 THE FACILITATOR: Thank you.
14
15 MS. SPRAGUE: It's so quiet in here, it's a
16 little intimidating to walk up to.
17 Good afternoon, my name is Tiffany Sprague and
18 I'm a resident of Phoenix, and I'm very strongly opposed
19 to the South Mountain freeway. I urge ADOT to select the
20 no-action to this project. ADOT must begin looking
21 towards real solutions for our transportation needs and
22 this freeway is not it. This is more than evident by our
23 increasingly congested roads and freeways. Widening
24 routes and building new ones only provide short-term
25 relief. More vehicles will soon fill these uncongested
26 areas.

The Arizona Department of Transportation and Federal Highway Administration identified several issues and concerns that were frequently noted by commenters. Responses to these issues can be found in the Responses to Frequently Submitted Public Comments beginning on page B733 of this appendix.

Although the region's freeways are now congested during the peak travel period, conditions in 2035 without the proposed freeway would be substantially worse with more congested areas and congested conditions for longer periods of time (see Final Environmental Impact Statement pages 1-21 and 1-22).
By 2035, east- and westbound motorists on Interstate 10 between State Route 101L (Agua Fria Freeway) and State Route 202L (Santan Freeway) are expected to experience stop-and-go driving for over 3 hours every day. This is for a distance of nearly 30 miles. A new freeway in the Study Area would distribute commuters over an additional freeway facility. As a result, the duration of stop-and-go traffic on the region's freeways would be reduced.
1. ADOT is forcing people to remain dependent on vehicles, rather than looking towards real solutions that focus on getting people off the road. ADOT absolutely must shift its focus toward reducing the number of vehicles congesting our roadways, and this can only be accomplished by planning for and investing in alternative transportation solutions, including rail, bus, walking, and biking.

2. ADOT claims that this freeway is necessary to help the air quality within our region. However, as it’s been shown by other areas of the Valley and in other cities in our nation, this freeway will just spread out the air quality problem and will in time cause it to worsen significantly.

3. Again, whatever congestion relief is provided by this freeway will be short-lived, as is evident by all our seriously congested freeways in the region, some of which are brand new or were just recently widened. By encouraging more vehicles to use our roadways, air quality will continue to worsen, endangering public health, negatively affecting our environment, and risking funding from the federal government.

4. The DEIS frequently notes that the South Mountain freeway is necessary in order to better utilize the San Tan portion of the Loop 202, but what’s meant by...
### Code Comment Document

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Comment Document</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>better utilization of this portion of the freeway? Every afternoon I hear about how congested the San Tan portion is, so it seems like the South Mountain freeway will just increase congestion on this roadway, or is that what ADOT considers to be better utilization, more congestion and increased travel time. Overall, this freeway is not worth the cost. It will destroy a portion of South Mountain Park, an area that was set aside to protect natural resources and to provide public benefit. It will destroy wildlife habitat and movement corridors. It will exacerbate air quality concerns and climate change. It will endanger public health, and it will do all of this without any real added benefit to our communities, so we should not build the South Mountain freeway. Thank you.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>The Facilitator: Thank you. Ana Morena?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Steve Schwab. Please feel free to use either microphone.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Mr. SCHWAB: Good afternoon. My name is Steve Schwab. I’ve been in the Valley for 31 years and I have witnessed a lot of freeway growth here and I strongly, strongly urge you to accept the action alternative here.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

### Code Issue Response

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Issue and Need, Lack of Support</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>The Arizona Department of Transportation and Federal Highway Administration identified several issues and concerns that were frequently noted by commenters. Responses to these issues can be found in the Responses to Frequently Submitted Public Comments beginning on page B733 of this appendix.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

### Code Issue Response

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Section 4(f) and Section 6(f)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

### Code Issue Response

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Biology, Plants, and Wildlife</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>This document does not incorporate an analysis of the greenhouse gas emissions or climate change effects of each of the action alternatives because the potential change in greenhouse gas emissions is very small in the context of the affected environment. Because of the relative insignificance of the greenhouse gas impacts, those impacts would not be meaningful to identification of the Preferred Alternative. The Federal Highway Administration is working to develop strategies to reduce transportation’s contribution to greenhouse gases—particularly carbon dioxide emissions—and to assess the risks to transportation systems and services from climate change (see Final Environmental Impact Statement pages 4-85 through 4-86). Construction best practices represent practicable project-level measures that, while not substantially reducing global greenhouse gas emissions, may help reduce greenhouse gas emissions on an incremental basis and could contribute in the long term to meaningful cumulative reduction when considered across the Federal-aid highway program.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

### Code Issue Response

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Health Effects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>The Arizona Department of Transportation and Federal Highway Administration identified several issues and concerns that were frequently noted by commenters. Responses to these issues can be found in the Responses to Frequently Submitted Public Comments beginning on page B733 of this appendix.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

Driver and Nix Court Reporters - (602) 266-6525  
www.drivernix.com
1 RTP there was also a freeway system, which working
2 together to provide, you know, all modes of travel
3 for the community.
4 With regard to the funding itself, there
5 are some firewalls built into the regional
6 transportation plan and it does limit the ability to
7 both use freeway funds for transit projects, as well
8 as to take money from transit projects and use them
9 for freeways.
10 So that would be something that would have
11 to probably be, you know, vetted at the top of MAG.
12 It would be a decision made by them, but there are
13 fire walls built in that would really limit or do not
14 allow the mixing of those funds.
15 THE FACILITATOR: Scott Sprague. “In
16 pre-design meetings for I-11, ADOT representatives
17 have repeatedly stated that no part of the I-11 or
18 scenic drive has been identified beyond a very wide
19 30-mile swath between Phoenix and Las Vegas. Upon
20 approaching Phoenix, ADOT has insisted that many
21 alignments through and around the city are still on
22 the table. This contradicts what the map shows
23 tonight. Please explain the disconnect.”
24 MR. SPARGO: Can I have you repeat just the
25 part about where the information was coming from that

5248

Driver and Nix Court Reporters – (602) 266-6525
www.drivernix.com
it's not --
THE FACILITATOR: ADOT representatives.
MEMBER OF PUBLIC: I can clarify, if you
like. In pre-design meetings with the I-11 route,
they, ADOT, has provided maps for where they're
looking and they purposefully, upon request of a more
refined map, they said there's nothing set. This is
all that's been decided is this 30-mile swath, and
again, I have no, this is just a guess, but there's a
swath between Phoenix and Las Vegas and then their
map has actually several arrows that spread out at
the Vegas end and Phoenix end, and they said even
those areas aren't even in consideration at this
point or they're pre-designed. That's the next step
is entering Phoenix, so I'm just curious, if that's
very pertinent to that meeting, so if it's set, it's
going to be over there, it's more important to me for
that meeting than this meeting.
MR. SPARGO: I guess I'm not in tune with
all the things going on with I-11 study. I don't
know if anybody wants to add anything, but we can
follow up after this meeting with more information
regarding that, with the I-11 team that's doing that
study.
THE FACILITATOR: Scott Sprague. "If
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Comment Document</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5249</td>
<td>it's not --</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>THE FACILITATOR: ADOT representatives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>MEMBER OF PUBLIC: I can clarify, if you</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>like. In pre-design meetings with the I-11 route,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>they, ADOT, has provided maps for where they're</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>looking and they purposefully, upon request of a more</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>refined map, they said there's nothing set. This is</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>all that's been decided is this 30-mile swath, and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>again, I have no, this is just a guess, but there's a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>swath between Phoenix and Las Vegas and then their</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>map has actually several arrows that spread out at</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>the Vegas end and Phoenix end, and they said even</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>those areas aren't even in consideration at this</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>point or they're pre-designed. That's the next step</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>is entering Phoenix, so I'm just curious, if that's</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>very pertinent to that meeting, so if it's set, it's</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>going to be over there, it's more important to me for</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>that meeting than this meeting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>MR. SPARGO: I guess I'm not in tune with</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>all the things going on with I-11 study. I don't</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>know if anybody wants to add anything, but we can</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>follow up after this meeting with more information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>regarding that, with the I-11 team that's doing that</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>study.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>THE FACILITATOR: Scott Sprague. &quot;If</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1 transit, light rail is truly a priority for the
2 future of the Valley's transportation infrastructure,
3 why was a co-located line not considered as part of
4 this project?"
5           MR. SPARGO:  A co-located line, I mean, we
6 do in the Draft EIS discuss the option to co-locate
7 lines. There are some of those that are in the plan
8 today along I-10 west from downtown, as well as the
9 potential for something is around the SR 51 corridor.
10 I think the unique part is that being more of a loop
11 facility, it doesn't facilitate as much for the type
12 of uses that the light rail is, where it's being
13 developed more as a -- more in the spokes from the
14 downtown area.
15           And just like ADOT and MAG do, you know,
16 regional freeway planning and sort of put this system
17 together that works together, you know, Valley Metro
18 and the transit planners have looked at where the
19 best places are based on the density of population,
20 the jobs, and the housing and things like that to put
21 together their plan. And they've identified the
22 corridors that you see in the RTP at this time.
23 Which are more geared towards those other areas and
24 not this area.
25           THE FACILITATOR:  Okay. Let's do the

The Arizona Department of Transportation and Federal Highway Administration identified several issues and concerns that were frequently noted by commenters. Responses to these issues can be found in the Responses to Frequently Submitted Public Comments beginning on page B733 of this appendix.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Biology, Plants, and Wildlife</td>
<td>The Arizona Department of Transportation and Federal Highway Administration identified several issues and concerns that were frequently noted by commenters. Responses to these issues can be found in the Responses to Frequently Submitted Public Comments beginning on page B733 of this appendix.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. follow-up to your question, then I'll wrap up with the last one.
2. Yes, ma'am.
3. MEMBER OF PUBLIC: Okay. Regarding the Game & Fish being approached in 2002 and 2003, have the discussions continued since then, because a lot of information has been learned about appropriate wildlife crossing structures since 2002, and made leaps and bounds of discovery since that time.
4. UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Not specifically on that topic, no.
5. MEMBER OF PUBLIC: Okay.
6. THE FACILITATOR: One last question, the others remaining here we either addressed earlier tonight or have been referenced in the EIS, the draft. So we'll put the responses to these on the Internet so we have time for closing. Fair enough?
7. The last question, then, from Scott Sprague, "What about the Tucson Shovel-nose Snake?" is that what it's called, it is another candidate species in the region.
8. MR. SPARGO: Yeah, it is a candidate species, so therefore, as a candidate species therefore it isn't something that has a regulatory requirement, but it will be considered. The initial
1 assessment is that there really is not much
2 appropriate habitat.
3 THE FACILITATOR: Okay. That concludes the
4 open questions from the general public.
5 I'd like to introduce Chaun Hill. And
6 before Chaun comes up or while she's coming up,
7 please keep in mind we do have a quorum and we need
8 to close the meeting out shortly thereafter, but
9 Chaun has a couple comments. I have a closing
10 comments, and then we'll return.
11 CAT MEMBER: I have a question. What are
12 they going to do with these after the meeting?
13 THE FACILITATOR: What are we going to do
14 with the Draft EIS documents after the meeting?
15 MR. SPARGO: We use them at the public
16 hearings, to provide the public an opportunity to
17 look through. We'll have them at the public forums
18 as well. Beyond that, we don't have any.
19 CAT MEMBER: My community has their annual
20 meeting next week and having one of these available
21 would be beneficial.
22 MR. SPARGO: We've made them available for
23 people on the Citizens Advisory Team that have made
24 that request. So if you would like one, just talk to
25 me at the end and we can make that arrangement.
1 on this, so if I botch up some words, let me know.
2 Are these all from the same --
3 MEMBER OF PUBLIC: No.
4 THE FACILITATOR: Have you identified who
5 is who?
6 MEMBER OF PUBLIC: No.
7 THE FACILITATOR: Let's do that. Okay.
8 MEMBER OF PUBLIC: Sure.
9 THE FACILITATOR: What Fred is passing out
10 is the meeting evaluation form, please fill it out.
11 The first question is from Tiffany Sprague.
12 MEMBER OF PUBLIC: Sprague.
13 THE FACILITATOR: "Has the Arizona Game &
14 Fish been consulting regarding wildlife habitat and
15 mitigation efforts. For example, planning for any
16 wildlife proxy requires a multi-year effort to
17 determine the species, attempted crossing locations,
18 and where to place structures, in-depth analysis on
19 appropriate site, etc. Was Game & Fish consulted on
20 multi-functional design based on available
21 information such structures do not work for many
22 species?"
23 MR. SPARGO: Curt, go ahead.
24 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yes, in early, I
25 think it was 2002, 2003, Game & Fish was approached.

Not for mitigation specifically. The Federal Highway Administration and Arizona Department of Transportation have committed to continue coordination with the Arizona Game and Fish Department and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service regarding wildlife concerns that could result from the proposed freeway’s implementation. This commitment will be carried forward in the Final Environmental Impact Statement and Record of Division.
1 about the opportunity for providing structures on the
2 west end of the South Mountain Preserve area and a
3 meeting was held with FHWA and Game & Fish to talk
4 about the options. It was determined by Game & Fish
5 that the jurisdictional washes there, the corridors,
6 the movement corridors, the obvious locations for
7 multi-functional crossings would best serve wildlife,
8 and -- you can't hear?
9           In 2002, 2003, a meeting was held between
10 FHWA and Arizona Game & Fish Department to discuss
11 the opportunity for placement of wildlife crossings.
12 It was determined that the jurisdictional washes
13 provided the best opportunity, those are movement
14 corridors for a wide variety of wildlife. And it was
15 determined that because of the, let's say, the
16 population densities of wildlife in the area, it was
17 most beneficial on the western side of the South
18 Mountain Preserve to kind of access between the
19 floodplains and the Gila River; as far as the
20 designs, that's something that I think is potentially
21 still on the books to discuss. It was determined
22 that those were the best locations and opportunities
23 for any kind of crossing structures in the project
24 area. And that area has the most impact in terms of
25 lack of development.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Comment Document</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TELEPHONE CONVERSATION RECORD**  
**SOUTH MOUNTAIN FREEWAY INFORMATION LINE**

**INCOMING CALL**

**DATE:** 6/10/13  
**TIME:** 10:44 AM

**CALLER:** PENNY SPRAY  
**CALLER ADDRESS:** 5525 E. LINCOLN DRIVE #114, PARADISE VALLEY, ARIZONA 85253

**PHONE:** 480-949-8711  
**EMAIL:**

**CALLER REMARKS/QUESTIONS:**
I'm backing the South Mountain freeway. I can be reached at...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Comment noted.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SOUTH MOUNTAIN PUBLIC HEARING
/Public comments to reporter/
May 21, 2013
10:00 a.m.
REPORTED BY:
April Lassiter, CSR #1521

13 DANIELLE SPRING: I'm a part of the community
14 river of the Gila community. I live in District 6 in
15 the village of co-op. I live on 67th Avenue and
16 Elliot and I am appalled by the loop 202 extinction
17 being pursued through the South Mountain. I don't
18 believe the EIS has proper address on this freeway. I
19 don't even see that they are acknowledged as living
20 there, even though we have lived there for thousands and
21 thousands of years before Christ was born -- our people
22 have lived there.
23 We are not a tribe that was relocated though the
24 "Trail of Tears" or anything like that. We have always
25 lived here. We were created here. We have always been
1 here.
2 They did not succeed in killing us off completely
3 yet, I know with the 202 that is their intentions of
4 killing our people. I think this genocide in our
5 community, I don't believe it has been addressed -- the
6 pollution for the next five years, 20 years, 40 years
7 and beyond. Our people have lived here for thousands of
8 years and you can't project thousands of years.
9 I know these Laveen people don't care about that,
10 because they've only lived five, 10 years, maybe 30.
11 When the pollution comes, they're gonna leave. They
12 didn't come from here. They don't belong here. They're
13 going to go home where they belong. Who's going to be
14 stuck here if we're still around the atrocities of
15 what's happening to our community?
16 I think that, as I said, it has not been properly
17 addressed. They do not see. And I've seen in the Title
18 IV, that it has no bearing; this EIS, but that's
19 ridiculous, because we are a minority.
20 The Gila River is comprised of about twenty thousand
21 community members, all of which do not live on the
22 reservation. They've been displaced by lack of jobs and

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Cultural Resources</td>
<td>The Arizona Department of Transportation and Federal Highway Administration identified several issues and concerns that were frequently noted by commenters. Responses to these issues can be found in the Responses to Frequently Submitted Public Comments beginning on page B733 of this appendix.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Environmental Justice/Lifestyle</td>
<td>While the Preferred Alternative would have an adverse effect on environmental justice populations, impacts would be temporary and would not create undue hardship or be disproportionately high compared with projected impacts on all populations in the Study Area. All populations would benefit from the proposed action's implementation through improved regional mobility and reduced local arterial street traffic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Air Quality</td>
<td>The Arizona Department of Transportation and Federal Highway Administration identified several issues and concerns that were frequently noted by commenters. Responses to these issues can be found in the Responses to Frequently Submitted Public Comments beginning on page B733 of this appendix.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
23 things of that nature, so they had to move off the 24 reservation, especially in the District 6 area -- 25 thousands of people. So we're on the verge of 1 extinction. It's very sad.

2 They continue to push onto our people, onto our 3 community. I don't see any preparation (sic) from the 4 dusty lane area in Laveen. I don't believe they even 5 have the right-away in that area; for the Ahwatukee 6 Foot Hills. They don't explain how pollution is 7 going to affect them, how the pollution will sit between 8 the South Mountain and the Estrella Mountains. It's no 9 outlet for it. It's the only place in the valley that I 10 believe any freeway system will be going through that is 11 right between the valleys of these two mountains.

12 They're not far apart. They're close together. There's 13 no way for the two to escape.

14 I heard the EIS spoke with the Gila River community. 15 They work in conjunction. I don't see that reflected in 16 the EIS. They don't address the effects of our 17 community as folks on that mountain. They might speak 18 on it occasionally, but it's not thorough. I know it 19 says that the community doesn't allow certain 20 information. They didn't want it to be made public, but 21 that is 'just certain locations. They didn't want it to 22 be made public, which I don't understand why they would 23 care, since they're going to blast through it. They 24 have no regard for that. It's not cultural 25 significance, but it is.

1 They say there aren't any historical sites back 2 there, but there are plenty historical sites back there. 3 They have ancient trails back there. They aren't 4 recreational trails, as if people are going to buy 5 groceries -- icing these trails. That's why they're not 6 made historical sites, because people aren't going to 7 use them to go buy groceries. It's crazy. Who uses 8 those mountains to go buy their groceries? That's 9 stupid. I think that's ridiculous. I don't think 10 that's a reason to not be historical. It is historical.

11 It's been there thousands of years.

Also, it has not been addressed -- oh yeah, I was 12 talking about the minority of the people. Community 13 people are a minority -- a small minority, as related to 14 the Phoenix area. There's millions of people, millions 16 of people. Like I said, in District 6 there's only

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Comment Document</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1    | They continue to push onto our people, onto our community. I don't see any preparation (sic) from the dusty lane area in Laveen. I don't believe they even have the right-away in that area; for the Ahwatukee Foot Hills. They don't explain how pollution is going to affect them, how the pollution will sit between the South Mountain and the Estrella Mountains. It's no outlet for it. It's the only place in the valley that I believe any freeway system will be going through that is right between the valleys of these two mountains. They're not far apart. They're close together. There's no way for the two to escape. I heard the EIS spoke with the Gila River community. They work in conjunction. I don't see that reflected in the EIS. They don't address the effects of our community as folks on that mountain. They might speak on it occasionally, but it's not thorough. I know it says that the community doesn't allow certain information. They didn't want it to be made public, but that is 'just certain locations. They didn't want it to be made public, which I don't understand why they would care, since they're going to blast through it. They have no regard for that. It's not cultural significance, but it is.

1 They say there aren't any historical sites back there, but there are plenty historical sites back there. They have ancient trails back there. They aren't recreational trails, as if people are going to buy groceries -- icing these trails. That's why they're not made historical sites, because people aren't going to use them to go buy groceries. It's crazy. Who uses those mountains to go buy their groceries? That's stupid. I think that's ridiculous. I don't think that's a reason to not be historical. It is historical. It's been there thousands of years. Also, it has not been addressed -- oh yeah, I was talking about the minority of the people. Community people are a minority -- a small minority, as related to the Phoenix area. There's millions of people, millions of people. Like I said, in District 6 there's only

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Air Quality</td>
<td>According to the Arizona Department of Transportation, 2013, <em>Air Quality Assessment South Mountain Freeway 202L Draft Report</em>, review of wind data from the Gila River Indian Community monitoring site at St. Johns suggests that during the morning hours and associated with mountain-drainage air flows and stable atmospheric conditions, wind flows are from the southeast and follow the Gila River channel to the north. Locations to the east of St. Johns tend to flow from the east to the lower elevations along the Gila River. During the warmer hours’ improved mixing, flows typically follow the river channel and come from the north and northwest. Likewise, during a 1-month-long meteorological monitoring period (November 20, 2006, through December 21, 2006) at Pecos Road and 40th Street and a second 1-month-long monitoring period at Pecos Road and 24th and 40th streets (April 19, 2007, through May 21, 2007), winds during the morning hours typically were from the northeast. During the warmer hours, and with improved mixing, winds typically were from the west.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Cultural Resources</td>
<td>Prehistoric trails have been identified through archaeological survey and consultations with Native American tribes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
about 3000 people. In District 7 there's less than a thousand people. All of that pollution is going to cloud that area, right between Estrella and South Mountain. And when the wind comes and it blows, there's nowhere for it to go but south. When it goes to the south region, then that's going to affect the rest of our community members.

District 5, 2, 3, 1 -- there's no where else to go, because those mountains just make the valley for the Gila River community. It's one valley. I didn't see it addressed in the EIS about the Gila River environmental 3 award in 2010, how we have clean air. We won a national 4 award. I don't see that addressed in that -- how it's going to address our people.

When the Phoenix area is heavily polluted, you can see the clouds and smoke. It's ridiculous. They want to bring that down to our area. I don't agree with that. I don't believe it's a good policy they should be having, regardless.

To that one point, nine billion dollars on a freeway for 3 -- two miles is a huge waste of resources. They could use that money for something better -- do something more constructive with their time with that.

I see that they said that there's going to be a lot of traffic if they don't build this freeway. Oh yeah, they came to our community in District 6, and I think they told us that if we didn't build a freeway, then the projections in 2030 would be that there would be 15 to 16 thousand vehicles traveling 51st Avenue. Ok. But then, the freeway - if the freeway's built, it's going to be 250 thousand vehicles traveling on that freeway. That's stupid. That's retarded. Why is that better for our community to have 250 thousand communities, rather than 16 thousand? It doesn't make sense. It's retarded. That is outrageous. I can't believe it.

Hold on, I got more. Let me think. Those people are too much for me.

Also, if it hasn't been made aware that our culture is still alive, we're still here. We're not dead. We haven't been extinct yet. We are still practicing our culture and we still go to the mountain. We still pray at those sites that they're planning to blast through.
We leave our blessings there. We leave our prayers, our words of strength, guidance. We go to this mountain to gather those things for the types of things that we have to go through on a daily basis. We need that strength. We need that power that comes from our community. And we call it Nulduck (sic). That is our sacred place of being. That's where our creator was born. That's why he came out of the ground after the floods came and he created our people. That's why we live here, the Alamelech (sic), then people -- A-I-R-E-M-L -- I don't know how to spell it. Another -- which is O-T-H-O-M, I think I spelled it right. That's why the creator created the Othom people, to protect the land, to look after it. All the sites, the creator gave to us. That's what South Mountain means to us. That our creator was from there, and he created us from out of clay. That was used on the mountain.

Maybe you people don't believe in any of that. You don't care. You just came out of nowhere, the dust of something. We don't know where you came from -- where you came from. We know where we came from and our beliefs. We know where we were created. I don't know where you people were created and you probably don't know either. That's why it's probably not significant to you. That's not our fault. That's your fault for leaving your land, then you would know where you came from. Let me see. Ok. I'm running out of stuff to say. Thank you.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Comment Document</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>You're also welcome to provide additional comments to the court reporter in the next room. Your time is up. Andrew Pedro. Andrew, are you in the auditorium? Claudine Reifschneider. If you could turn the microphone and address the front, you'll be able to see the time better that way. MS. REIFSCHNEIDER: Thank you. THE FACILITATOR: Thank you. Just a note, remember, there are two microphones, one on either side, so if you'd please feel free to use either one. Danelle Spring. MS. SPRING: Hello, my name is Danelle Spring, I live in Co-op Village in Gila River Indian Community, District 6. I live on 67th Avenue and Elliot in that area, so the freeway affects me even though it's on 59th Avenue, it's only a few miles away from my house. It's really a tragedy to see this coming to be. I'm definitely against this freeway being built. And the EIS, I didn't see anywhere in there that it said the effect it would have on our community and our community members that live between the South Mountain and the Estrella Mountains. It really doesn't, I guess, affect...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1 Laveen because Laveen's kind of north of that, but we
2 live in the valley that's right between it. I don't see
3 anywhere in the EIS that addresses that, not in the last
4 five years, but 10, 20, 30, 40 years, what are the
5 projections from this pollution that's going to be
6 trapped in those mountains, in those little valley areas?
7 I didn't see that addressed anywhere.
8 In our community in the district we only have
9 maybe 2- or 3,000 people that live there, so we're a
10 small minority. I know we're not Phoenix area where they
11 have six million people so, of course, their voices are
12 going to be louder than our voices can possibly be.
13 There's more of them, there's few of us. When we talked
14 about extinction and things of that nature, I think our
15 people are going to be extinct if you project those
16 projections, what is it going to say, that they're all
17 going to be sick from cancer and who knows all what other
18 diseases that will come up from those toxins that come in
19 there, and there's no way for that pollution to escape.
20 I'm sorry for all you people. I know you don't
21 care, because you don't live out there, you live over
22 there on the north side and wherever you live, I know you
23 people don't concern yourself with us, just because we've
24 been here since way before any of you people ever even
25 have thought of coming out here. Our people have lived

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Comment Document</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1    | Laveen because Laveen's kind of north of that, but we
       | live in the valley that's right between it. I don't see
       | anywhere in the EIS that addresses that, not in the last
       | five years, but 10, 20, 30, 40 years, what are the
       | projections from this pollution that's going to be
       | trapped in those mountains, in those little valley areas?
       | I didn't see that addressed anywhere.

1. Laveen because Laveen's kind of north of that, but we
live in the valley that's right between it. I don't see
anywhere in the EIS that addresses that, not in the last
five years, but 10, 20, 30, 40 years, what are the
projections from this pollution that's going to be
trapped in those mountains, in those little valley areas?
I didn't see that addressed anywhere.

1. Laveen because Laveen's kind of north of that, but we
live in the valley that's right between it. I don't see
anywhere in the EIS that addresses that, not in the last
five years, but 10, 20, 30, 40 years, what are the
projections from this pollution that's going to be
trapped in those mountains, in those little valley areas?
I didn't see that addressed anywhere.

3. Air Quality
According to the Arizona Department of Transportation, 2013, Air Quality
Assessment South Mountain Freeway 202L Draft Report, review of wind data from the
Gila River Indian Community monitoring site at St. Johns suggests that during
the morning hours and associated with mountain-drainage air flows and stable
atmospheric conditions, wind flows are from the southeast and follow the Gila
River channel to the north. Locations to the east of St. Johns tend to flow from
the east to the lower elevations along the Gila River. During the warmer hours'
improved mixing, flows typically follow the river channel and come from the north
and northwest. Likewise, during a 1-month-long meteorological monitoring period
(November 20, 2006, through December 21, 2006) at Pecos Road and 40th Street
and a second 1-month-long monitoring period at Pecos Road and 24th and 40th
streets (April 19, 2007, through May 21, 2007), winds during the morning hours
typically were from the northeast. During the warmer hours, and with improved
mixing, winds typically were from the west.

4. Health Effects
The Arizona Department of Transportation and Federal Highway Administration
identified several issues and concerns that were frequently noted by commenters.
Responses to these issues can be found in the Responses to Frequently Submitted
Public Comments beginning on page B733 of this appendix.

5. Environmental Justice/Lifestyle
While the Preferred Alternative would have an adverse effect on environmental
justice populations, impacts would be temporary and would not create undue
hardship or be disproportionately high compared with projected impacts on all
populations in the Study Area. All populations would benefit from the proposed
action's implementation through improved regional mobility and reduced local
arterial street traffic.
out there for hundreds of years, not in the last couple
of decades, no, we've been out there for hundreds of
years, thousands of years, truly. It affects us more
than it affects anybody else.
I mean, besides the fact that the mountain is
sacred to us, yeah, it is sacred. I looked in the EIS
and it says oh, some people might be upset about this
that live in the community. Yeah, upset is not the word
that I would use for that. It's really disgusting,
really, how we feel about that, but I'm just talking
specifically about the pollution and how it affects our
people. I didn't see anything of that in the EIS. It
didn't even really act like we live there. I'm even -- I
don't even think it talked about the effects that would
have on the people that live in Ahwatukee and in the
Laveen area, because they would all be affected too.
There's all that congestion that's at the I-10 now
already where the Litchfield is and all that area, all
that pollution just stands there, stays there. If the
wind is blowing to the south it'll come straight down
between the bypass, come straight down through our
community, all the way to the other end.
So I have to say we're against this freeway
being built, it's just awful and tragic, and I would like
to see that addressed in EIS. What are your projections
for the future in 10, 15, 20 years for the people that
live out there? Thank you.

THE FACILITATOR: Thank you very much.

Andrew Pedro.

MR. PEDRO: Hello, I'm from the Gila River
Indian Community and I'm one of our community managers,
our community manager, David White for Gila River, he
stated that transportation officials were to be taking
cultural awareness training, and has that ever happened
for people part of the 202? Anyone? And if it were, who
would be taking those cultural awareness training
classes; would it be construction? Would it be ADOT
officials themselves? And in the DEIS it does say that
if any uncovered cultural items, that construction would
stop immediately. How are they supposed to know if
training never happened?

And like Danelle said, it is a sacred place to
us and we have been here thousands of years, you people
have been here 200 years. And that thing in the EIS,
except for saying that it could cause loss of cultural
property and that is like -- that's a violation of our
religious rights, that is a sacred place. How is ADOT
able to go through there with being that it's a public
park and it's a public preserve, so it's owned by the
public; how are you supposed to get those right-of-ways
THE REPORTER: Please state your name.

MS. SPRING: My name is Danelle Spring.

I'm a member of the Gila River Indian Community. I live in District 6 in the Co-Op Village. And I read the EIS, and I believe that it is old, and it should be updated. I think I read it, it was in like 12 years ago, that they did this statement, and 10 years ago. We just barely got our new hospital. We just got our dialysis center. We just got different things that have been built around the area, that they're proposing to put this freeway, and I don't think they took any of that into consideration. As a matter of fact, I don't think they took the effects it would have on the Gila River Indian Community into consideration very much. It doesn't talk about the award that we got for the clean air in 2010, because this State EIS was done over a decade ago. So I think that that's not right, that they should do it again and be more accurate. And I think the study area should be expanded because of the vicinity between District 6 between Estrella Mountain and South Mountain and it should be considered more in depth. For the next 20 years, 30 years, not just...
the next coming-up years, but in the future, how it's
going to look and how it will affect the people that
live in the Valley area right here, between, like I
said, the Estrellas and South Mountain.

I looked at the alternatives, and the
alternatives are just different ways to build the
freeway. I don't see alternatives for different
types of roads or different kinds of transportation,
other than a freeway. There's just alternatives to a
different freeway, because that's not alternatives.
Alternatives are more than one choice, you get more
than one choice. You get alternatives to one
freeway.

I would like to say that the impacts of
blasting through South Mountain in our community
culturally is just disgusting, really, that they
would attempt to do that. They hold sacred buildings
that they built 10 years ago, 20, 30, they hold that
as some kind of special building, and yet a place
that we consider to be our church can just be
destroyed, and they know that there are sacred sites
up there that they're going to demolish, and they say
in the EIS that that could affect some community
members, they don't know whether they're hehda
[phonetic] or not, it doesn't matter, it still

The Arizona Department of Transportation and Federal Highway Administration
identified several issues and concerns that were frequently noted by commenters.
Responses to these issues can be found in the Responses to Frequently Submitted
Public Comments beginning on page B733 of this appendix.

Federal regulations stipulate that an environmental impact statement shall
"rigorously explore and objectively evaluate all reasonable alternatives" (40 Code
of Federal Regulations § 1502.14; see Final Environmental Impact Statement
page 3-1). All alternatives were screened using a multidisciplinary set of criteria.
Nonfreeway alternatives were considered (see Final Environmental Impact
Statement pages 3-3 through 3-6). Among other things, the study took into
account improving existing freeways, improving or expanding other travel modes,
strategies to reduce travel demand, and various roadway configurations. This
study examined not only the potential impacts from improvements, but also the
consequences of building nothing, the No-Action Alternative. As proposed by
the Maricopa Association of Governments, the South Mountain Freeway would
be part of the Regional Freeway and Highway System. Other transportation
improvements such as mass transit and local roads are specified in the Regional
Transportation Plan and were considered during the evaluation of this proposed new
freeway.
affects them. It still affects them. And it affects all of us and the future of our people and how we perceive ourselves, especially in our district. We know that we are the original people in this land. We did not move here. We did not migrate here. And our creation stories are from that mountain, saying that we were born from the mountain or grandfather created us. And that's how we know ourselves to be who we are as O'odham people. And no study can really explain that to you. Either you have that feeling and you know that or you don't know it. You can't study that. You can't explain that.

You can't feel that way unless you're one of us. If you're not one of us, then you wouldn't know, and you never will know.

Most of the people that do these studies are from other countries, from other lands, they have to be, because they're not originally from here. Maybe their ancestors lived here for a couple of decades, but our ancestors have lived here from the beginning of time. You can't understand that unless you live in a place where your ancestors came from and you will never know what that's like. And it can't be explained.

I know that there are six million people…
In Phoenix, there's only 20,000, maybe 10-21,000 people that live here. So our voices are not being heard as loudly as the voices on the outside. And our voices could not possibly be heard as voices on the outside. It's not possible. And that's due to already taking away our land and already killing our people from different things, stealing our water, and things of that nature. Killing off all our elders and not having enough of us out here. It's already been done. And this is a continuation of that genocide on my people. It just keeps going and going, and there's never enough. They take a little bit for one road and then they want more and more and more. And they're just trying to get rid of everybody, it seems like. They have no feelings or concerns for the original people that live here.

In studying the alignment, I don't see why it has to be a freeway. Why can't it just be the roadways that go through there? Why does it have to be a freeway? Pecos Road already comes down to just a little bit below the mountain and it's on the south side, and it's four lanes, but there's two lanes going east and westbound. And then on Gila River

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Comment Document</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>in Phoenix, and there's only 20,000, maybe 10-21,000 of us that live in this community, that live in this area. Of District 6, there's only about 3,000 people that live here. So our voices are not being heard as loudly as the voices on the outside. And our voices could not possibly be heard as voices on the outside. It's not possible. And that's due to already taking away our land and already killing our people from different things, stealing our water, and things of that nature. Killing off all our elders and not having enough of us out here. It's already been done. And this is a continuation of that genocide on my people. It just keeps going and going, and there's never enough. They take a little bit for one road and then they want more and more and more. And they're just trying to get rid of everybody, it seems like. They have no feelings or concerns for the original people that live here.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>In studying the alignment, I don't see why it has to be a freeway. Why can't it just be the roadways that go through there? Why does it have to be a freeway? Pecos Road already comes down to just a little bit below the mountain and it's on the south side, and it's four lanes, but there's two lanes going east and westbound. And then on Gila River</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Environmental Justice/Lifestyle</td>
<td>While the Preferred Alternative would have an adverse effect on environmental justice populations, impacts would be temporary and would not create undue hardship or be disproportionately high compared with projected impacts on all populations in the Study Area. All populations would benefit from the proposed action’s implementation through improved regional mobility and reduced local arterial street traffic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Alternatives</td>
<td>In the best-case scenario, a parkway would carry approximately 105,000 vehicles per day, well below the average daily traffic on the proposed freeway, which would range from 117,000 to 190,000 vehicles per day (see Final Environmental Impact Statement page 3-19). As a result, the Arizona Parkway would lack sufficient capacity to meet projected travel demand. The Arizona Parkway would not adequately address the projected transportation system capacity deficiency, would not remove a sufficient amount of traffic from arterial streets, and, therefore, would not meet the project’s purpose and need. For these reasons, the Arizona Parkway was eliminated from further consideration.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1 side, there's the Vee Quiva Casino, and that has two, the same thing, it has two lanes, two ways to go on north and -- east and west, north and south. So I don't understand why one of the alternatives is just to not connect those two pieces of road and have them be together. And then that would open up that area for the people. But not to allow big diesel trucks on those roads. Not to allow hazardous material on those roads, but really just to be for local traffic. That makes more sense than blasting through the mountain. That would save all of the Pecos people's homes in Ahwatukee. That will save all of the Laveen people's homes that live on Dusty Lane. And it doesn't seem like it's necessary to blast through the mountain and put an eight-lane freeway, so that all these trucks can pass through there, giving off all their diesel fuel and things like that.

It doesn't make any sense at all, when they already have the road that goes down south and comes around the Estrella Mountains. That's already supposed to be a truck bypass. They're using that truck bypass, the 303. The 303 is coming through; then why do you need the 202? The 303 is already almost put together, so why would they need the 202 as well to be expanded over here? It doesn't make...
The Arizona Department of Transportation and Federal Highway Administration identified several issues and concerns that were frequently noted by commenters. Responses to these issues can be found in the Responses to Frequently Submitted Public Comments beginning on page B733 of this appendix.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Purpose and Need, Lack of Support</td>
<td>The Arizona Department of Transportation and Federal Highway Administration identified several issues and concerns that were frequently noted by commenters. Responses to these issues can be found in the Responses to Frequently Submitted Public Comments beginning on page B733 of this appendix.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Alternatives, W59 Alternative Versus W101 Alternative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Comment Document</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>sense.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Also, they came to our community, and they have a whole chapter devoted to the Gila River Indian Community, blah, blah, blah, and they don't seem to take note that every time they come to the Gila River Indian Community, we've been saying no for 20 years, 30 years, however long this has been coming up, everybody has been saying no. We don't want it in our community. We have our resolutions against it. We have resolutions to try to protect the mountains and we intend to push our council representatives to take a lawsuit against the State of Arizona for continuously taking advantage of us, and for not listening to us, and not taking our opinions into their EIS. They just overlap it, and don't even consider it. I mean, I read the whole chapter and it seems pretty stupid. And it says that the community won't allow them to share, or whatever, they won't tell them what's the significance of the mountains to us. I don't understand that. It doesn't make any sense. I think we have told them numerous times, but it just doesn't seem to get into the EIS report. All I know is that if ADOT continues to push this freeway through our community, we will be</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Alternatives</td>
<td>No alternative is proposed to be on or use Gila River Indian Community land.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
forced to take action on them through a lawsuit, through a civil suit, whatever we have to do, that's what we plan to do. To join with the people in Ahwatukee who don't want it to come through there and some people in Laveen who don't want it to come through there, and there's some that do, but whatever. We're going to have to keep moving on, keep fighting this. Because this is ridiculous. That's it. Thank you.

THE REPORTER: Thank you very much.
Finally!!! The benefits far outweigh the hindrances.

We, however, trust that the people whose homes or businesses are being affected or lost will be very fairly compensated. And..we trust that they will also receive the help and guidance they might need to start over again somewhere else.

Thank you! Please... enough planning. 28 years should do it. Let’s get this done!!

Steve and Barbara Spurlock
Laveen

------------------------------
Barbara Spurlock
SPURS HOME INSPECTION SERVICES
SPURS MECHANICAL SPECIALTIES
P.O. BOX 769
LAVEEN, AZ 85339
602-795-0695
mailto:spurs@cox.net
http://www.SpursHomeInspections.com

Confidentiality and Nondisclosure Notice: This email transmission and any attachments are intended for use by the persons/employees 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 return this email.
MR. ST. LEGER: My name is Jim and last name is St. Leger. I've been living in Arizona 17 years. When my wife and I moved here, we didn't have children at the time. We looked long and hard before we decided where in the Phoenix metro area we would live. The factors that impacted our choices were quality of life, access to the outdoors and clean air.

I have a distinct memory of looking at pollution maps that showed the prevailing winds in the Phoenix metro area pushing more pollution to the northeast area including Scottsdale and that part of town, and was extremely happy to see that Ahwatukee had some of the cleanest air in Phoenix which is why I moved there.

I was aware of the potential freeway at the time, but then watching Loop 202, Loop 101 get built, the impact of what might come hit home. When I look at the -- who might use this highway, I can't fathom the need in an Ahwatukee area of a six to ten lane freeway. The population clearly can't justify it nor can the traffic.

However, if I drive up I-10 into downtown and lived in that corridor, I would love to see all of that traffic off-loaded onto Santan Freeway, Loop.

The Arizona Department of Transportation and Federal Highway Administration identified several issues and concerns that were frequently noted by commenters. Responses to these issues can be found in the Responses to Frequently Submitted Public Comments beginning on page B733 of this appendix.
202. Which as a resident, I absolutely never want to see happen because of the diesel particulates from the tractor-trailers, the noise, the traffic, the congestion and frankly what it will do to my quality of life, and specifically the three children I now have today being impacted by it.

So from that perspective, I'm tremendously against a full freeway. If the argument is valid that people that live in the Phoenix metro area absolutely need it themselves, then put in a four lane parkway and ban the use of tractor-trailers. That would meet the local metro needs for traffic while eliminating the truck pollution problem, including trucks from Mexico that are not required, nor do they meet EPA air standards today.

Beyond that, I just struggle to see why we need to destroy our environment, South Mountain. For me the single most logical solution to the overarching metro traffic problem including I-10 through traffic would be to create a bypass that would be a shorter route for trucks likely off of I-8 through some other desolate area that doesn't impact any people or environments. And I think that's enough.
The proposed freeway is part of a transportation system developed to improve mobility in the region by increasing capacity and providing alternatives to allow traffic to bypass already congested routes (see Final Environmental Impact Statement pages 1-21, 1-22, 3-1, and 3-3). Like other "loop" freeways in the Phoenix metropolitan area, the proposed South Mountain Freeway would be a commuter corridor, helping to move local traffic between the eastern and western portions of Maricopa County. The State Route 85/Interstate 8 Alternative was evaluated for the proposed project. The reasons this alternative was eliminated from further study are presented on page 3-9 of the Final Environmental Impact Statement.
To Whom It May Concern:

I have attached a letter voicing my opinions on the DEIS report for the South Mountain Freeway (202 Extension). It is important for those of us residing in the Ahwatukee community to express our concerns regarding this proposed highway and the impact it will have on our unique area.

It is hoped this letter will be read and appreciated for its content. The primary concern is the quality of life for those of us who reside in Ahwatukee.

 Regards,
 Larry Stackhouse

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Neighborhoods/Communities</td>
<td>While the E1 Alternative is adjacent to the largely residential areas of Ahwatukee Foothills Village (to the north), a freeway has been planned in this location for many years (see Final Environmental Impact Statement pages 4-17 and 4-21). Where existing residential uses are adjacent to the proposed freeway, noise mitigation would be implemented according to the Arizona Department of Transportation policy (see Final Environmental Impact Statement page 4-91).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
To Whom It May Concern:

The most critical point of concern regarding this or any construction of highways in our state must be the welfare of its residents. Any number of studies can focus on important issues but none that I have seen address this most important aspect.

In reviewing this latest proposal from DEIS, it appears perfectly clear that this roadway will be a truck bypass. It will disrupt, degrade and pollute the Ahwatukee subdivision and the Gila River Indian Community. It does not enhance the quality of life or even maintain our present community attributes.

In speaking to neighbors and others residing in the area, less than 1% have told me they would use this highway. This is a clear sign that it is not meant to improve our quality of life but rather make it easier for commercial vehicles to save travel time by means of this bypass.

This has been proven by listening and talking to a number of trucking companies whose terminals are in close proximity to the I-10 junction of this extension. In fact, I have personally been told that no less than 100 trucks per hour will be using this 202 Extension.

This does not include the truck traffic that will originate in Mexico, which allows higher levels of sulfur in diesel fuel. They will be well into Arizona and past Phoenix before they will need to refuel. This will most definitely add to an already high level of pollution.

The Arizona Department of Transportation and Federal Highway Administration identified several issues and concerns that were frequently noted by commenters. Responses to these issues can be found in the Responses to Frequently Submitted Public Comments beginning on page B733 of this appendix.
The State Route 85/Interstate 8 Alternative was evaluated for the proposed
Alternatives
Health Effects
Alternatives
Response
The Draft Environmental Impact Statement provides a summary of the project
team’s analysis of the Tunnel Alternatives. Please see pages 3-14, 3-16 and 3-17,
and 5-18 through 5-20. Options to build a tunnel under the South Mountains
were eliminated from further study not just because of high costs. They would
not protect the South Mountains. Tunnel Alternatives would create safety and
constructability concerns, undesirable intrusion-related impacts, and maintenance
issues. Tunnel Alternatives would not achieve avoidance of the South Mountains
or meaningfully reduce use-related impacts under Section 4(f). Tunnel Alternatives
would have less visual, noise level, and habitat acreage impacts than would the
open-cut design of the proposed action.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Alternatives</td>
<td>The Draft Environmental Impact Statement provides a summary of the project team’s analysis of the Tunnel Alternatives. Please see pages 3-14, 3-16 and 3-17, and 5-18 through 5-20. Options to build a tunnel under the South Mountains were eliminated from further study not just because of high costs. They would not protect the South Mountains. Tunnel Alternatives would create safety and constructability concerns, undesirable intrusion-related impacts, and maintenance issues. Tunnel Alternatives would not achieve avoidance of the South Mountains or meaningfully reduce use-related impacts under Section 4(f). Tunnel Alternatives would have less visual, noise level, and habitat acreage impacts than would the open-cut design of the proposed action.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Air Quality</td>
<td>According to the Arizona Department of Transportation, 2013, Air Quality Assessment South Mountain Freeway 2021 Draft Report, review of wind data from the Gila River Indian Community monitoring site at St. Johns suggests that during the morning hours and associated with mountain-drainage air flows and stable atmospheric conditions, wind flows are from the southeast and follow the Gila River channel to the north. Locations to the east of St. Johns tend to flow from the east to the lower elevations along the Gila River. During the warmer hours’ improved mixing, flows typically follow the river channel and come from the north and northwest. Likewise, during a 1-month-long meteorological monitoring period (November 20, 2006, through December 21, 2006) at Pecos Road and 40th Street and a second 1-month-long monitoring period at Pecos Road and 24th and 40th streets (April 19, 2007, through May 21, 2007), winds during the morning hours typically were from the northeast. During the warmer hours, and with improved mixing, winds typically were from the west.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Hazardous Materials</td>
<td>The Arizona Department of Transportation and Federal Highway Administration identified several issues and concerns that were frequently noted by commenters. Responses to these issues can be found in the Responses to Frequently Submitted Public Comments beginning on page B733 of this appendix.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Health Effects</td>
<td>Prospective home buyers and members of the church built after the freeway was conceived, according to State law, should have been informed of the proposed facility. (Sellers are obligated by Arizona common law to disclose all known material facts about a property to the buyer.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Neighborhoods/Communities</td>
<td>The State Route 85/Interstate 8 Alternative was evaluated for the proposed project. The reasons this alternative was eliminated from further study are presented on page 3-9 of the Final Environmental Impact Statement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Alternatives</td>
<td>The proposed freeway is part of a transportation system developed to improve mobility in the region by increasing capacity and providing alternatives to allow traffic to bypass already congested routes (see Final Environmental Impact Statement pages 1-21, 1-22, 3-1, and 3-3). Like other “loop” freeways in the Phoenix metropolitan area, the proposed South Mountain Freeway would be a commuter corridor, helping to move local traffic between the eastern and western portions of Maricopa County.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

At the proposed highway marches toward the Estrella Mountain Range it will make a bend to the north to either circumvent South Mountain or be tunneled under it. This area is already plagued by pollution. The area between the northeast section of the Estrellas and the northwest part of the South Mountain range forms a funnel that does not allow for air to move through the pass. This is true now and will only become more troublesome if this roadway is built. Additionally, on the north side of South Mountain, at 45th Avenue and Broadway there is an air quality monitor. The station already reports air quality levels that are above acceptable levels and more traffic will not improve this fact.

There has also not been a comprehensive report and study on emergencies and hazardous spills that could occur on this freeway. Access by emergency vehicles does not seem to be addressed or defined by the plans in the report. People will die and be exposed to everything from fuel spills, chlorine and any number of other highly dangerous substances.

There are a number of public schools, at least five, and private schools that are located within a half mile of the proposed new road. Studies have shown the negative effect upon children whose schools are in close proximity to highways. Located within a half mile of the proposed new road.

Asthmatic conditions are heightened and other health risks are adversely affected.

As the proposed highway marches toward the Estrella Mountain Range it will make a bend to the north to either circumvent South Mountain or be tunneled under it. This area is already plagued by pollution. The area between the northeast section of the Estrellas and the northwest part of the South Mountain range forms a funnel that does not allow for air to move through the pass. This is true now and will only become more troublesome if this roadway is built. Additionally, on the north side of South Mountain, at 45th Avenue and Broadway there is an air quality monitor. The station already reports air quality levels that are above acceptable levels and more traffic will not improve this fact.

There has also not been a comprehensive report and study on emergencies and hazardous spills that could occur on this freeway. Access by emergency vehicles does not seem to be addressed or defined by the plans in the report. People will die and be exposed to everything from fuel spills, chlorine and any number of other highly dangerous substances.

There are a number of public schools, at least five, and private schools that are located within a half mile of the proposed new road. Studies have shown the negative effect upon children whose schools are in close proximity to highways. Located within a half mile of the proposed new road. A number of public schools, at least five, and private schools that are located within a half mile of the proposed new road. Studies have shown the negative effect upon children whose schools are in close proximity to highways.

The design also is planned to displace a community church at the corner of Pecos and 32nd Street. I have never known this to happen in several other major metropolitan areas in which I have resided. Again, another example of degrading the life of community residents.

What I also do not understand is the selection of this route, when it could be the most expensive limited access highway ever built. It will also add to an already poor air quality and cause additional traffic delays during high travel periods. I-10 on the west side of the city is already one of the most backed up of stretches in the valley. Adding more stopped cars is not going to improve travel, air quality and the quality of life for the people in the area.

The only realistic option I can imagine for a highway that is meant to bypass the downtown part of the city is one that is west of the Estrella Mountains. A highway that will travel south to Route 8 and connect to I-10 near the 303 makes much more sense. This would displace the least amount of people, provide a true truck bypass with less impact on residents, add much less pollution to an already poor air quality area and cost a lot less money.

If this SMF proposal is meant to be a benefit to the area, then why not restrict it to non-commercial vehicles? This has been done in and around the Baltimore/Washington DC area, Philadelphia, PA, Florida and numerous other areas around the country.
This proposal has left me highly suspicious. I can only hope that land owners and politicians are not taking advantage of a situation to improve their own standing at the expense of the tax paying public.

In conclusion, there seems to be little advantage to building this highway as proposed. With the millions of dollars spent on studies, reports and analysis, it is one of the least comprehensive studies of have ever seen. The only benefit I can draw from the information provided is to conclude it would be an excellent truck bypass for companies both far and near. It certainly would not improve the quality of life for those living in the area.

Respectfully,

Larry Stackhouse

Cc: PARC
LARRY STACKHOUSE: To whom it may concern:

The most critical point of concern regarding this or any construction of highways in our state must be the welfare of its residents. Any number of studies can focus on important issues but none that I have seen address this most important aspect.

In reviewing this latest proposal from DRIS, it appears perfectly clear that this roadway will be a truck bypass. It will disrupt, degrade, and pollute the Ahwatukee subdivision and the Gila River Indian Community. It does not enhance the quality of life or even maintain our present community attributes. In speaking to neighbors and others residing in the area, less than one percent have told me they would use this highway.

This is a clear sign that it is not meant to improve our quality of life, but rather make it easier for commercial vehicles to save travel time by means of this bypass. This has been proven by listening and talking to a number of trucking companies whose terminals are in close proximity to the I-10 junction of this extension.

In fact, I have personally been told that no less than 100 trucks per hour will be using this 202 extension. This does not include the truck traffic that...
1 will originate in Mexico which allows higher levels of sulfur in their diesel fuel. They will be well into Arizona and past Phoenix before they will need to refuel. This will most definitely add to an already high level of pollution.

As a proposed highway marches toward the Estrella Mountain range, it will make a bend to the north to either circumvent South Mountain or go through it. This area is already plagued by pollution. The area between the northeast section of the Estrellas and the northwest part of South Mountain range forms a tunnel that does not allow for air to move through the pass. This is true now and will only become more troublesome if this roadway is built.

Additionally, on the north side of South Mountain around 43rd Avenue and Broadway there is an air quality monitor. This station already reports air quality levels that are above acceptable levels and more traffic will not improve this fact.

There also have not been comprehensive reports and studies on emergency and hazardous spills that could occur on this freeway. Access by emergency vehicles does not seem to be addressed or defined by the plans in the report. People will die and be exposed to everything from fuel spills, chlorine, and any number of

The Arizona Department of Transportation and Federal Highway Administration identified several issues and concerns that were frequently noted by commenters. Responses to these issues can be found in the Responses to Frequently Submitted Public Comments beginning on page B733 of this appendix.

The Arizona Department of Transportation and Federal Highway Administration identified several issues and concerns that were frequently noted by commenters. Responses to these issues can be found in the Responses to Frequently Submitted Public Comments beginning on page B733 of this appendix.

The Final Environmental Impact Statement provides a thorough summary of the project team’s analysis of the Tunnel Alternatives. Please see pages 3-14, 3-16 and 3-17, and 5-18 through 5-20. Options to build a tunnel under the South Mountains were eliminated from further study not just because of high costs. They would not protect the South Mountains. Tunnel Alternatives would create safety and constructibility concerns, undesirable intrusion-related impacts, and maintenance issues. Tunnel Alternatives would not achieve avoidance of the South Mountains or meaningfully reduce use-related impacts under Section 4(f). Tunnel Alternatives would have less visual, noise level, and habitat acreage impacts than would the open-cut design of the proposed action.

According to the Arizona Department of Transportation, 2013, Air Quality Assessment South Mountain Freeway 202L Draft Report, review of wind data from the Gila River Indian Community monitoring site at St. Johns suggests that during the morning hours and associated with mountain-drainage air flows and stable atmospheric conditions, wind flows are from the southeast and follow the Gila River channel to the north. Locations to the east of St. Johns tend to flow from the east to the lower elevations along the Gila River. During the warmer hours' improved mixing, flows typically follow the river channel and come from the north and northwest. Likewise, during a 1-month-long meteorological monitoring period (November 20, 2006, through December 21, 2006) at Pecos Road and 40th Street and a second 1-month-long monitoring period at Pecos Road and 24th and 40th streets (April 19, 2007, through May 21, 2007), winds during the morning hours typically were from the northeast. During the warmer hours, and with improved mixing, winds typically were from the west.

The Arizona Department of Transportation and Federal Highway Administration identified several issues and concerns that were frequently noted by commenters. Responses to these issues can be found in the Responses to Frequently Submitted Public Comments beginning on page B733 of this appendix.
There are a number of public schools, at least five, and private schools that are located within a half mile of the proposed new road. Studies have shown the negative effect upon children whose schools are in close proximity to highways. Asthmatic conditions are heightened and other health risks are adversely affected.

The design is also planned to displace a community church at the corner of Pecos and 32nd Street. I have never known this to happen in several other major metropolitan areas in which I have resided. Again, another example of degrading the life of community residents.

What I also do not understand is the selection of this route when it could be the most expensive limited access highway ever built.

It will also add to an already poor air quality and cause additional traffic delays during high travel periods. I-10 on the west side of the city is already one of the most backed up stretches in the Valley. Adding more stopped cars is not going to improve travel, air quality, and the quality of life for the people in the area.

The only realistic option I can imagine for a highway that is meant to bypass the downtown part

The Arizona Department of Transportation and Federal Highway Administration identified several issues and concerns that were frequently noted by commenters. Responses to these issues can be found in the Responses to Frequently Submitted Public Comments beginning on page B733 of this appendix.
### Code | Comment Document
---|---
13 | Alternatives

The proposed freeway is part of a transportation system developed to improve mobility in the region by increasing capacity and providing alternatives to allow traffic to bypass already congested routes (see Final Environmental Impact Statement pages 1-21, 1-22, 3-1, and 3-3). Like other "loop" freeways in the Phoenix metropolitan area, the proposed South Mountain Freeway would be a commuter corridor, helping to move local traffic between the eastern and western portions of Maricopa County. The State Route 85/Interstate 8 Alternative was evaluated for the proposed project. The reasons this alternative was eliminated from further study are presented on page 3-9 of the Final Environmental Impact Statement.

---

1 of the city is one that is west of the Estrella Mountains. A highway that will travel south to Route 8 and connect I-10 near the 303 makes much more sense. This would displace the least amount of people, provide a truck route bypass with less impact on residents, add much less pollution to an already poor air quality area, and cost a lot less money.

If this SMF proposal is meant to be a benefit to the area, then why not restrict it to non-commercial vehicles?

This has been done in and around the Baltimore, DC area, Philadelphia, Florida, and numerous other areas around the country.

This proposal has also left me highly suspicious. I can only hope that landowners and politicians are not taking advantage of a situation to improve their own standing at the expense of the tax-paying public.

In conclusion, there seems to be little advantage in building this highway as proposed. The millions of dollars spent on studies, reports, and analyses, it is one of the least comprehensive studies I have ever seen. The only benefit I can draw from the information provided is to conclude it would be an excellent truck bypass for companies both far and near.
It certainly would not improve the quality of life for those living in the area.

Respectfully, Larry Stackhouse.


The South Mountain Freeway will get built, better to build it sooner that latter as it will only get more expensive as time goes on.

- The money to build the freeway is in the budget. It was approved by voters twice, first in 1985 and again in 2004.
- The project will create 30,000 jobs during the five to six year construction period and result in a $2 billion investment in the Phoenix-area economy.
- If we don’t build the South Mountain freeway, traffic in the region will get much worse over the next two decades. According to ADOT’s own study:

  - Traffic on I-10 between Ahwatukee and Goodyear will grow 28%
  - Another 103,000 cars will use the Broadway Curve each day
  - Another 38,000 cars will jam the Tunnel every day
  - Morning and evening commute times will increase 39% to 82%
  - Traffic congestion on city streets will increase 46%
The project will create jobs for the local community and reduce traffic congestion on the I-10 freeway.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Comment Document</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Brian Stadnick</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Document Created: 5/21/2013 2:06:19 PM by Web Comment Form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The project will create jobs for the local community and reduce traffic congestion on the I-10 freeway.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Comment noted.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MS. DOROMAL: Hi, good afternoon. My name is Lisa Doromal and I am a resident of Laveen and I am for the Loop 202 to bring sustainability to our community and have the hospital brought in, it is all contingent with the 202 being built. Thank you.

THE FACILITATOR: Thank you.

Mike Doromal.

MR. DOROMAL: Good afternoon. My name is Michael Doromal, I’m also for the Loop 202. Laveen is an underserved community, there’s a lot of services and businesses that will come into Laveen once the 202 is built. The residents are looking for it. It’s been an option since the ‘80s, so let’s get this freeway built.

Thank you.

THE FACILITATOR: Thank you.

Brian Stadnick.

MR. STADNICK: Yes, good afternoon. I'm Brian Stadnick, I'm a resident of Glendale, but I use the West Valley freeways extensively and I think it's with the help to aid the traffic congestion in the I-10, plus I think that now is the perfect time to build this freeway. The contracting environment and the economy the way it is, I think there's no time like the present to be able to build this thing for the cost savings of the public, so let’s get this thing built. Thank you.
TELEPHONE CONVERSATION RECORD
SOUTH MOUNTAIN FREEWAY INFORMATION LINE

INCOMING CALL
DATE: 05/13/13
TIME: 4:01 PM

CALLER: ROBERT STALDER
CALLER ADDRESS: 2582 W. IRONWOOD DRIVE, CHANDLER, AZ 85254
PHONE: EMAIL:

CALLER REMARKS/QUESTIONS:
I support the freeway construction.

1

Comment noted.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Comment Document</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TELEPHONE CONVERSATION RECORD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SOUTH MOUNTAIN FREEWAY INFORMATION LINE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DATE</td>
<td>6/15/13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TIME</td>
<td>2:03 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CALLER</td>
<td>TODD STAN/STEVEN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHONE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMAIL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CALLER REMARKS/QUESTIONS:
I support the South Mountain freeway. We've spoken about it twice approving it, it's time to build it. It makes sense with regard to the economy. It makes sense with regard to lowering the traffic. It makes sense with regard to getting started on it early and now. So I support the freeway and getting started on it now. Thank you.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Comment noted.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**TELEPHONE CONVERSATION RECORD**  
**SOUTH MOUNTAIN FREEWAY INFORMATION LINE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>TIME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5/15/13</td>
<td>9:09 AM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CALLER:**  
DENISE STANSON  
**CALLER ADDRESS:**  
10134 E. [UNCLEAR] ROAD, TEMPE, AZ  
**PHONE:**  
**EMAIL:**

**CALLER REMARKS/QUESTIONS:**  
I support the freeway.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Comment noted.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
From: JOAN STEDMAN [mailto:halstedman@msn.com]
Sent: Saturday, May 18, 2013 12:32 PM
To: Projects
Subject: Construct the 202 South Mtn freeway

Thanks for the opportunity to give input regarding this subject. I think that this unique bypass would really alleviate the traffic congestion on I-10 going east into Phoenix, especially during the “rush hour” period. This is an obvious statement. I feel that then air quality in Phoenix would be impacted in a positive way.

The alignment I prefer is a continuation of the existing 101 west to the south from I-10.

Hal Stedman.
Goodyear, AZ

Sent from Windows Mail
Comment noted.

From: Projects
To: Projects
Subject: FW: Build the 202
Date: Monday, May 20, 2013 8:28:09 AM

From: Tony Stedry [mailto:tsted31@yahoo.com]
Sent: Saturday, May 18, 2013 1:01 PM
To: Projects
Subject: Build the 202

I commute to the west side of Phoenix/Glendale and would love to see this freeway finished. It was supposed to be built years ago and the homes that were built in its path were put there with the knowledge of this freeway project. Yet they chose to build there anyway. We owe them nothing and the freeway should go on as proposed. Please help me cut my commute time in half by finishing the project that should have already been started.

Thank you,
Anthony Stedry
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Comment Document</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>From: Projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To: Projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Subject: 202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Date: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 10:54:00 AM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---Original Message---
From: Ashley Steele [mailto:ap_steele@hotmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, May 21, 2013 11:20 AM
To: Projects
Subject: 202

I am writing in support and vote YES to the Loop 202 South Mountain Freeway, specifically the W59 alternative.

Sent from my iPhone

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.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Alternatives, No-Action (No-Build) Alternative</td>
<td>The Arizona Department of Transportation and Federal Highway Administration identified several issues and concerns that were frequently noted by commenters. Responses to these issues can be found in the Responses to Frequently Submitted Public Comments beginning on page B733 of this appendix.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Purpose and Need</td>
<td>Although the region’s freeways are now congested during the peak travel period, conditions in 2035 without the proposed freeway would be substantially worse with more congested areas and congested conditions for longer periods of time (see Final Environmental Impact Statement pages 1-21 and 1-22). Congestion relief resulting from the proposed freeway would provide localized reductions of delays on arterial streets and at interchanges. Reduced travel times would result in lower exposure to elevated concentrations of mobile source air toxics occurring in traffic. Other benefits of the proposed freeway in comparison to the No-Action Alternative are presented in Table 3-9 on page 3-38 of the Final Environmental Impact Statement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Alternatives</td>
<td>Federal regulations stipulate that an environmental impact statement shall “rigorously explore and objectively evaluate all reasonable alternatives” (40 Code of Federal Regulations § 1502.14; see Final Environmental Impact Statement page 3-1). All alternatives were screened using a multidisciplinary set of criteria. Nonfreeway alternatives were considered (see Final Environmental Impact Statement pages 3-3 through 3-6). Among other things, the study took into account improving existing freeways, improving or expanding other travel modes, strategies to reduce travel demand, and various roadway configurations. This study examined not only the potential impacts from improvements, but also the consequences of building nothing, the No-Action Alternative. As proposed by the Maricopa Association of Governments, the South Mountain Freeway would be part of the Regional Freeway and Highway System. Other transportation improvements such as mass transit and local roads are specified in the Regional Transportation Plan and were considered during the evaluation of this proposed new Freeway. As noted in the Final Environmental Impact Statement (see page 3-60), the proposed freeway would provide opportunities to enhance operation of future mass transit improvements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Air Quality</td>
<td>The Arizona Department of Transportation and Federal Highway Administration identified several issues and concerns that were frequently noted by commenters. Responses to these issues can be found in the Responses to Frequently Submitted Public Comments beginning on page B733 of this appendix.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Health Effects</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Section 4(f) and Section 6(f)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Biology, Plants, and Wildlife</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Responses continue on next page)
Unplanned growth is often termed “urban sprawl.” Generally, this term is used in the context of rapid and uncontrolled urban growth onto previously undeveloped land—usually on the outskirts of an existing urban area. Projects like the proposed freeway are often identified as contributors to urban sprawl. Freeway projects are often cited as making land at the urban fringe more accessible and, therefore, more attractive for development. However, examination of data comparing population and land use between 1975 and 2000 suggests major transportation projects like the proposed freeway do not induce growth in the region (see Final Environmental Impact Statement pages 4-170 through 4-174). The proposed action would be implemented in a historically quickly urbanizing area (most noticeably in the Western Section of the Study Area, although the nationwide recession which began in 2007 slowed growth). In the Eastern Section of the Study Area, the proposed freeway would abut public parkland, Native American land, and a near-fully developed area—therefore, any contribution to accelerated or induced growth would be constrained. The proposed freeway would be built in an area planned for urban growth as established in local jurisdictions’ land use plans for at least the last 25 years.
TELEPHONE CONVERSATION RECORD
SOUTH MOUNTAIN FREEWAY INFORMATION LINE

DATE: 05/10/13
TIME: 9:34 AM

CALLER: FREDERICK STEIN
CALLER ADDRESS: 5732 W. SHANNON, CHANDLER, AZ 85226
PHONE: EMAIL:

CALLER REMARKS/QUESTIONS:
I think that the Loop 202 South Mountain Freeway should be built. It would be a shame if this project is not passed.

Comment noted.
From: Ray Steinhart
To: Projects
Subject: Southmountain Freeway comments
Date: Friday, May 24, 2013 8:38 AM

I understand the purpose of the freeway is to relieve traffic on I-10 through metro Phoenix. I commute from the Northwest Valley North/South on the West Loop 101 Aqua Fria freeway to I-10 east to 59th avenue. During the high traffic season August through May when winter visitors as well as students/teachers add to the freeways, I-10 is backed up from the Loop 101 all the way to I-17 daily. Why would ADOT want to add more traffic?

I believe adding the Southmountain Freeway route in general is going to encourage more traffic off of I-8 and bring it to I-10. I cannot understand why the preferred route would be anywhere east of the Loop 101 and utilizing I-10. Additionally, the W59 has the most disruption to people and businesses. How could this be considered the preferred route?

At a minimum this route should start at the West Loop 101. Now that the Loop 303 is starting to take shape, why has this connection not been considered?

If in fact the study shows that the traffic is not metropolitan but regional, the Loop 303 would take even more traffic out of the metro area and would allow easy access to I-17 to the north and route traffic away from any part of I-10 east of the Loop 101.

I operate a capital intensive manufacturing facility at 55th avenue just south of I-10. Although I do not believe my business will be impacted, if it were, it would cause me considerable financial losses if I have to move my facility due to the amount of power and process piping that is required for my business.

Sincerely,
Ray Steinhart

--
Raymond C. Steinhart
President
Mastermolding, Inc.
1715 Tanya Drive
Phoenix, AZ 85023
919-481-1234
Fax 919-481-1235

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Comment Document</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>From: Ray Steinhart [<a href="mailto:rsteinhart@mastermolding.com">mailto:rsteinhart@mastermolding.com</a>] Sent: Friday, May 24, 2013 8:38 AM Subject: Southmountain Freeway comments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Purpose and Need</td>
<td>The proposed freeway is part of a transportation system developed to improve mobility in the region by increasing capacity and providing alternatives to allow traffic to bypass already congested routes (see Final Environmental Impact Statement pages 1-21, 1-22, 3-1, and 3-3). Like other “loop” freeways in the Phoenix metropolitan area, the proposed South Mountain Freeway would be a commuter corridor, helping to move local traffic between the eastern and western portions of Maricopa County.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Alternatives, W59 Alternative Versus W101 Alternative</td>
<td>The Arizona Department of Transportation and Federal Highway Administration identified several issues and concerns that were frequently noted by commenters. Responses to these issues can be found in the Responses to Frequently Submitted Public Comments beginning on page B733 of this appendix.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Alternatives</td>
<td>Alternatives as far west as State Route 363L were considered in the corridor screening process (see Final Environmental Impact Statement pages 3-6 and 3-7 and Figure 3-4, on page 3-7). They were eliminated early in the alternatives development process for the reasons identified on those pages, chiefly for not meeting the project purpose and need criteria.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Acquisitions and Relocations</td>
<td>Agencies may acquire only those properties located entirely or partly within the project right-of-way limits (see Final Environmental Impact Statement page 4-45).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Comment Document</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:rsteinhart@mastermolding.com">rsteinhart@mastermolding.com</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Confidentiality and NonDisclosure Notice: This email transmission and any attachments are intended for use by the persons/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.
From: Projects
To: Projects
Subject: FW: 202
Date: Monday, May 20, 2013 8:47:35 AM

-----Original Message-----
From: Jeff S [mailto:stempakj@yahoo.com]
Sent: Friday, May 17, 2013 4:49 PM
To: Projects
Subject: 202

I do believe that building the 202 SRF will be beneficial to the people of Arizona. I drove in NY traffic for years & our freeways are definitely getting congested. Considering the projected growth that should be a factor as well.
Thanks & Regards
Jeff Stempak
Sent from Jeff's iPhone

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.
Dear South Mountain Study Team,

I am writing to express my opposition to the proposed South Mountain Freeway and to urge ADOT to select the No-Build Alternative.

Two billion dollars? To encourage more pollution and destroy this rare open space jewel in the city? Why not use OUR money to improve clean transportation/public transportation, supporting OUR health and slowing the rise of OUR health care costs ?

The proposed freeway would cause more problems than it would solve. In addition, it would only provide short-term congestion relief. As is evident by our numerous clogged roads and freeways, many of which have recently been built or widened, building more roads is not the answer. ADOT needs to instead focus on planning for and investing in long-term transportation solutions, including mass transit. The only way to effectively reduce congestion and mobilize people is by reducing the number of vehicles utilizing our roads, not by encouraging more to use them.

South Mountain Freeway would have incredible negative impacts on our communities. Despite what the DEIS claims, air quality in the region would worsen over time, increasing public health risks. As more vehicles fill the "uncongested" areas this freeway would temporarily provide, more pollution will be spewed into the air, exacerbating asthma, cancer, and other diseases.

The freeway would also negatively affect our environment. South Mountain Park is the largest city park in our nation. It was set aside to protect resources and to benefit our communities. By blasting a freeway through a portion of this park, wildlife and habitat will be destroyed, movement corridors will be cut off, valuable public spaces will be lost, and more. This would set a terrible precedent by demolishing what should remain a protected area.

This freeway will also exacerbate urban sprawl and further burden Arizona’s taxpayers. Its construction would continue ADOT’s trend of forcing residents to remain vehicle-dependent while paying for infrastructure so that others can live farther and farther from a city center.

Please help protect our communities, our health, and our environment by selecting the No Action Alternative. If you get any flack from oil companies, refer them to me. Thank you!

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Jun 4, 2013

Arizona Department of Transportation South Mountain Study Team
1655 W Jackson St, MD 126F
Phoenix, AZ 85007

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Alternatives, No-Action (No-Build) Alternative</td>
<td>The Arizona Department of Transportation and Federal Highway Administration identified several issues and concerns that were frequently noted by commenters. Responses to these issues can be found in the Responses to Frequently Submitted Public Comments beginning on page B733 of this appendix.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Air Quality</td>
<td>Federal regulations stipulate that an environmental impact statement shall “rigorously explore and objectively evaluate all reasonable alternatives” (40 Code of Federal Regulations § 1502.14; see Final Environmental Impact Statement page 3-1). All alternatives were screened using a multidisciplinary set of criteria. Nonfreeway alternatives were considered (see Final Environmental Impact Statement pages 3-3 through 3-6). Among other things, the study took into account improving existing freeways, improving or expanding other travel modes, strategies to reduce travel demand, and various roadway configurations. This study examined not only the potential impacts from improvements, but also the consequences of building nothing, the No-Action Alternative. As proposed by the Maricopa Association of Governments, the South Mountain Freeway would be part of the Regional Freeway and Highway System. Other transportation improvements such as mass transit and local roads are specified in the Regional Transportation Plan and were considered during the evaluation of this proposed new freeway. As noted in the Final Environmental Impact Statement (see page 3-66), the proposed freeway would provide opportunities to enhance operation of future mass transit improvements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Alternatives</td>
<td>(Responses continue on next page)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Purpose and Need</td>
<td>Although the region’s freeways are now congested during the peak travel period, conditions in 2035 without the proposed freeway would be substantially worse with more congested areas and congested conditions for longer periods of time (see Final Environmental Impact Statement pages 1-21 and 1-22). Congestion relief resulting from the proposed freeway would provide localized reductions of delays on arterial streets and at interchanges. Reduced travel times would result in lower exposure to elevated concentrations of mobile source air toxics occurring in traffic. Other benefits of the proposed freeway in comparison to the No-Action Alternative are presented in Table 3-9 on page 3-38 of the Final Environmental Impact Statement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Health Effects</td>
<td>The Arizona Department of Transportation and Federal Highway Administration identified several issues and concerns that were frequently noted by commenters. Responses to these issues can be found in the Responses to Frequently Submitted Public Comments beginning on page B733 of this appendix.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Section 4(f) and Section 6(f)</td>
<td>(Responses continue on next page)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Biology, Plants, and Wildlife</td>
<td>(Responses continue on next page)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Unplanned growth is often termed “urban sprawl.” Generally, this term is used in the context of rapid and uncontrolled urban growth onto previously undeveloped land—usually on the outskirts of an existing urban area. Projects like the proposed freeway are often identified as contributors to urban sprawl. Freeway projects are often cited as making land at the urban fringe more accessible and, therefore, more attractive for development. However, examination of data comparing population and land use between 1975 and 2000 suggests major transportation projects like the proposed freeway do not induce growth in the region (see Final Environmental Impact Statement pages 4-170 through 4-174). The proposed action would be implemented in a historically quickly urbanizing area (most noticeably in the Western Section of the Study Area, although the nationwide recession which began in 2007 slowed growth). In the Eastern Section of the Study Area, the proposed freeway would abut public parkland, Native American land, and a near-full developed area—therefore, any contribution to accelerated or induced growth would be constrained. The proposed freeway would be built in an area planned for urban growth as established in local jurisdictions’ land use plans for at least the last 25 years.
To whom this may concern,

The proposed South Mountain Freeway project would have a negative effect on my family by increasing the traffic and congestion on S. 17th Ave between W. Chandler Blvd and E. Pecos Road—the proposed freeway.

I have a current student enrolled in the Tempe High School district and South 17th Avenue is a Tempe Union High School bus route for picking up and dropping off my student. The street is also a Kyrene Middle School bus route for picking up and dropping off other local students. I fear for the safety of these students because of the increase traffic and lack of proper crosswalks.

If the freeway must be built, please consider extending W. Liberty Lane out to S. 27th Ave (in addition to the W. Chandler Blvd extension) to alleviate the increased traffic along South 17th Ave.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Karen M. Stepp
Local resident of Ahwatukee Foothills Club West
kmstepp@gmail.com

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Traffic</td>
<td>In 2006, the City of Phoenix conducted a traffic circulation study to evaluate the impacts of the proposed freeway on the local street system. The City study found no adverse effects on the local street system from the freeway (see Appendix 3-1 in the Final Environmental Impact Statement). The daily traffic volume on 17th Street in 2011 was approximately 4,500 vehicles per day just north of Pecos Road (see &lt;phoenix.gov/streets/traffic/volumemap&gt;). With the proposed freeway in place, an additional 4,000 vehicles day would use 17th Avenue to gain access to residences west of 17th Avenue. The total daily traffic would be well below the capacity of a two-lane road (approximately 15,000 vehicles per day). The extension of the Liberty Lane to the west is not part of the proposed project. This road would likely be built in the future along with the development of the Arizona State Land Department property.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Design</td>
<td>The extension of Liberty Lane to the west is not part of the proposed project. The road would likely be built in the future along with the development of the Arizona State Land Department property. In 2006, the City of Phoenix conducted a traffic circulation study to evaluate the impacts of the freeway on the local street system. The City study found no adverse effects on the local street system from the proposed freeway. The traffic volume on 17th Street in 2011 was approximately 4,500 vehicles per day just north of Pecos Road (see &lt;phoenix.gov/streets/traffic/volumemap&gt;). With the proposed freeway in place, an additional 4,000 vehicles day would use 17th Avenue to gain access to residences west of 17th Avenue. The total daily traffic would be well below the capacity of a two-lane road (approximately 15,000 vehicles per day).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Comment Document</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Joan Stern</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>You only show cars on the proposed 202. You know it will be bumper to bumper of semi's on this short cut around Phoenix. We moved to Ahwatukee Foothills to be away from the noise of the city and the smog. I am apposed to the current alignment mainly due to the pollution it will leave us in. The mountain will lock in the smog to settle down around us like a blanket gradually killing off wild life, plant life and human life.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Purpose and Need, Truck Bypass</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>The Arizona Department of Transportation and Federal Highway Administration identified several issues and concerns that were frequently noted by commenters. Responses to these issues can be found in the Responses to Frequently Submitted Public Comments beginning on page B733 of this appendix.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Neighborhoods/Communities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>While the E1 Alternative is adjacent to the largely residential areas of Ahwatukee Foothills Village (to the north), a freeway has been planned in this location for many years (see Final Environmental Impact Statement pages 4-17 and 4-21). Where existing residential uses are adjacent to the proposed freeway, noise mitigation would be implemented according to the Arizona Department of Transportation policy (see Final Environmental Impact Statement page 4-91).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Air Quality</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>The Arizona Department of Transportation and Federal Highway Administration identified several issues and concerns that were frequently noted by commenters. Responses to these issues can be found in the Responses to Frequently Submitted Public Comments beginning on page B733 of this appendix.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Air Quality</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>According to the Arizona Department of Transportation, 2013, Air Quality Assessment South Mountain Freeway 202L Draft Report, review of wind data from the Gila River Indian Community monitoring site at St. Johns suggests that during the morning hours and associated with mountain-drainage air flows and stable atmospheric conditions, wind flows are from the southeast and follow the Gila River channel to the north. Locations to the east of St. Johns tend to flow from the east to the lower elevations along the Gila River. During the warmer hours' improved mixing, flows typically follow the river channel and come from the north and northwest. Likewise, during a 1-month-long meteorological monitoring period (November 20, 2006, through December 21, 2006) at Pecos Road and 40th Street and a second 1-month-long monitoring period at Pecos Road and 24th and 40th streets (April 19, 2007, through May 21, 2007), winds during the morning hours typically were from the northeast. During the warmer hours, and with improved mixing, winds typically were from the west.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Biology, Plants, and Wildlife</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>The Arizona Department of Transportation and Federal Highway Administration identified several issues and concerns that were frequently noted by commenters. Responses to these issues can be found in the Responses to Frequently Submitted Public Comments beginning on page B733 of this appendix.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

### Code Issue Response

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Purpose and Need, Truck Bypass</td>
<td>The Arizona Department of Transportation and Federal Highway Administration identified several issues and concerns that were frequently noted by commenters. Responses to these issues can be found in the Responses to Frequently Submitted Public Comments beginning on page B733 of this appendix.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Neighborhoods/Communities</td>
<td>While the E1 Alternative is adjacent to the largely residential areas of Ahwatukee Foothills Village (to the north), a freeway has been planned in this location for many years (see Final Environmental Impact Statement pages 4-17 and 4-21). Where existing residential uses are adjacent to the proposed freeway, noise mitigation would be implemented according to the Arizona Department of Transportation policy (see Final Environmental Impact Statement page 4-91).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Air Quality</td>
<td>The Arizona Department of Transportation and Federal Highway Administration identified several issues and concerns that were frequently noted by commenters. Responses to these issues can be found in the Responses to Frequently Submitted Public Comments beginning on page B733 of this appendix.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Air Quality</td>
<td>According to the Arizona Department of Transportation, 2013, Air Quality Assessment South Mountain Freeway 202L Draft Report, review of wind data from the Gila River Indian Community monitoring site at St. Johns suggests that during the morning hours and associated with mountain-drainage air flows and stable atmospheric conditions, wind flows are from the southeast and follow the Gila River channel to the north. Locations to the east of St. Johns tend to flow from the east to the lower elevations along the Gila River. During the warmer hours' improved mixing, flows typically follow the river channel and come from the north and northwest. Likewise, during a 1-month-long meteorological monitoring period (November 20, 2006, through December 21, 2006) at Pecos Road and 40th Street and a second 1-month-long monitoring period at Pecos Road and 24th and 40th streets (April 19, 2007, through May 21, 2007), winds during the morning hours typically were from the northeast. During the warmer hours, and with improved mixing, winds typically were from the west.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Biology, Plants, and Wildlife</td>
<td>The Arizona Department of Transportation and Federal Highway Administration identified several issues and concerns that were frequently noted by commenters. Responses to these issues can be found in the Responses to Frequently Submitted Public Comments beginning on page B733 of this appendix.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Comment Document**

**TELEPHONE CONVERSATION RECORD**
**SOUTH MOUNTAIN FREEWAY INFORMATION LINE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INCOMING CALL</th>
<th>INCOMING CALL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DATE:</td>
<td>TIME:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/17/13</td>
<td>4:47 PM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CALLER:** KATHY STERNBERG  
**CALLER ADDRESS:** 5700 NORTH CANYON DRIVE, PHOENIX AZ 85016  
**PHONE:** EMAIL:

**CALLER REMARKS/QUESTIONS:**
I'm calling to voice my support for the South Mountain Freeway Loop 202. Thank you.

**Response**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Comment noted.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
they need to be listened to rather than people who
don’t live in that area. I’ve been around long
enough that I know the Sierra Club and Don’t Waste
Arizona, when they worked against medical waste
incinerators in the Laveen and South Phoenix area.
People [unintelligible] because their studies then
were very important to stopping those incinerators.
Now, however, some of the same people who worked to
stop those incinerators seem to think this freeway is
a great idea, because it saves them five minutes’
driving. So that’s crazy to me. It’s still the
health of the individuals that are more important,
the children who are going to school and the people
living and working in the area along where this
freeway will be built. It needs to be put somewhere
where it’s not as dangerous healthwise for the people
living there.

Thanks.

THE FACILITATOR: Thank you.

Don Steuter.

MR. STEUTER: Thank you.

Use this one?

THE FACILITATOR: Yes, please.

MR. STEUTER: My name is Don Steuter.

Thanks for this opportunity to talk to you about the
1 South Mountain Freeway and your Draft Environmental Impact Statement. I’ve had an opportunity to read quite a few different Environmental Impact Statements over the years, and there’s a lot of good information in your document. I appreciate that, and I must say it does seem to be, as opposed to being an objective document, it seems to be predisposed biased in favor of the freeway, so I have to say that at the outset. But there is a lot of good information in there, and I do appreciate that.

The main thing I want to tell you about is that I think that the freeway, I remember when it was first proposed back in the 1980s, and at the time I would have to say I was probably in favor of it or didn’t give it a whole lot of thought. But today, in 2013, it seems like quite an outdated idea. The challenges that we’re up against seem to be considerably different than what we were dealing with back in the 1980s. And foremost among those is things like climate change that we don’t want to think about, but seem to be upon us, whether we want to deal with it or not. And I noticed that the draft EIS does talk about CO2 emissions, but it talks about those emissions in the context that the EPA has not made any decisions. There’s no cap. There’s no...
limits. Nationwide on CO2 emissions, and so,
therefore, Arizona Department of Transportation
thought that it's not in their purview to have to
address that.

But it's hard to know if we don't start
talking about it, at least start talking about these
things at the local level. How are we going to get
anywhere with dealing with it? And I'm sure that
many others of the 50 states are basically in the
same situation, they're looking around and having
freeways that they're considering building. And if
everyone has that attitude, we're going to end up
still with a lot of freeways that, admittedly, a lot
of people want, but there are many other, you know,
long-term considerations that we need to start
talking about.

So I would hope that in the final EIS that
you take more time and flesh out the old CO2 issue
further, try to figure out which other states might
be trying to address it, and if there are some things
that Arizona could pick up on and follow up on that.

A lot of people -- I'm a hiker, and a lot
of us are very jealous, as I'm sure you heard today,
about our parks and preserves in the Phoenix area.
And personally, I've been involved in several over
the last 25 years, fights over trying to project,
enhance our Phoenix Mountain Preserves, and whenever
something happens, we worry. I guess it's hikers,
outdoor people's nature that when we see something
happening to one of our parks or preserves, we get
very worried. We think it possibly could be a
precedence. In the past there's been a lot of
wonderful activists who have worked to protect the
preserves, but, you know, I hate to say it, but we're
all starting to get more gray hair, if we're still
around even. And so we hate to see projects like
this that take a chunk out of the park without really
being mitigated in any way, shape, or form.

We're going to, in effect, lose about 30
acres of South Mountain Park and --

THE FACILITATOR: Would you wrap up?

MR. STEUTER: Sure. And there is no
proposal really to do anything about that. We've
planned, but not built other freeways in the past,
the Paradise Freeway was planned, never built. The
143 extension north never happened, so we do
sometimes concede the freeways and we don't build
them, so it's possible we could live without the
South Mountain Freeway as well.

Thank you very much for your time.

The Arizona Department of Transportation and Federal Highway Administration
identified several issues and concerns that were frequently noted by commenters.
Responses to these issues can be found in the Responses to Frequently Submitted
Public Comments beginning on page B733 of this appendix.

Mitigation measures to address impacts on the Phoenix South Mountain Park/
Preserve are discussed throughout Chapters 5 and 6 in the Draft Environmental
Impact Statement.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Comment Document</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Michael Stewart</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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At some point whether it's part of this project (W101 Alternative) or not, the I10-Eastbound to Loop101-Northbound interchange needs to be expanded from 1 lane to 2 lanes. Traffic is currently backed-up Eastbound on I10 before the Loop 101 interchange for a mile or so every morning during rush hour and it causes frequent collisions. Thank you.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Traffic</td>
<td>The recommended improvement is not within the scope of the Preferred Alternative. The Arizona Department of Transportation and Maricopa Association of Governments continually evaluate bottlenecks within the existing regional freeway system and identify opportunities for fixing problems.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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To: Projects
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What is the pathway of the proposed freeway? What area of town? Please advise.
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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.
the mountain with the hauling of hazardous materials. Nitrates, fuel, and chlorine. And the existence for clear and present endangerment, i.e., death, if you live within the wind distance of these things being carried by the winds in the event of a crash and an imminent subsequent explosion. And all are.

Nothing -- this is criminal negligence by ADOT to the citizens of this city and by HDR, their $21 million consultant whom they depend upon like they were biblical. They are all guilty of criminal negligence to the citizens directly affected and to the citizens of Phoenix, and I unalterably oppose this. Thank you.

THE FACILITATOR: Please refrain from applause or boos. Be respectful of both build and no-build discussions today. This is a hearing and we appreciate your patience.

MS. STEWART: Good morning. Speak this way? Hi, everyone, thanks for -- my name is Michelle Stewart. Thank you for listening to our comments today, and I'm addressing you. And you. I'm an
1 educator and parent in the Valley here. I’ve lived
2 here 12 years, and I’m speaking today to say that my
3 belief is no-build. Speaking to let you know that
4 because I value really, most of all, I value my son
5 and really all people who enjoy breathing clean air.
6 Their ability to have that clean air. And also
7 because it seems irresponsible to continue to pursue
8 the alternative of building the freeway when a
9 satisfactory plan has not been developed in these
decades that have gone on. I was a member of the
10 South Mountain Citizens Advisory Team for about a
11 year and a half, I believe, 2005 to '06.
12 And at that time really nothing’s changed
13 in those years, as far as what’s being offered.
14 Definitely to impact South Mountain in any way is not
15 a good option for anyone in the community, it’s a
16 world-class resource. Both in terms of the habitat
17 that it provides to wildlife and in the gift that it
18 offers to anyone who values that land, which really,
19 you know, just speaking for myself and my family,
20 it’s invaluable. It is an amazing place.
21 In terms of what we’re doing to our world
22 with continuing the same old path of build more
23 roads, build more roads, we -- studies have shown
24 that it continues to foster more congestion. It’s a

1 Alternatives, No-Action (No-Build) Alternative

2 Air Quality

3 Section 4(f) and Section 6(f)

4 Biology, Plants, and Wildlife

5 Purpose and Need

Although the region’s freeways are now congested during the peak travel period,
conditions in 2035 without the proposed freeway would be substantially worse with
more congested areas and congested conditions for longer periods of time (see Final
Environmental Impact Statement pages 1-21 and 1-22).

By 2035, east- and westbound motorists on Interstate 10 between State Route
101L (Agua Fria Freeway) and State Route 202L (Santan Freeway) are expected to
experience stop-and-go driving for over 3 hours every day. This is for a distance of
nearly 30 miles. A new freeway in the Study Area would distribute commuters over
an additional freeway facility. As a result, the duration of stop-and-go traffic on
the region’s freeways would be reduced.

The Arizona Department of Transportation and Federal Highway Administration
identified several issues and concerns that were frequently noted by commenters.
Responses to these issues can be found in the Responses to Frequently Submitted
Public Comments beginning on page B733 of this appendix.
Comment Response Appendix

6 Alternatives

Federal regulations stipulate that an environmental impact statement shall “rigorously explore and objectively evaluate all reasonable alternatives” (40 Code of Federal Regulations § 1502.14; see Final Environmental Impact Statement page 3-1). All alternatives were screened using a multidisciplinary set of criteria. Nonfreeway alternatives were considered (see Final Environmental Impact Statement pages 3-3 through 3-6). Among other things, the study took into account improving existing freeways, improving or expanding other travel modes, strategies to reduce travel demand, and various roadway configurations. This study examined not only the potential impacts from improvements, but also the consequences of building nothing, the No-Action Alternative. As proposed by the Maricopa Association of Governments, the South Mountain Freeway would be part of the Regional Freeway and Highway System. Other transportation improvements such as mass transit and local roads are specified in the Regional Transportation Plan and were considered during the evaluation of this proposed new freeway.

7 Air Quality

Climate change is an important national and global concern. While the earth has gone through many natural changes in climate in its history, there is general agreement that the earth’s climate is currently changing at an accelerated rate and will continue to do so. Human-caused greenhouse gas emissions contribute to this rapid change. Carbon dioxide makes up the largest component of these greenhouse gas emissions. Other prominent transportation-related Greenhouse gases include methane and nitrous oxide. Greenhouse gases trap heat in the earth’s atmosphere. Because the atmospheric concentration of greenhouse gases continues to climb, our planet will likely continue to experience climate change-related phenomena (see Final Environmental Impact Statement pages 4-85 through 4-86). To date, no national standards have been established regarding greenhouse gases. Greenhouse gases are different than other air pollutants evaluated in federal environmental reviews because their impacts are not localized or regional due to their rapid dispersion into the global atmosphere. The affected environment for greenhouse gas emissions is the entire planet. In contrast to broad-scale actions such as those involving an entire industry sector or very large geographic areas, it is difficult to isolate and understand greenhouse gas emissions’ impacts for a particular transportation project. Furthermore, presently there is no scientific methodology for attributing specific climatological changes to a particular transportation project’s emissions. Under the National Environmental Policy Act, detailed environmental analysis should focus on issues that are significant and meaningful to decision making. The Federal Highway Administration has concluded, based on the nature of greenhouse gas emissions and the exceedingly small potential greenhouse gas impacts of the proposed freeway (as shown in Final Environmental Impact Statement Table 4-37 on page 4-85), that greenhouse gas emissions from the proposed freeway would not result in “reasonably foreseeable significant adverse impacts on the human environment” [40 Code of Federal Regulations § 1502.22(b)].

8 Health Effects

The Arizona Department of Transportation and Federal Highway Administration identified several issues and concerns that were frequently noted by commenters. Responses to these issues can be found in the Responses to Frequently Submitted Public Comments beginning on page B733 of this appendix.
to me, and thanks. Good-bye.

THE FACILITATOR: Andrew Pedro. Andrew,
are you in the auditorium?
Claudia Reifsneider.
MS. REIFSCHNEIDER: Here.
THE FACILITATOR: If you would, if you
could turn the microphone and address the front,
you'll be able to see the time better that way.
MS. REIFSCHNEIDER: Perfect. Thank you.
I'm here in favor of the 202 South Mountain Freeway.
I think it's time that we build it, and keep the
congestion off of our highways, make our air
circulate better so we don't have cars that are
idling on the freeway, and producing more poor air
that we breathe. I -- also, you'll probably hear
today not only a lot about air, but you're going to
hear about the South Mountain Park and the mountain
there. I believe there are some people that believe
that it is sacred land, but I'm here to say that it
is federal and state land. And as far as I know, it
hasn't been deemed as sacred.
Although it is a beautiful park and we
all love it, we have many states in our country that
have had to make tough decisions and had to shave off
small portions of their mountains throughout our
TELEPHONE CONVERSATION RECORD
SOUTH MOUNTAIN FREEWAY INFORMATION LINE

INCOMING CALL
DATE: 5/16/13
TIME: 4:05 PM

CALLER: LYLE STEWART
CALLER ADDRESS: 1947 E. DIAMOND DRIVE, TEMPE, AZ 85283

PHONE: EMAIL:

CALLER REMARKS/QUESTIONS:
I am definitely in favor of the 202 south loop around South Mountain Freeway. In fact, I support working with the Indian tribe to put it on the res and not cut into the corner of the mountain taking advantage of the easy build job and saving all the money to not go through the mountain and not worry about all the houses that have been bought in Ahwatukee, etc. etc. I sure something can be worked out with the tribe. I just think they are going to delay it as long as possible to get the best possible price. Just like the Pima Freeway, I don’t think there’s any [voicemail unclear] there, but I strongly support it. I think it needs to move ahead as fast as possible, the traffic is a mess and that will be much improved from the big cul-de-sac in Ahwatukee. I live just off the 101 and Guadalupe.
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The Arizona Department of Transportation and Federal Highway Administration identified several issues and concerns that were frequently noted by commenters. Responses to these issues can be found in the Responses to Frequently Submitted Public Comments beginning on page B733 of this appendix.

Prospective home buyers and members of the church built after the freeway was conceived, according to State law, should have been informed of the proposed facility. (Sellers are obligated by Arizona common law to disclose all known material facts about a property to the buyer.)

Thank you for participating in the South Mountain Freeway Draft Environmental Impact Statement public comment process.

ADOT encourages all interested parties to submit written comments on any aspect of the Draft EIS. ADOT will consider all comments in preparing the final EIS, which will include responses to all comments, final conclusions on potential impacts, and ADOT’s final recommendation.

When submitting comments, please be as specific as possible and substantiate your comments and recommendations.

Comments must be received or postmarked by July 24, 2013.

I strongly disagree with the extension of Ra 202. It will destroy our schools, churches, homes, and business and make the area unhealthy.

We do not need another intercity highway through our area. We have a national intercity highway to transport goods from the lower Americas.

ADOT

Carolyn D. Stewart
carolyn.stewart@az.gov

Phoenix, AZ 85048

Comments must be received or postmarked by July 24, 2013. Comments can be deposited at today’s meeting, emailed to: projects@adot.gov or mailed to: ADOT Loop 202 South Mountain Freeway Study, 1055 W. Jackson Street, MD 1266, Phoenix, AZ 85007

For more information:
adot.gov/southmountainfreeway

ADOT:
South Mountain Freeway Study

Issue

Response

1
Neighborhoods/Communities

Prospective home buyers and members of the church built after the freeway was conceived, according to State law, should have been informed of the proposed facility. (Sellers are obligated by Arizona common law to disclose all known material facts about a property to the buyer.)

2 Air Quality

The Arizona Department of Transportation and Federal Highway Administration identified several issues and concerns that were frequently noted by commenters. Responses to these issues can be found in the Responses to Frequently Submitted Public Comments beginning on page B733 of this appendix.
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Hello and thank you for accepting my comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the proposed South Mountain freeway. The best alternative to put into action regarding this proposed freeway is to not build it.

My family and I deeply value clean air, public health and South Mountain Park. This freeway would be terrible on all three accounts.

The proposed freeway would cause more problems than it would solve. In addition, it would only provide short-term congestion relief. As is evident by our numerous clogged roads and freeways, many of which have recently been built or widened, building more roads is not the answer. ADOT needs to instead focus on planning for and investing in long-term transportation solutions, including mass transit. The only way to effectively reduce congestion and mobilize people is by reducing the number of vehicles utilizing our roads, not by encouraging more to use them.

South Mountain Freeway would have incredible negative impacts on our communities. Despite what the DEIS claims, air quality in the region would worsen over time, increasing public health risks. As more vehicles fill the "uncongested" areas this freeway would temporarily provide, more pollution will be emptied into our air, worsening asthma, cancer, and other diseases.

The freeway would also harm our environment. South Mountain Park is the largest city park in our nation. It was set aside to protect resources and to benefit our communities. By blasting a freeway through a portion of this park, wildlife and habitat will be destroyed, movement corridors will be cut off, valuable public spaces will be lost, and more. This would set a terrible precedent by demolishing what should remain a protected area.

The freeway will also make our existing urban sprawl even worse. The expenses associated with its construction, with increased air pollution and traffic congestion will only further burden Arizona's taxpayers. The building of this freeway would simply continue ADOT's trend of forcing residents to remain vehicle-dependent while paying for infrastructure so that others can live farther and farther from a city center.

Instead of this proposed freeway, we need to encourage innovative, incentive-based programs to optimize carpooling and biking opportunities, as well as the optimal use of public transportation. As well, we need increased funding for public transportation options like fuel-efficient buses and rail projects.

Thank you.
Respectfully,
Michelle Pulich Stewart

The Arizona Department of Transportation and Federal Highway Administration identified several issues and concerns that were frequently noted by commenters. Responses to these issues can be found in the Responses to Frequently Submitted Public Comments beginning on page B733 of this appendix.

Although the region's freeways are now congested during the peak travel period, conditions in 2035 without the proposed freeway would be substantially worse with more congested areas and congested conditions for longer periods of time (see Final Environmental Impact Statement pages 1-21 and 1-22).

By 2035, east- and westbound motorists on Interstate 10 between State Route 101L (Agua Fria Freeway) and State Route 202L (Santan Freeway) are expected to experience stop-and-go driving for over 3 hours every day. This is for a distance of nearly 30 miles. A new freeway in the Study Area would distribute commuters over an additional freeway facility. As a result, the duration of stop-and-go traffic on the region's freeways would be reduced.

Federal regulations stipulate that an environmental impact statement shall "rigorously explore and objectively evaluate all reasonable alternatives" (40 Code of Federal Regulations § 1502.14; see Final Environmental Impact Statement page 3-1). All alternatives were screened using a multidisciplinary set of criteria. Nonfreeway alternatives were considered (see Final Environmental Impact Statement pages 3-3 through 3-6). Among other things, the study took into account improving existing freeways, improving or expanding other travel modes, strategies to reduce travel demand, and various roadway configurations. This study examined not only the potential impacts from improvements, but also the consequences of building nothing, the No Action Alternative. As proposed by the Maricopa Association of Governments, the South Mountain Freeway would be part of the Regional Freeway and Highway System. Other transportation improvements such as mass transit and local roads are specified in the Regional Transportation Plan and were considered during the evaluation of this proposed new freeway. As noted in the Final Environmental Impact Statement (see page 3-60), the proposed freeway would provide opportunities to enhance operation of future mass transit improvements.

The Arizona Department of Transportation and Federal Highway Administration identified several issues and concerns that were frequently noted by commenters. Responses to these issues can be found in the Responses to Frequently Submitted Public Comments beginning on page B733 of this appendix.

Responses to these issues can be found in the Responses to Frequently Submitted Public Comments beginning on page B733 of this appendix.
Unplanned growth is often termed “urban sprawl.” Generally, this term is used in the context of rapid and uncontrolled urban growth onto previously undeveloped land—usually on the outskirts of an existing urban area. Projects like the proposed freeway are often identified as contributors to urban sprawl. Freeway projects are often cited as making land at the urban fringe more accessible and, therefore, more attractive for development. However, examination of data comparing population and land use between 1975 and 2000 suggests major transportation projects like the proposed freeway do not induce growth in the region (see Final Environmental Impact Statement pages 4-170 through 4-174). The proposed freeway would be implemented in a historically quickly urbanizing area (most noticeably in the Western Section of the Study Area, although the nationwide recession which began in 2007 slowed growth). In the Eastern Section of the Study Area, the proposed freeway would abut public parkland, Native American land, and a near-fully developed area—therefore, any contribution to accelerated or induced growth would be constrained. The proposed freeway would be built in an area planned for urban growth as established in local jurisdictions’ land use plans for at least the last 25 years.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Neighborhoods/Communities</td>
<td>Unplanned growth is often termed “urban sprawl.” Generally, this term is used in the context of rapid and uncontrolled urban growth onto previously undeveloped land—usually on the outskirts of an existing urban area. Projects like the proposed freeway are often identified as contributors to urban sprawl. Freeway projects are often cited as making land at the urban fringe more accessible and, therefore, more attractive for development. However, examination of data comparing population and land use between 1975 and 2000 suggests major transportation projects like the proposed freeway do not induce growth in the region (see Final Environmental Impact Statement pages 4-170 through 4-174). The proposed freeway would be implemented in a historically quickly urbanizing area (most noticeably in the Western Section of the Study Area, although the nationwide recession which began in 2007 slowed growth). In the Eastern Section of the Study Area, the proposed freeway would abut public parkland, Native American land, and a near-fully developed area—therefore, any contribution to accelerated or induced growth would be constrained. The proposed freeway would be built in an area planned for urban growth as established in local jurisdictions’ land use plans for at least the last 25 years.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Commercial trucks would use the proposed freeway. As with all other freeways in the region, trucks would use it for the through transport of freight, for transport to and from distribution centers, and for transport to support local commerce. Nevertheless, the primary users of the proposed freeway would be automobiles.

I rose and questioned the engineers' methodology and logic. I pointed out that they had made no attempt to see whether the trucks they counted on the incoming side were the same trucks they counted on the outgoing side. The reason that is significant is that Central Phoenix is home to a) one of the largest trucking company yards in America, and b) many other truck-dependent shipping operations (e.g. the airport-bound truks of the various delivery companies, and the Amazon warehouses.) Trucks coming into Phoenix that are headed for such major trucking centers would NOT use the SMF. In an astounding bit of deception, the SMF proponents no longer cite that "study," but instead merely claim that the "study" they conuded that most trucks currently passing through Central Phoenix were merely passing through, and would be likely to take the SMF, thus bypassing downtown and reducing I-10 truck traffic significantly.

I have lived in the Ahwatukee Foothills Village since 1989. I relocated my law office to the neighborhood for the reason that is significant is that Central Phoenix is home to a) one of the largest trucking company yards in America, and b) many other truck-dependent shipping operations (e.g. the airport-bound trucks of the various delivery companies, and the Amazon warehouses.) Trucks coming into Phoenix that are headed for such major trucking centers would NOT use the SMF. In an astounding bit of deception, the SMF proponents no longer cite that "study," but instead merely claim that the freeway will accomplish its goals...totally ignoring the above facts.

The EIS Panel must, of course, weigh impact against benefit. Having already addressed the shaky claim of at least one benefit, let me point out the reality of the impact. Our neighborhood has the lowest crime rate in the Valley. That is in no small part due to the fact that we are isolated by the lack of entrance/egress to the south and west. This freeway would fundamentally change the nature of our neighborhood, and the EIS has completely failed to address this change.

The EIS has also failed to address the impact of this freeway in the instance of traffic accidents...only the impact of the "ideal" situation has been included. For example, if there were a fatal accident (e.g. a freeway closure) on the eastbound SMF, on the east end near I-10, traffic would have to exit the freeway at one of the proposed exits (40th St? 32nd St? 24th St? 17th Ave?) and take surface streets over to I-10. The streets of the Ahwatukee Foothills Village are not designed to handle a large volume of detoured trucks, let alone such a huge influx of other vehicles, and in fact, such detoured traffic would have to be directed to use Ray Road to I-10, which would take them through a school zone on weekdays! Such decisions should not be made solely on the basis of a best-case-scenario, and when looks at...
### Alternatives

Just that easily-imagined example, one sees that this freeway could spell future nightmares on the streets of my neighborhood.

Finally, our area would be much better-served if the billions of dollars this freeway will cost were spent to get more cars off the existing freeways, or to use the existing freeway locations more efficiently. ONE bus line serves the area. NO light rail is planned or even being considered. No consideration appears to have been given to the possibility of multi-level freeways (as is commonly done in California) using the existing freeway locations.

I personally would probably benefit if this freeway were built, because west-side clients would consider me as their attorney, but IT'S NOT WORTH IT. Nor are the weakly-supported benefits that the Valley will allegedly enjoy. Ruining the quality of life of hundreds of thousands of people for purely speculative benefits is simply ridiculous.

The EIS is merely a slick retelling of the same arguments ADOT has been making for years. This current process is clearly designed to diffuse opposition and allow ADOT to politely claim it listened. I oppose this freeway. I always have, and I always will, and no number of displays and videos will change the facts I've stated above.

### Alternatives

Federal regulations stipulate that an environmental impact statement shall "rigorously explore and objectively evaluate all reasonable alternatives" (40 Code of Federal Regulations § 1502.14; see Final Environmental Impact Statement page 3-1). All alternatives were screened using a multidisciplinary set of criteria. Nonfreeway alternatives were considered (see Final Environmental Impact Statement pages 3-3 through 3-6). Among other things, the study took into account improving existing freeways, improving or expanding other travel modes, strategies to reduce travel demand, and various roadway configurations. This study examined not only the potential impacts from improvements, but also the consequences of building nothing, the No-Action Alternative. As proposed by the Maricopa Association of Governments, the South Mountain Freeway would be part of the Regional Freeway and Highway System. Other transportation improvements such as mass transit and local roads are specified in the Regional Transportation Plan and were considered during the evaluation of this proposed new freeway.

The Arizona Department of Transportation and Federal Highway Administration identified several issues and concerns that were frequently noted by commenters. Responses to these issues can be found in the Responses to Frequently Submitted Public Comments beginning on page B733 of this appendix.

The double-deck option suggested in the comment would have similar benefits and impacts as the Bridge Alternatives evaluated in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (see pages 3-13 and 5-20). Options to build a bridge through or over the South Mountains were eliminated from further study because of incident management, constructibility and maintenance issues, future expansion limitations, substantially higher estimated construction costs, and undesirable intrusion-related impacts.

The Arizona Department of Transportation and Federal Highway Administration identified several issues and concerns that were frequently noted by commenters. Responses to these issues can be found in the Responses to Frequently Submitted Public Comments beginning on page B733 of this appendix.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Alternatives, No-Action (No-Build) Alternative</td>
<td>The Arizona Department of Transportation and Federal Highway Administration identified several issues and concerns that were frequently noted by commenters. Responses to these issues can be found in the Responses to Frequently Submitted Public Comments beginning on page B733 of this appendix.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Purpose and Need</td>
<td>Although the region’s freeways are now congested during the peak travel period, conditions in 2035 without the proposed freeway would be substantially worse with more congested areas and congested conditions for longer periods of time (see Final Environmental Impact Statement pages 1-21 and 1-22). Congestion relief resulting from the proposed freeway would provide localized reductions of delays on arterial streets and at interchanges. Reduced travel times would result in lower exposure to elevated concentrations of mobile source air toxics occurring in traffic. Other benefits of the proposed freeway in comparison to the No-Action Alternative are presented in Table 3-9 on page 3-38 of the Final Environmental Impact Statement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Alternatives</td>
<td>Federal regulations stipulate that an environmental impact statement shall “rigorously explore and objectively evaluate all reasonable alternatives” (40 Code of Federal Regulations §1502.14; see Final Environmental Impact Statement page 3-1). All alternatives were screened using a multidisciplinary set of criteria. Nonfreeway alternatives were considered (see Final Environmental Impact Statement pages 3-3 through 3-6). Among other things, the study took into account improving existing freeways, improving or expanding other travel modes, strategies to reduce travel demand, and various roadway configurations. This study examined not only the potential impacts from improvements, but also the consequences of building nothing, the No-Action Alternative. As proposed by the Maricopa Association of Governments, the South Mountain Freeway would be part of the Regional Freeway and Highway System. Other transportation improvements such as mass transit and local roads are specified in the Regional Transportation Plan and were considered during the evaluation of this proposed new freeway. As noted in the Final Environmental Impact Statement (see page 3-60), the proposed freeway would provide opportunities to enhance operation of future mass transit improvements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Air Quality</td>
<td>The Arizona Department of Transportation and Federal Highway Administration identified several issues and concerns that were frequently noted by commenters. Responses to these issues can be found in the Responses to Frequently Submitted Public Comments beginning on page B733 of this appendix.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Health Effects</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Section 4(f) and Section 6(f)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Biology, Plants, and Wildlife</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Responses continue on next page)
Unplanned growth is often termed “urban sprawl.” Generally, this term is used in the context of rapid and uncontrolled urban growth onto previously undeveloped land—usually on the outskirts of an existing urban area. Projects like the proposed freeway are often identified as contributors to urban sprawl. Freeway projects are often cited as making land at the urban fringe more accessible and, therefore, more attractive for development. However, examination of data comparing population and land use between 1975 and 2000 suggests major transportation projects like the proposed freeway do not induce growth in the region (see Final Environmental Impact Statement pages 4-170 through 4-174). The proposed action would be implemented in a historically quickly urbanizing area (most noticeably in the Western Section of the Study Area, although the nationwide recession which began in 2007 slowed growth). In the Eastern Section of the Study Area, the proposed freeway would abut public parkland, Native American land, and a near-fully developed area—therefore, any contribution to accelerated or induced growth would be constrained. The proposed freeway would be built in an area planned for urban growth as established in local jurisdictions’ land use plans for at least the last 25 years.
I wanted to drop you a note to say I support the plan to Build The 202. It’s a much needed freeway for the valley and will benefit locals and interstaters alike! Let’s get building!!

Thanks,

Luke Stokebrand, MBA
Taxpayer, Phoenix, AZ

Comment Response Appendix - B3171

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Comment noted.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MR. STOKEBRAND: I sent an e-mail to ADOT regarding just how I support the 202. It's much needed for the people living -- it will bring much needed funds to the City of Phoenix in terms of tax revenue and for all us citizens who leave Laveen and City of Phoenix to go to Goodyear, Avondale, and other cities. I will be a lot happier to keep those tax funds inside of our city for community centers, things of that sort. And I'm someone who lives close, within half a mile of the proposed freeway and I still support it just because it will make my life better, easier to get around the city, and alleviate some of the congestion on Baseline Avenue.

That's about it. The rest of it is pretty well documented, so I don't have anything else to add.

Thank you.

MR. THOMAS: My name is Jim Thomas. I live in Goodyear, Arizona. I work at Broadway and 40th Street, so I drive I-10 every day and the traffic is bad in the morning and it's horrible in the afternoon. I normally get to the office between 5:30 and 6:00 and it takes me 35 minutes, it's about 30 miles. In the evenings, it takes me at least 45 minutes, sometimes an hour to get home so this would be very helpful.

And I think, if they would take the bypass off of the 101 -- if you go down to 59th, you're just...
The loss of entrance ramps at 51st Ave. will be bad for business and the community. 51st Ave is the gateway to the Maryvale area. There is considerable traffic that enters and exits the I-10 freeway at 51st Av. One major impact will be on the traffic to and from the Maryvale Baseball Park where spring training games are held. Map 21 shows a confusing and illogical design that will keep thousands of cars on roads longer and lead to more congestion and poor air quality of neighborhoods. It also appears that you are diverting even more traffic into the area with the loss of ramps at 59th Av. South of I-10 are 2 major truck stops that will have a huge negative business impact due to traffic’s inability to exit. I am a community leader in an adjacent neighborhood and I oppose this part of the plan.

Debra Stone

The majority of motorists who enter and exit Interstate 10 at 51st Avenue are coming from or going to the east. The ramps on the east side would not be affected by the proposed freeway. To allow for the freeway-to-freeway connection, local access along Interstate 10 between 51st Avenue and 67th Avenue would be reconfigured (see Draft Environmental Impact Statement Figure 3-29 for more details). The new configuration includes access roads between 67th Avenue and 51st Avenue on the northern and southern sides of Interstate 10 to allow vehicles to gain access to Interstate 10.
The bulk of Ahwatukee slopes up from Pecos Road up into the Foothills, well above the noise abatement wall. Noise travels, it bounces off the mountain and is amplified back, so you'll have a significant noise increase farther away from the freeway than your measurements would indicate.

Essentially, what this boils down to is ADOT is sacrificing a community of 85,000 for the purpose of building a truck bypass, a truck bypass that could be easily done using the I-8 to 85 corridor and improving the 85 highway from I-8 to I-10. If the purpose is to provide and route trucks away from Central Phoenix, this is a far better alternative than the Loop 202 truck bypass. Thank you.

THE FACILITATOR: Thank you, Mr. Knight.

Again, as a reminder, out of mutual respect and as a courtesy to all participants, we ask that you refrain from clapping and making reactions to speakers' comments.

I'd like to invite our next speaker, Tim Stone.

MR. STONE: Do I introduce myself? I don't know the rules.

THE FACILITATOR: Thank you, Mr. Stone. You have three minutes.

MR. STONE: My name is Tim Stone, I've been a

Driver and Nix Court Reporters - (602) 266-6525
www.drivenix.com

(Comment codes begin on next page)
1 member of the South Mountain advisory team since back in 2007. My recommendation is a no-build on the 59th Avenue alternative. To me it’s the wrong highway in the wrong location. We were advised that the 202 loop was designed to relieve the current and future congestion at the Broadway curve, and if that’s our goal we need to start diverting the expected traffic flow through the west -- further west than 59th Avenue. In the past we have seen where they talked about the Loop 101 and the 202 matching up out by 99th Avenue; that’s something that would be better. Or better still, if we just push it further west and kept all of the heavy traffic that just wants to skirt Phoenix well south of the population areas of Phoenix. My recommendation on that would be to go to the furthest away from like the Estrella mountains, the Salt River, and then the reservation as a guideline to keep things further south and away from the city.

In part of our hearings they were indicating that the traffic creating the exhaust emissions, 85 percent of it or 81 percent of it would be based on diesel-type vehicles, rather than cars, which to me indicates a lot of semi-tractor-trailer-type traffic. They told us there would be 19,000 semis that would not be stopping in the Valley at all, just transiting through heading to the East Coast or whatever, but that the

Code | Comment Document
--- | ---
1 | Alternatives, No-Action (No-Build) Alternative
2 | Alternatives, W59 Alternative Versus W101 Alternative
3 | Alternatives
4 | Purpose and Need, Truck Bypass
5 | Trucks

The Arizona Department of Transportation and Federal Highway Administration identified several issues and concerns that were frequently noted by commenters. Responses to these issues can be found in the Responses to Frequently Submitted Public Comments beginning on page B733 of this appendix.
1 Loop 202 would be carrying up to 129,000 vehicles per day. If 81 percent of that is semi-type diesel, that’s an awful lot of semi-trucks that, in my mind, we need to try and keep away from neighborhoods and congested areas with a lot of people and schools.

And we were provided by a presentation at the CAT meeting by a Pete Hyde from the school of engineering at ASU, they provided us with a health study on nine selected sites here in the Valley who wanted I-10 and 27th Avenue as the closest to the freeway put down by the facts and progressively getting further away. The data it shows was incidents of cancer and the incident rate for that first site was 700 per million and as you got further away the furthest remote one was out by Roosevelt Lake and that was 100 cases of cancer per million that far up. And as you work your way through it, it definitely showed a connection between some method cancer and petrol chemical vehicles and cars, trucks, and gas.

So to me, we need to keep the roadway once again further away from neighborhoods and a lot of people than -- we’re hearing at the meetings that they were talking about making the 202 a narrower footprint than like we have, say, on the southern part of the Loop 101.

THE FACILITATOR: Thank you, Mr. Stone, your
the build of Loop 202, we get none of that. Shame on us if we bury our heads in the sand.

MR. STONE: Tim Stone, S-t-o-n-e. I'm a member of the South Mountain CAT Team that undertook part of the study of the Loop 202. In our April meeting we were provided with the results of the Sonoma Technology, Inc., presentation on State Route 95 near Las Vegas and its effects on two schools in that area as they were producing and building the road and then using it afterward. The study concentrated on black carbon impact on the schools. What the school -- what the study indicated was that there was significant downwind effects that would occur if the school was in close proximity to the highway, but it would mitigate as it comes further away, more remote from the highway.

This is of concern because along the Loop 202 route, Betty Fairfax High School is not all that remote from it. It's close. And there's another elementary school down near the Pecos Road. And these downwind effects would be adverse to the children there.

In their study they indicated that with proper filters, the classrooms could remain safe, but outdoor activities would be at hazard, especially as it -- if it occurred near peak traffic transit; in other words, the rush hour time for morning or afternoon, with the kids
The Arizona Department of Transportation and Federal Highway Administration identified several issues and concerns that were frequently noted by commenters. Responses to these issues can be found in the "Responses to Frequently Submitted Public Comments" beginning on page B733 of this appendix.

Noise modeling is used to determine the most appropriate and effective location for noise barriers. All noise-sensitive land uses are included in the noise analysis and noise abatement considerations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Noise</td>
<td>The Arizona Department of Transportation and Federal Highway Administration identified several issues and concerns that were frequently noted by commenters. Responses to these issues can be found in the &quot;Responses to Frequently Submitted Public Comments&quot; beginning on page B733 of this appendix. Noise modeling is used to determine the most appropriate and effective location for noise barriers. All noise-sensitive land uses are included in the noise analysis and noise abatement considerations.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Melinda Stone

I love traveling through Arizona to visit friends and family and know from their stories how little taxpayer dollars are flowing into their communities. This project is WASTEFUL and unnecessary. There are better ways to create good long-term jobs and spend the few precious tax dollars we have by keep existing social programs funded. Please, do not build another freeway.

Comment noted.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Comment Document</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>TELEPHONE CONVERSATION RECORD</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>SOUTH MOUNTAIN FREEWAY INFORMATION LINE</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>INCOMING CALL</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/16/13</td>
<td><strong>INCOMING CALL TIME:</strong> 6:58 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LISA STONE</td>
<td><strong>CALLER ADDRESS:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHONE</td>
<td><strong>EMAIL:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>CALLER REMARKS/QUESTIONS:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I support the freeway.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Comment noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Comment Document</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|      | **TELEPHONE CONVERSATION RECORD**  
|      | **SOUTH MOUNTAIN FREEWAY INFORMATION LINE**  
|      | **INCOMING CALL**  
|      | **DATE:** 6/11/13  
|      | **TIME:** 3:29 PM  
|      | **CALLER:** MR. STONE  
|      | **CALLER ADDRESS:** 10845 W. BOSWELL BLVD., SUN CITY, ARIZONA  
|      | **PHONE:** EMAIL:  
| **1** | **CALLER REMARKS/QUESTIONS:**  
|      | I'm totally in favor of the South Mountain Freeway. I work for an engineering company and that would be great work for us in the future. So let's get this baby going for design and let's build them bridges. Thank you.  
<p>|      | <strong>Code</strong> | <strong>Issue</strong> | <strong>Response</strong> |
|      | 1 | | Comment noted. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Alternatives</td>
<td>Aerial maps showing the proposed freeway (W59 and E1 Alternatives) are accessible through the online hearing Web site, &lt;azdot.gov/southmountainfreeway&gt;. The maps covering the noted area are numbers 8 and 9. In this area, the freeway’s right-of-way footprint is approximately 400 to 500 feet wide. Access to the residential area would be provided by way of Dusty Lane and an underpass at Ivanhoe Street. All other connections to Dusty Lane would be cut off by the freeway. Internal roads would be reconfigured and reconnected (see Figure 3-33, on page 3-57 of the Final Environmental Impact Statement). Your contact information was forwarded to the Arizona Department of Transportation Right-of-way Group for further coordination.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Acquisitions and Relocations</td>
<td>The Arizona Department of Transportation and Federal Highway Administration identified several issues and concerns that were frequently noted by commenters. Responses to these issues can be found in the Responses to Frequently Submitted Public Comments beginning on page B733 of this appendix.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Comment Document</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Alternatives</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aerial maps showing the proposed freeway (W59 and E1 Alternatives) are accessible through the online hearing Web site, &lt;azdot.gov/southmountainfreeway&gt;. The maps covering the noted area are numbers 8 and 9. In this area, the freeway’s right-of-way footprint is approximately 400 to 500 feet wide. Access to the residential area would be provided by way of Dusty Lane and an underpass at Ivanhoe Street. All other connections to Dusty Lane would be cut off by the freeway. Internal roads would be reconfigured and reconnected (see Figure 3-33, on page 3-57 of the Final Environmental Impact Statement). Your contact information was forwarded to the Arizona Department of Transportation Right-of-way Group for further coordination.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Acquisitions and Relocations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Arizona Department of Transportation and Federal Highway Administration identified several issues and concerns that were frequently noted by commenters. Responses to these issues can be found in the Responses to Frequently Submitted Public Comments beginning on page B733 of this appendix.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Comment Document</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TELEPHONE CONVERSATION RECORD**
**SOUTH MOUNTAIN FREEWAY INFORMATION LINE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>TIME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5/18/13</td>
<td>11:23 AM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CALLER**: JOHN STRAVERS

**CALLER ADDRESS**: PHONE

**CALLER REMARKS/QUESTIONS**: I support the South Mountain Freeway. It's needed to alleviate congestion on the I-10 Corridor through downtown Phoenix.

1 Comment noted.
From: Dan Streyle [mailto:dgstreyle@cox.net]
Sent: Sunday, April 28, 2013 12:50 PM
To: Projects
Subject: Comment on South Mountain Freeway - Draft EIS

ADOT:

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the above Draft EIS.

While I have only done a cursory review I definitely would prefer the W101 Alternative for the western section compared to the W59 or W71 options. In the "big" picture it just does not make sense to continue to funnel all traffic along I-10 in the section between L101 and 59th Avenue (in the W59 option). This is true for both directions of travel. Having the W101 option serve as an extension of L101 appears to "complete the loop" to provide the bypass around Phoenix that is the primary purpose of the South Mountain Freeway. In travelling this area every day the AM traffic typically moves well until the I-10 and L101 traffic must merge on I-10. The W101 alternative will better help to alleviate this congestion.

Daniel Streyle
11120 W. Citrus Grove
Avondale, AZ 85392

Alternatives, W59 Alternative Versus W101 Alternative

The Arizona Department of Transportation and Federal Highway Administration identified several issues and concerns that were frequently noted by commenters. Responses to these issues can be found in the Responses to Frequently Submitted Public Comments beginning on page B733 of this appendix.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Comment Document</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>From:</td>
<td>Projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To:</td>
<td>ADOT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject:</td>
<td>FW: South Mountain Freeway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date:</td>
<td>Tuesday, April 30, 2013 8:54:21 AM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From: mstrohmeyer [mailto:mstrohmeyer@msn.com]
Sent: Friday, April 26, 2013 10:29 AM
To: Projects

Subject: South Mountain Freeway

100% support.

Martin Strohmeyer
4628 W Ellis St
Laveen, 85339
Homeowner
480-525-3705

From my Android phone on T-Mobile. The first nationwide 4G network.
This environmental impact draft study doesn't seem to think that it will worsen the air quality on the sensor that's on 63rd Avenue, which will be two to three miles away from this construction. So it really needs to be understood that it could -- could risk Arizona losing its federal funds. And then the City and our citizens will have to pay the bill. This could turn into one of the more expensive highways. And I think a separate study of that impact is very, very important before we go to the final phase of the environmental study.

So thank you very much for your time. I appreciate the opportunity to comment.

MR. SMITH: They've already spent a lot of money studying this thing, right? And they might as well finish the project or a lot of people's work has been wasted already. And as far as alignments go, I think, even though the one that's more expensive, that would link up to the 101, is probably a better option in the long run, even though it looks like it might be more expensive now. I don't think I have anything else to say.

MR. STROOP: Well, I just wanted to say that I am a Laveen resident and that I am for the proposal to build the freeway in any of the capacities that I saw today. I don't really have a preference on an alternative, but I would prefer it to get built as soon as possible.

MR. ALLEN: I don't know what ADOT's plans for
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Comment Document</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Comment noted.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TELEPHONE CONVERSATION RECORD
SOUTH MOUNTAIN FREEWAY INFORMATION LINE

INCOMING CALL
DATE: 5/15/13
TIME: 6:35 PM

CALLER: CATHY STRUNK
ADDRESS: 2880 S. NOLINA PLACE, CHANDLER, AZ 85286
PHONE: EMAIL:

CALLER REMARKS/QUESTIONS:
I am in favor of the South Mountain Freeway. Thank you.
The Arizona Department of Transportation and Federal Highway Administration identified several issues and concerns that were frequently noted by commenters. Responses to these issues can be found in the Responses to Frequently Submitted Public Comments beginning on page B733 of this appendix.
### TELEPHONE CONVERSATION RECORD
#### SOUTH MOUNTAIN FREEWAY INFORMATION LINE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INCOMING CALL</th>
<th>COMMENT DOCUMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DATE: 7/24/13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TIME: 11:13 AM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CALLER: CLORIS STUART</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CALLER ADDRESS: 83rd &amp; Camelback</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHONE:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMAIL:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CALLER REMARKS/QUESTIONS:**
Yes, I would love to see the freeway to come to the west side. I definitely support the freeway coming through. Thank you. Bye bye.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Comment noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Comment Document</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TELEPHONE CONVERSATION RECORD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SOUTH MOUNTAIN FREEWAY INFORMATION LINE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DATE: 5/15/13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TIME: 12:04 AM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CALLER: GARY STUDEBAKER</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CALLER ADDRESS: 2067 E. POWELL PLACE, CHANDLER, AZ 85249</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PHONE: EMAIL:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CALLER REMARKS/QUESTIONS: I work in Tolleson and I drive through the reservation every day and this would shorten my trip and make it much more enjoyable. I totally support the 202 extension around South Mountain. Please make this possible.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Comment noted.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
From: Paul Sublasky  
To: ADOT
Subject: Support For South Mountain 202

My name is Paul Sublasky, I work in the Aerospace / Manufacturing / IT Staffing Industry. I am a life long resident of The east valley and think that the South Mountain Loop 202 Freeway, which has been approved by Maricopa voters twice, first in 1985 and again in 2004 should be built immediately. The traffic jams are stupid and unnecessary. Arizona residents want it, it will bring jobs and money to our economy. Infrastructure is the key to growth- if you build it they will come!!!! What is the delay? Is it you? If you do not approve this to get this going than why are you running the show? Maybe we need new officials. This is an outrage that it has taken so long to build. Don’t you work for the people of Arizona? DO YOUR JOB OR GET OUT.
Dear ADOT Representative,

I am in support of the building of the South Mountain freeway; Because, as our communities increase in population and many more travelers passing through our communities; It is imperative to have the freeway built to help limit gas emissions, congestion, and allow the flow of traffic to continue; So, it can limit road rage.

I thank-you for hearing my concerns in support of the building of the South Mountain freeway.

Sincerely,

John H. Sullivan
10540 E. Apache Trail, Lot #539
Apache Junction, AZ 85120-3359
(H) 480-807-0678

ARIZONA'S VALLEY OF THE SUN WHERE FAMILY AND FRIENDS CAN REST AND RELAX WITH ME!!!
I am offering my public comment about the proposed South Mountain Freeway.

First off, I don’t have any illusions my comments will have any impact on the final decision. I strongly believe the decision has been made and this is just a formality to satisfy some legal requirements. Nonetheless, I will submit my comments.

When the freeway alignment was proposed 30 years ago (approximately), there was nothing in the area to impede construction. At that time, even though I didn’t live in the Ahwatukee Foothills area, I thought the loop was a good idea.

However, many things have changed since then. First and foremost, there is a complete community (Ahwatukee Foothills) that will be affected. Despite the findings in the EIS, I do not believe there will be little or no adverse impact on the community. Ahwatukee Foothills will be trapped between the freeway and South Mountain. Noise and pollution WILL SIGNIFICANTLY increase. Just the fact this freeway will be a truck by-pass makes this consequence inevitable.

Second, there is the Kyrene de los Lagos elementary school that butts up to the free alignment. I firmly believe the noise and pollution from the freeway will have a serious adverse impact on the children. Given what we know today about the effects of noise and pollution on children, it is unconscionable to put a freeway so close to a school.

Personally, I live about 1/2 mile from the alignment (40th and Pecos). I know I will experience increased noise and increased pollution. I can hear freeway noise coming from the I-10, and that is 1-1/2 miles away.

I have 2 questions for ADOT. First, is there any possibility this freeway will not be built? Second, if the freeway is built, can I sue the state for adversely affecting my property values?

Craig Sullivan
3851 E Tangwood Dr
Phoenix, AZ 85048
480-750-9615
jgw1953@cox.net
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>Noise</td>
<td>Noise barriers are designed to provide a substantial reduction in noise levels along freeways, but do not and cannot eliminate noise from passing into nearby neighborhoods. Just because noise can be heard does not mean that noise barriers are ineffective. Even at the levels considered “acceptable” by the Arizona Department of Transportation Noise Abatement Policy and Federal Highway Administration regulations, noise is still readily audible and can be heard for some distance from the freeway.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Alternatives</td>
<td>After publication and receipt and consideration of public and agency comment on the Final Environmental Impact Statement, a decision regarding the Selected Alternative will be made by the Federal Highway Administration in its record of decision. This process is described in Draft Environmental Impact Statement pages 5-2, 5-3, and 6-23. The Selected Alternative could be the No-Action Alternative (see page 3-40).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Economics, Socioeconomics</td>
<td>A review of the literature reveals few detailed and comprehensive analyses of the relationship between the transportation infrastructure and residential property values (Transportation Research Record: Journal of the Transportation Research Board, No. 2174, Transportation Research Board of the National Academies, Washington, D.C., 2010, pp. 138–47; “Impact of Highways on Property Values: Case Study of the Superstition Freeway Corridor”). A recent study by the California Department of Transportation concluded that freeway facilities did not substantially affect sales prices in residential areas adjacent to the facility. The study concluded that it is the visibility of the freeway that may influence selling price and not distance or noise. As a result, the researchers generally concluded that the more the visibility of a new freeway is reduced, the less it would determine the sales price of homes sold in the area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Issue</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Comment noted.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TELEPHONE CONVERSATION RECORD**

**SOUTH MOUNTAIN FREEWAY INFORMATION LINE**

**INCOMING CALL**

**DATE:** 6/15/13  
**TIME:** 12:05 PM  
**CALLER:** LANELLE SUMMERS  
**CALLER ADDRESS:** 8048 W. YUVIE (?) (UNCLEAR) AVENUE, PEORIA, ARIZONA  
**PHONE:** EMAIL:  

**CALLER REMARKS/QUESTIONS:**

Yes I support having the freeway put in to reduce traffic flow.
The Arizona Department of Transportation and Federal Highway Administration identified several issues and concerns that were frequently noted by commenters. Responses to these issues can be found in the Responses to Frequently Submitted Public Comments beginning on page B733 of this appendix.

Final Environmental Impact Statement pages 4-138 and 4-139 describe the relevant mitigation that would be used for revegetation. All disturbed soils that would not be landscaped or otherwise permanently stabilized by construction would be seeded using species native to the project vicinity.
The Arizona Department of Transportation and Federal Highway Administration identified several issues and concerns that were frequently noted by commenters. Responses to these issues can be found in the Responses to Frequently Submitted Public Comments beginning on page B733 of this appendix.

Even if the recently observed national trend of per capita vehicle miles traveled decreasing continues, total vehicle miles traveled in the region would still increase along with increases in total population.

The Maricopa Association of Governments approved new population, employment, housing, and traffic projections in June 2013. The new data are presented in the Final Environmental Impact Statement beginning on page 1-11. The purpose and need and analysis of alternatives were updated and reevaluated using these new socioeconomic projections and corresponding projections related to regional traffic. While new projections based on the 2010 Census showed a lower anticipated population and vehicle miles traveled in 2035 than the previous projections, the conclusions reached in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement were validated in the Final Environmental Impact Statement (see Chapter 3, Alternatives). The traffic analysis demonstrated that the proposed project is needed today and will continue to be needed into the future.

Information related to origins and destinations of motorists that would use the proposed freeway is presented in Figure 3-18 on page 3-36 of the Final Environmental Impact Statement. The definition of freeway users considers only those motorists who travel through the South Mountains; so, motorists who begin their trips in Ahwatukee Foothills Village and travel east to Interstate 10 (Maricopa Freeway) or motorists who begin in Laveen Village and travel north to Interstate 10 (Papago Freeway) are not counted in the analysis. The analysis of origins and destinations shows that 73 percent of travelers would be involved in trips beginning or ending in the Study Area or areas immediately surrounding it. Seven percent of the trips would begin, end, or begin and end outside of the Maricopa Association of Governments region; ten percent would either begin or end in Pinal County.

Unplanned growth is often termed “urban sprawl.” Generally, this term is used in the context of rapid and uncontrolled urban growth onto previously undeveloped land—usually on the outskirts of an existing urban area. Projects like the proposed freeway are often identified as contributors to urban sprawl. Freeway projects are often cited as making land at the urban fringe more accessible and, therefore, more attractive for development. However, examination of data comparing population and land use between 1975 and 2000 suggests major transportation projects like the proposed freeway do not induce growth in the region (see Final Environmental Impact Statement pages 4-170 through 4-174). The proposed freeway would be implemented in a historically quickly urbanizing area (most noticeably in the Western Section of the Study Area, although the nationwide recession which began in 2007 slowed growth). In the Eastern Section of the Study Area, the proposed freeway would abut public parkland, Native American land, and a near-full developed area—therefore, any contribution to accelerated or induced growth would be constrained. The proposed freeway would be built in an area planned for urban growth as established in local jurisdictions’ land use plans for at least the last 25 years.
Hello,

The draft EIS for the South Mtn Freeway was sloppy, ignoring induced demand and making an utterly false claim that to build this mega-project would actually improve air quality — absolutely false and as an alumnus of MIT with a graduate degree in Transportation, I'm ashamed that this state's top transportation professionals would peddle such a dishonesty to the public.

Stop studying the South Mtn Freeway which wastes our taxpayer dollars. Start putting more resources into the Phoenix-to-Tucson rail project, which will open up the region to better development patterns and connect our economic abilities. Start helping cities build better transit, bike, and pedestrian infrastructure. This is an opportunity for ADOT to change gears and become leaders of a better future for Arizona. The first step to doing so, however, is to stop creating EIS documents based on disproven traffic engineering assumptions that haven't changed noticeably in the Western Section of the Study Area, although the nationwide recession which began in 2007 slowed growth. In the Eastern Section of the Study Area, the proposed freeway would abut public parkland, Native American land, and a near-fully developed area—therefore, any contribution to accelerated or induced growth would be constrained. The proposed freeway would be built in an area planned for urban growth as established in local jurisdictions' land use plans for at least the last 25 years.

Sincerely,
Sean D. Sweat
President, Thunderdome Neighborhood Association for Non-Auto Mobility

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Neighborhoods/Communities</td>
<td>Unplanned growth is often termed “urban sprawl.” Generally, this term is used in the context of rapid and uncontrolled urban growth on previously undeveloped land—usually on the outskirts of an existing urban area. Projects like the proposed freeway are often identified as contributors to urban sprawl. Freeway projects are often cited as making land at the urban fringe more accessible and, therefore, more attractive for development. However, examination of data comparing population and land use between 1975 and 2000 suggests major transportation projects like the proposed freeway do not induce growth in the region (see Final Environmental Impact Statement pages 4-170 through 4-174). The proposed freeway would be implemented in a historically quickly urbanizing area (most noticeable in the Western Section of the Study Area, although the nationwide recession which began in 2007 slowed growth). In the Eastern Section of the Study Area, the proposed freeway would abut public parkland, Native American land, and a near-fully developed area—therefore, any contribution to accelerated or induced growth would be constrained. The proposed freeway would be built in an area planned for urban growth as established in local jurisdictions’ land use plans for at least the last 25 years.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Air Quality</td>
<td>The Arizona Department of Transportation and Federal Highway Administration identified several issues and concerns that were frequently noted by commenters. Responses to these issues can be found in the Responses to Frequently Submitted Public Comments beginning on page B733 of this appendix.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Purpose and Need</td>
<td>The analysis used to assess the purpose and need for the proposed freeway followed Federal Highway Administration guidance. The proposed freeway is needed to serve projected growth in population and accompanying transportation demand and to correct existing and projected transportation system deficiencies. See Chapter 1, Purpose and Need, in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Although the region’s freeways are now congested during the peak travel period, conditions in 2035 without the proposed freeway would be substantially worse with more congested areas and congested conditions for longer periods of time (see Final Environmental Impact Statement pages 1-21 and 1-22). By 2035, east- and westbound motorists on Interstate 10 between State Route 101L (Agua Fria Freeway) and State Route 202L (Santan Freeway) are expected to experience stop-and-go driving for over 3 hours every day. This is for a distance of nearly 30 miles. A new freeway in the Study Area would distribute commuters over an additional freeway facility. As a result, the duration of stop-and-go traffic on the region’s freeways would be reduced.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Purpose and Need</td>
<td>The proposed project is part of the Regional Transportation Plan for the Maricopa Association of Governments region. In 2004, the voters of Maricopa County approved the Regional Transportation Plan and the extension of a half-cent sales tax to fund its projects. The funding for the right-of-way acquisition and construction of the proposed project would come from a combination of federal (National Highway Performance Program) and County (half-cent sales tax, also known as Regional Area Road Funds) sources. Use of these funds for construction of the proposed freeway would not affect available funds for statewide projects nor would not constructing this facility make available additional funds for other statewide projects.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Federal regulations stipulate that an environmental impact statement shall “rigorously explore and objectively evaluate all reasonable alternatives” (40 Code of Federal Regulations § 1502.14; see Final Environmental Impact Statement page 3-1). All alternatives were screened using a multidisciplinary set of criteria. Nonfreeway alternatives were considered (see Final Environmental Impact Statement pages 3-3 through 3-6). Among other things, the study took into account improving existing freeways, improving or expanding other travel modes, strategies to reduce travel demand, and various roadway configurations. This study examined not only the potential impacts from improvements, but also the consequences of building nothing, the No-Action Alternative. As proposed by the Maricopa Association of Governments, the South Mountain Freeway would be part of the Regional Freeway and Highway System. Other transportation improvements such as mass transit and local roads are specified in the Regional Transportation Plan and were considered during the evaluation of this proposed new freeway.

The Arizona Department of Transportation and Federal Highway Administration identified several issues and concerns that were frequently noted by commenters. Responses to these issues can be found in the Responses to Frequently Submitted Public Comments beginning on page B733 of this appendix.
From: Violet R. Syrotiuk [mailto:syrotiuk@asu.edu]
Sent: Wednesday, May 15, 2013 8:32 AM
To: Projects
Subject: objection to freeway

Dear ADOT,

I am unable to attend the public hearings this time. (I have attended others in the past.) I would like to express my objection (again) to the construction of the South Mountain Freeway. Apparently not building a freeway still remains an option, and that is my preferred option.

I would highly prefer to see the funds allocated used to extend the light rail system. It would be much better to encourage people to use mass transit rather than private vehicles. Please build the light rail south down I-10 instead!! In my opinion, it would be a much better use of the money. And it would modernize our city and prepare it for the rest of the 21st century.

A few of the reasons for my objection include:

1) I think the impact on the freeway on Phoenix South Mountain Park/Preserve is too great. Right now, the park is an oasis in the middle of the city that I frequently enjoy. You can be hiking in the park and not hear any road traffic; it is like you are not in the city, and that’s really wonderful and should be preserved. Of course, there are many other negative impacts on the park.

2) I do not like the placement of the freeway. I do not wish to see it connect to Pecos Road on the south side of Ahwatukee. If it has to be built, I prefer a route further south (even beyond the Gila River native community if needed).

But really, I prefer that the freeway not be built at all.

Please note my objection.

Violet R. Syrotiuk, Phoenix resident
403 E Brookwood Ct.
Phoenix, AZ 85048-1957

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Comment Document</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>From:</td>
<td>Projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To:</td>
<td>ADOT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject:</td>
<td>your objection to freeway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date:</td>
<td>Wednesday, May 15, 2013 8:37:13 AM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Alternatives, No-Action (No-Build) Alternative</td>
<td>The Arizona Department of Transportation and Federal Highway Administration identified several issues and concerns that were frequently noted by commenters. Responses to these issues can be found in the Responses to Frequently Submitted Public Comments beginning on page B733 of this appendix.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Purpose and Need</td>
<td>The proposed project is part of the Regional Transportation Plan for the Maricopa Association of Governments region. In 2004, the voters of Maricopa County approved the Regional Transportation Plan and the extension of a half-cent sales tax to fund its projects. The funding for the right-of-way acquisition and construction of the proposed project would come from a combination of federal (National Highway Performance Program) and County (half-cent sales tax, also known as Regional Area Road Funds) sources. Use of these funds for construction of the proposed freeway would not affect available funds for statewide projects nor would not constructing this facility make available additional funds for other statewide projects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Alternatives. Nonfreeway Alternatives</td>
<td>The Arizona Department of Transportation and Federal Highway Administration identified several issues and concerns that were frequently noted by commenters. Responses to these issues can be found in the Responses to Frequently Submitted Public Comments beginning on page B733 of this appendix.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Section 4(f) and Section 6(f)</td>
<td>Alternatives, Gila River Indian Community</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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/unauthorized 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.
The Arizona Department of Transportation and Federal Highway Administration identified several issues and concerns that were frequently noted by commenters. Responses to these issues can be found in the Responses to Frequently Submitted Public Comments beginning on page B733 of this appendix.

According to the Arizona Department of Transportation, 2013, Air Quality Assessment South Mountain Freeway 202L Draft Report, review of wind data from the Gila River Indian Community monitoring site at St. Johns suggests that during the morning hours and associated with mountain-drainage air flows and stable atmospheric conditions, wind flows are from the southeast and follow the Gila River channel to the north. Locations to the east of St. Johns tend to flow from the east to the lower elevations along the Gila River. During the warmer hours’ improved mixing, flows typically follow the river channel and come from the north and northwest. Likewise, during a 1-month-long meteorological monitoring period (November 20, 2006, through December 21, 2006) at Pecos Road and 40th Street and a second 1-month-long monitoring period at Pecos Road and 24th and 40th streets (April 19, 2007, through May 21, 2007), winds during the morning hours typically were from the northeast. During the warmer hours, and with improved mixing, winds typically were from the west.

The Arizona Department of Transportation and Federal Highway Administration identified several issues and concerns that were frequently noted by commenters. Responses to these issues can be found in the Responses to Frequently Submitted Public Comments beginning on page B733 of this appendix.
MR. SZEJN: Brian Szejn. I'm extremely
against the proposed freeway for many reasons,
health, truckers coming up from Mexico is another
reason, pollution, movement of the church at 24th
Street and the homes that would have to be moved. I
feel there's a much better route that could be
attained by just a little bit of thought. I believe
that there are people that are going to profit from
the alignment on Pecos, and those people should be
looked at to find out why the Pecos alignment has
been the only route really looked at.
Yeah, I'm very touchy about this one. I
feel like in the past, ADOT has not listened to
people that are actually against the freeway and
welcomed all others who are for it. That's pretty
much it. Thank you.

The Arizona Department of Transportation and Federal Highway Administration
identified several issues and concerns that were frequently noted by commenters.
Responses to these issues can be found in the Responses to Frequently Submitted
Public Comments beginning on page B733 of this appendix.

Prospective home buyers and members of the church built after the freeway was
conceived, according to State law, should have been informed of the proposed
facility. (Sellers are obligated by Arizona common law to disclose all known
material facts about a property to the buyer.)

The Arizona Department of Transportation and Federal Highway Administration
identified several issues and concerns that were frequently noted by commenters.
Responses to these issues can be found in the Responses to Frequently Submitted
Public Comments beginning on page B733 of this appendix.
1 Air Quality

The Arizona Department of Transportation and Federal Highway Administration identified several issues and concerns that were frequently noted by commenters. Responses to these issues can be found in the *Responses to Frequently Submitted Public Comments* beginning on page B733 of this appendix.

2 Economics, Socioeconomics

A review of the literature reveals few detailed and comprehensive analyses of the relationship between the transportation infrastructure and residential property values (Transportation Research Record: Journal of the Transportation Research Board, No. 2174, Transportation Research Board of the National Academies, Washington, D.C., 2010, pp. 138–47; “Impact of Highways on Property Values: Case Study of the Superstition Freeway Corridor”). A recent study by the California Department of Transportation concluded that freeway facilities did not substantially affect sales prices in residential areas adjacent to the facility. The study concluded that it is the visibility of the freeway that may influence selling price and not distance or noise. As a result, the researchers generally concluded that the more the visibility of a new freeway is reduced, the less it would determine the sales price of homes sold in the area.

3 Neighborhoods/Communities

While the E1 Alternative is adjacent to the largely residential areas of Ahwatukee Foothills Village (to the north), a freeway has been planned in this location for many years (see Final Environmental Impact Statement pages 4-17 and 4-21). Where existing residential uses are adjacent to the proposed freeway, noise mitigation would be implemented according to Arizona Department of Transportation policy (see Final Environmental Impact Statement page 4-91).

4 Noise

The Arizona Department of Transportation and Federal Highway Administration identified several issues and concerns that were frequently noted by commenters. Responses to these issues can be found in the *Responses to Frequently Submitted Public Comments* beginning on page B733 of this appendix.

5 Visual Resources

Because Pecos Road is already a four-lane arterial street and is in approximately the same location as the proposed E1 Alternative, viewers would not be seeing any phenomena they do not already see (see Final Environmental Impact Statement page 4-169). The proposed freeway would have eight lanes of traffic and carry more vehicles, but what park users and residents would see would not be substantively different from what they already see along Pecos Road. Page 4-169 in the Final Environmental Impact Statement lists measures that should help to avoid, reduce, or mitigate aesthetic impacts. Larger saguaro cacti, mature trees, and large shrubs that would likely survive the transplanting and sitting-in period would help in visually sensitive or critical roadway areas.

6 Section 4(f) and Section 6(f)

The Arizona Department of Transportation and Federal Highway Administration identified several issues and concerns that were frequently noted by commenters. Responses to these issues can be found in the *Responses to Frequently Submitted Public Comments* beginning on page B733 of this appendix.

(Responses continue on next page)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Comment Document</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Neighborhoods/Communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Health Effects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Purpose and Need</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Trucks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Alternatives, Gila River Indian Community Alignment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Purpose and Need, Lack of Support</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Comment Document

TELEPHONE CONVERSATION RECORD
SOUTH MOUNTAIN FREEWAY INFORMATION LINE

INCOMING CALL

DATE: 5/15/13
TIME: 3:48 PM

CALLER: MARK TACK
PHONE: EMAIL:
ADDRESS: AZ

CALLER REMARKS/QUESTIONS:
I live at South Mountain. I support the South Mountain Freeway. I think it needed to happen twenty years ago. Thank you.

1

Response

Code Issue Response

1 Comment noted.
May 25, 2013

ADOT Environmental Planning Group
1655 W. Jackson St.
Phoenix, Arizona 85007

Subject: Loop 202 South Mountain Freeway Study

Over 30 years ago, my husband and I saw a large model for housing developments south of South Mountain (Ahwatukee). The model showed a proposed new freeway. It was a selling point for the developers.

Over 20 years ago, at a planning and zoning meeting, my husband proposed a route for the freeway to connect with Interstate 10. Your representatives dismissed it as ludicrous. Today it is your “Preferred Alternative.”

Over the last 20 years vehicular pollution has hurt EVERYONE. The congestion (bumper to bumper, stop and go) on downtown Interstate 10 has made it many times worse.

Now, what are you going to gain by another “study”? Who is doing the “studies”? How much money are they making? Can they use me, a retired industrial engineer? People who do “studies” have no incentives to stop.

Please, just build the freeway.

Donna Taddia
P.O. Box 578
4216 W. Carter Rd.
Laveen, AZ 85339

Code | Issue | Response
---|---|---
1 | | Comment noted.
I wholeheartedly support the recommended construction of the Loop 202 using Pecos on the south, and the 59th Ave. alternative. I prefer to see it happen as soon as possible. My home is near Chandler Blvd. and 17th Ave. which is near one of the proposed exits. I am originally from the Los Angeles area where poorly planned transportation routes have taken a major toll on quality of life. Population expansion and development will continue in metro Phoenix. It will only get more expensive as time passes to deal with transportation infrastructure. This freeway can be added now, with relatively minimal impact to the environment and without excessive cost due to eminent domain (property acquisition). Those against this freeway have no argument. I live in the Ahwatukee Foothills and assert that my property values, quality of life, and convenience will all be enhanced as a result of the construction of this freeway. The 50 MPH speed limit on Pecos, which dead-ends at 27th Avenue is inconvenient. The community will still be relatively secluded, except with the added convenience of nearby major highway access. Failure to provide better access to and through this area will continue to box Ahwatukee into a corner and isolate it from downtown Phoenix. If L.A. is any indication of the future of this city, that commute will get much worse in the coming years, and providing 2 routes to and from downtown will help. Not to mention, those who commute from East to West Valley or vice versa would be able to avoid downtown altogether. There is a clear benefit to building this freeway. I support it, and would like to see the project expedited.

Ron Tafoya

Comment noted.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Comment Document</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**TELEPHONE CONVERSATION RECORD**  
**SOUTH MOUNTAIN FREEWAY INFORMATION LINE**

- **INCOMING CALL:**  
  - **DATE:** 6/12/13  
  - **TIME:** 3:44 PM  
- **CALLER:** PAUL TANDY  
  - **CALLER ADDRESS:** 20080 W. PINEWISH COURT, SURPRISE, AZ 85374  
  - **EMAIL:**  

**CALLER REMARKS/QUESTIONS:**  
I support the South Mountain Freeway.

---

**Response:**  
1 Comment noted.
I have major concern regarding building the freeway by cutting ridges off the South Mountain, destroying parkland and disturbing wildlife. I would consider this highway a truck bypass largely since people live along the path will not benefit a lot from transportation convenience perspective. Actually I am troubled knowing that quite a number of houses and communities will be leveled to make room for the freeway. If such a freeway is really necessary for re-routing traffic, can we just make the current exiting path of US-85 a freeway instead?

Dong Tang

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Section 4(f) and Section 6(f)</td>
<td>The Arizona Department of Transportation and Federal Highway Administration identified several issues and concerns that were frequently noted by commenters. Responses to these issues can be found in the Responses to Frequently Submitted Public Comments beginning on page B733 of this appendix.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Biology, Plants, and Wildlife</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Purpose and Need, Truck Bypass</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Purpose and Need, Lack of Support</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Neighborhoods/Communities</td>
<td>Prospective home buyers and members of the church built after the freeway was conceived, according to State law, should have been informed of the proposed facility. (Sellers are obligated by Arizona common law to disclose all known material facts about a property to the buyer.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Alternatives</td>
<td>The proposed freeway is part of a transportation system developed to improve mobility in the region by increasing capacity and providing alternatives to allow traffic to bypass already congested routes (see Final Environmental Impact Statement pages 1-21, 1-22, 3-1, and 3-3). Like other &quot;loop&quot; freeways in the Phoenix metropolitan area, the proposed South Mountain Freeway would be a commuter corridor, helping to move local traffic between the eastern and western portions of Maricopa County. The State Route 85/Interstate 8 Alternative was evaluated for the proposed project. The reasons this alternative was eliminated from further study are presented on page 3-9 of the Final Environmental Impact Statement.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
From: lptanner1@yahoo.com [mailto:lptanner1@yahoo.com]  
Sent: Saturday, May 11, 2013 11:28 AM  
To: Projects  
Subject: Build the South Mountain Freeway  

I support building the South Mountain Freeway  
Lawrence Tanner  

Sent from Samsung tablet
The resources to build a freeway through South Mountain should be used on other projects including increasing the light rail, bus operations and making Phoenix a more livable city. Adding additional miles of freeway encourages urban sprawl and increases air pollution including carbon emissions, which are warming our planet.

Rene Tanner

Section 4(f) and Section 6(f)
The Arizona Department of Transportation and Federal Highway Administration identified several issues and concerns that were frequently noted by commenters. Responses to these issues can be found in the Responses to Frequently Submitted Public Comments beginning on page B733 of this appendix.

Purpose and Need
The proposed project is part of the Regional Transportation Plan for the Maricopa Association of Governments region. In 2004, the voters of Maricopa County approved the Regional Transportation Plan and the extension of a half-cent sales tax to fund its projects. The funding for the right-of-way acquisition and construction of the proposed project would come from a combination of federal (National Highway Performance Program) and County (half-cent sales tax, also known as Regional Area Road Funds) sources. Use of these funds for construction of the proposed freeway would not affect available funds for statewide projects nor would not constructing this facility make available additional funds for other statewide projects.

Alternatives, Nonfreeway Alternatives
The Arizona Department of Transportation and Federal Highway Administration identified several issues and concerns that were frequently noted by commenters. Responses to these issues can be found in the Responses to Frequently Submitted Public Comments beginning on page B733 of this appendix.

Alternatives
Federal regulations stipulate that an environmental impact statement shall “rigorously explore and objectively evaluate all reasonable alternatives” (40 Code of Federal Regulations § 1502.14; see Final Environmental Impact Statement page 3-1). All alternatives were screened using a multidisciplinary set of criteria. Nonfreeway alternatives were considered (see Final Environmental Impact Statement pages 3-3 through 3-6). Among other things, the study took into account improving existing freeways, improving or expanding other travel modes, strategies to reduce travel demand, and various roadway configurations. This study examined not only the potential impacts from improvements, but also the consequences of building nothing, the No-Action Alternative). As proposed by the Maricopa Association of Governments, the South Mountain Freeway would be part of the Regional Freeway and Highway System. Other transportation improvements such as mass transit and local roads are specified in the Regional Transportation Plan and were considered during the evaluation of this proposed new freeway.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Neighborhoods/Communities</td>
<td>Unplanned growth is often termed “urban sprawl.” Generally, this term is used in the context of rapid and uncontrolled urban growth onto previously undeveloped land—usually on the outskirts of an existing urban area. Projects like the proposed freeway are often identified as contributors to urban sprawl. Freeway projects are often cited as making land at the urban fringe more accessible and, therefore, more attractive for development. However, examination of data comparing population and land use between 1975 and 2000 suggests major transportation projects like the proposed freeway do not induce growth in the region (see Final Environmental Impact Statement pages 4-170 through 4-174). The proposed freeway would be implemented in a historically quickly urbanizing area (most noticeably in the Western Section of the Study Area, although the nationwide recession which began in 2007 slowed growth). In the Eastern Section of the Study Area, the proposed freeway would abut public parkland, Native American land, and a near-fully developed area—therefore, any contribution to accelerated or induced growth would be constrained. The proposed freeway would be built in an area planned for urban growth as established in local jurisdictions’ land use plans for at least the last 25 years.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Air Quality</td>
<td>The Arizona Department of Transportation and Federal Highway Administration identified several issues and concerns that were frequently noted by commenters. Responses to these issues can be found in the Responses to Frequently Submitted Public Comments beginning on page B733 of this appendix.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Air Quality</td>
<td>Climate change is an important national and global concern. While the earth has gone through many natural changes in climate in its history, there is general agreement that the earth’s climate is currently changing at an accelerated rate and will continue to do. Human-caused greenhouse gas emissions contribute to this rapid change. Carbon dioxide makes up the largest component of these greenhouse gas emissions. Other prominent transportation-related Greenhouse gases include methane and nitrous oxide. Greenhouse gases trap heat in the earth’s atmosphere. Because the atmospheric concentration of greenhouse gases continues to climb, our planet will likely continue to experience climate change-related phenomena (see Final Environmental Impact Statement pages 4-85 through 4-86). To date, no national standards have been established regarding greenhouse gases. Greenhouse gases are different than other air pollutants evaluated in federal environmental reviews because their impacts are not localized or regional due to their rapid dispersion into the global atmosphere. The affected environment for greenhouse gas emissions is the entire planet. In contrast to broad-scale actions such as those involving an entire industry sector or very large geographic areas, it is difficult to isolate and understand greenhouse gas emissions’ impacts for a particular transportation project. Furthermore, presently there is no scientific methodology for attributing specific climatological changes to a particular transportation project’s emissions. Under the National Environmental Policy Act, detailed environmental analysis should focus on issues that are significant and meaningful to decision making. The Federal Highway Administration has concluded, based on the nature of greenhouse gas emissions and the exceedingly small potential greenhouse gas impacts of the proposed freeway (as shown in Final Environmental Impact Statement Table 4-37 on page 4-85), that greenhouse gas emissions from the proposed freeway would not result in “reasonably foreseeable significant adverse impacts on the human environment” [40 Code of Federal Regulations § 1502.22(b)].</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MR. TASHQUINTH: In this EIS report, it has nothing
to do with my people. In this EIS report, it says about the
cultural significance. They don’t understand the cultural
significance of South Mountain to us and what it means to
the -- to the Gila River Indian community. But not only to my
community, but to the Salt River and to the Tohono O’odham and
to the Ak-Chin communities.

You see this basket here? This basket, my mother
told me, you divide it into four. You divide it into four.
And, in birth, you come to the opening. And you begin your
journey into life by going through all the twists and turns.
You learn how to walk, how to talk, how to feed yourself. You
learn how to bathe.

You go through all of life like that, as a baby, as
a youth, until you get down here to the bottom. At the bottom
you start to go through all the twists and turns of life as a
youth. You go through all of the difficulty. You get lost.
You stumble around, and you try to figure out how to get out.
And, even into adulthood, you go through all of
that. Down here at the bottom: The twists and turns of life.
You go through growing up as an adult, looking for
a job, taking care of your families, taking care of yourself.
You get lost in here, those twists and turns, until
you get to be an elder. When you become an elder, you come out
to the outside on this side. You find your way back, all the
The center of this maze is Mawuduc, South Mountain. To us, that's the center of the universe. That is where our creator, Siuuhu, he lives there, Elder Brother. He lives in that area. That's his house. He built this maze to get away from his enemies. But in our way, we use this to show what life is about. That's our culture. That's our religion. That is our tradition. It's our way of life, what we call our -- what we say is our himduc.

That is the religious significance to us and our way, because he's our creator. Elder Brother is our creator. Elder Brother made us. That's why that mountain is very significant to us. We hold -- you know, to go up there and do ceremonies.

There are animals up there. There's the desert tortoise. There's the Gambel's quail. There's vegetation up there that's still used as herbal medicines by our people, a root that's up there that's used to heal with: the greasewood, shegoi. Greasewood, that's used to heal. Drink it when you have a cold. Drink it when you're sick, like a tea. And you use that to help clear yourself.

There's a lot of places up there that are old prehistoric trails, where all the Hohokam used to go, our
Our ancestors walked up there and did their ceremonies up there. That's the center of the universe for all of us. That's where we come from.

Your -- If somebody wanted to go downtown and build a freeway through St. Mary's Basilica downtown, all the Catholics would get up, and they would be angry about it. They would get mad about it and they would say, "No."

That is the same thing. We don't want that. We don't want that freeway through there. We don't need that freeway through there. Our people have been here for hundreds and thousands of years.

When the forty-niners first came through here, our people were the ones that helped find those forty-niners that were lost. Our people went out with mercy patrol, with gourd water, gourd canteens with water in them. They had corn and melon, all these different things, looking for the forty-niners that were lost out there in the desert.

And when they found them, they gave them the water and told them, "Go. Go that way. Follow the mountains back there. Follow, see where Naward is and the Camelback Mountain and the Estrellas."

Below those mountains are our people, all along the Gila River. Our people took care of them, helped them.

In 1847 the United States sent their first cavalry patrol through here. And when they came through here, they
1 asked Antonio Azul if they could trade horses with them so that
2 they could continue on to California. And he agreed, on a
3 handshake. On a handshake, he said, "Yes," and he traded
4 horses with them.
5 The Spanish garrison that was over in Tucson, they
6 wanted those horses. They tried to come and take it. They
7 wanted to take it away from us. Antonio Azul said, "If you
8 want those horses, come and get them. But you're going to have
9 to fight for them."
10 They never came back and got those horses because
11 Antonio Azul said, "I made a promise, on a handshake, that I
12 would take care of these horses for those white people that
13 went through here, came through here. And they'll be back, and
14 I'll give them back to them."
15 From that time on, our allegiance and our loyalty
16 was given to the United States of America. Our
17 great-grandfathers and our grandfathers, our fathers and our
18 brothers and our uncles fought alongside many of the white
19 people from the State of Arizona, when they fought in World
20 War I, World War II, Korea, Vietnam, all the way up to now, to
21 Iraq and Iran.
22 All over the world, our young men and women are
23 standing, side by side, with many of those people. We're all
24 a -- We're all a part of the -- We're all a part of the
25 Creator. We're all a people of the Creator. We're all
children. And we need to understand that nobody owns the land, the way our elders told us. No one owns the land. The land belongs to everyone. It was made and given to us so that we can live in harmony and balance with all of the vegetation, with the mountains, with the waters, and with all of the little animals and all the birds in the sky. We live in harmony and balance with one another and to take care of one another. That's why we, as Akimel O'odham and Pee Posh people, we -- we are the caretakers of this land. That's what we're supposed to be doing. We don't want that freeway. We don't need that freeway. They're not telling us about what the pollution is going to do. They're not telling us about the toxins that's going to come off of those tires after it rains. It's going to pollute our waters that we're sitting on top of. Our river doesn't run anymore because the people that -- that are on the east side, those people are cutting -- cutting, to take the water away from us. That water was our life. That water, the river, was what made us who we are. But it's not running anymore. The white man has come and is strangling us. They're taking that water away from us. Now they want to destroy our mountain that's sacred to us, but not only to us but also to the Salt River, to the Tohono O'odham, to the
Ak-Chin community, to many of the tribes that are in the surrounding areas. It's significant to them, in their ways, too.

All we have is a little bit of strip of land, from 110th Avenue, Phoenix International Raceway, that corner along the Salt River, all along to here, to South Mountain, all the way towards Coolidge, all the way towards Casa Grande and Maricopa and coming back around, back to the Estrellas, of all the land we had. When we were strong, when we were a true Nation, our land stretched from the headwaters of the Gila River, outside the city of Silver City, New Mexico -- that's where the Gila River begins -- all the way down to almost to the Colorado River.

Many of our -- Many of our Hohokam relatives, ancestors, their homes are up along the Mogollon Rim, all along that way. They're up there because our land stretched that far, all the way into Mexico.

When the Spanish first came, they called this whole area Pima-era Alta. Pima-era Alta, the Northern First Ones. We have relatives in Mexico. They are the Baja Pima-era. They are the Southern First Ones.

This is who we are, since the coming of the European settlers, coming through here, stealing land from us, lying to us, cheating us, just as they're doing now, telling us lies and half-truths, what they really want, by either stealing
or cheating from us, making bad deals with people who want

to -- think that money is good.

That time -- That's how we lost both of our lands.

That's how we lost this whole state.

But not only us, but all the rest of the other

tribes, too. The 21 tribes that are here in this state have

been reduced to small little pockets, reservations. And all

their traditional lands have been stolen from them.

All tribes are fighting. All tribes are trying to

stand up. All tribes are trying to take back what was theirs.

But it's hard because the white man will not listen to us. The

white man is too greedy. They're thieves and liars. So it has

been said, from a long time ago. But all tribes have dealt

with them. That's what they've come to find out.

We'll continue to fight. Those of us that are

against it, we'll continue to try and stop it, any way we can.

And, if all the other tribes in the outside understand, stand

with this, then, all together, we can make one last stand and

we can prevent the white man from coming through here and

taking what doesn't belong to them.

That's all I have to say.
### TELEPHONE CONVERSATION RECORD

**SOUTH MOUNTAIN FREEWAY INFORMATION LINE**

**INCOMING CALL**

- **DATE:** 7/24/13
- **TIME:** 10:12 AM

**CALLER:** GLENDA TATUM

**CALLER ADDRESS:** 12718 WEST SOLA COURT, SUN CITY WEST, ARIZONA 85375

**PHONE:** (532) 4214

**INCOMING CALL**

**CALLER REMARKS/QUESTIONS:**

I am a voter, I live on the West side and I do support that freeway. It is a needed freeway, it is something that would help us connect to the east side from west side. I work in Chandler, so having to take the 10 and no other connection is really an inconvenience. I support that freeway and I look forward to that freeway construction. Thank you.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Comment noted.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
From: Nikki Taylor [mailto:tntaylor2001@gmail.com]  
Sent: Monday, May 20, 2013 7:33 PM  
To: Projects  
Cc: info@buildthe202.com  
Subject: Build the South Mountain Freeway  

I am a Phoenix resident. I live in north Phoenix (district 2 85024 zip code), but my sister lives in Laveen. I visit her home often and would like the 202 to go through this area. Thank you.

Nikki Taylor
TELEPHONE CONVERSATION RECORD
SOUTH MOUNTAIN FREEWAY INFORMATION LINE

INCOMING CALL
DATE: 5/15/13
TIME: 6:19 PM

CALLER: NANCY TAYLOR
ADDRESS: GILBERT, AZ
PHONE: EMAIL:

CALLER REMARKS/QUESTIONS:
I am calling in support of the South Mountain Freeway. I feel it will help relieve some of the congestion that we now have on I-10 and the 101 that is all traffic and just trying to bypass to get to the other end of town or other side of the city. I live in Gilbert, Arizona and I definitely support it. Thank you.

1 Comment noted.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Comment Document</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>From:</td>
<td>Projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To:</td>
<td>ADOT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject:</td>
<td>FW: South Mountain Freeway Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date:</td>
<td>Monday, July 15, 2013 8:05:05 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attachments:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thank you,
Matthew Eberhart
Community Relations Officer
1655 W Jackson St. MD 126F
Phoenix, AZ 85007
602-712-2060
azdot.gov

From: Joe Taylor [mailto:jlt9@msn.com]
Sent: Sunday, July 14, 2013 10:50 AM
To: Projects
Subject: South Mountain Freeway Project

ADOT Loop 202 South Mountain Freeway Study

Where to join the 202 with I-10.

Resident Comment:

The most logical and practical and best plan for the overall long term city traffic flow is to join in the 202 at the 101W and I-10 interchange. Connecting the 202 to I-10 at 51st Ave would cause extreme traffic congestion on that section of I-10, especially between 51st Ave and 101W which is an already over-crowded freeway section leading to more traffic accidents and deaths. Freight transport trucks attempting to by-pass Phoenix will be using this route heavily. The increase truck traffic this would cause on this section of I-10 will only add to the problem and more accidents.

Connecting the 202 to 101W and I-10 interchange will reduce traffic on I-10 between I-17 and 101W and provide an overall more seamless and safer freeway system with fewer accidents and traffic deaths. And isn’t providing the safest freeway system for the parents and children traveling them the ultimate goal. Look at the big picture. Plan to reduce the congestion, not increase it.

Thank you.

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Alternatives, W59: Alternative Versus W101 Alternative</td>
<td>The Arizona Department of Transportation and Federal Highway Administration identified several issues and concerns that were frequently noted by commenters. Responses to these issues can be found in the Responses to Frequently Submitted Public Comments beginning on page B733 of this appendix.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Purpose and Need, Truck Bypass</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Comment Document</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Joe Taylor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Laveen, AZ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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.
From: Projects
To: ADOT
Subject: FW: Loop 202 Comment
Date: Tuesday, July 23, 2013 5:02:20 PM
Attachments: image001.png

Thank you,
Matthew Eberhart
Community Relations Officer
1655 W Jackson St. MD 126F
Phoenix, AZ 85007
602-712-2060
azdot.gov

From: Howard Teeter [mailto:hteeter@cox.net]
Sent: Tuesday, July 23, 2013 5:00 PM
To: Projects
Subject: Loop 202 Comment

I had high hopes that the GRIC negotiations would be successful but they appear to have fallen through. At this point all I can ask is that the proposed route be moved or abandoned entirely due to the serious, detrimental effects that it would have on the immediate community of Ahwatukee Foothills. The congestion, the pollution (noise and air) and the added pressure of traffic and people would all contribute to the degradation of our neighborhoods, our schools and our health. Neighborhood preservation must be a priority. Our community abutting Pecos Road will suffer... which was never an issue at the time of inception, but is very much an issue now. Thank you for listening.

Howard Teeter.
2719 E. Amberwood Dr.
Phoenix, Az 85048

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/proposed 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Comment Document</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Neighborhoods/Communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Noise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Air Quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Comment Document</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TELEPHONE CONVERSATION RECORD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SOUTH MOUNTAIN FREEWAY INFORMATION LINE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>INCOMING CALL DATE: 6/13/13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TIME: 4:43 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CALLER: SUSAN TELLER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CALLER ADDRESS: 9122 W. HARBOR HILLS, SUN CITY, ARIZONA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PHONE: EMAIL:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CALLER REMARKS/QUESTIONS:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I support the freeway.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 Comment noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Issue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Estudio de la Autopista South Mountain Loop 202

Reporte Del Impacto Ambiental FORMULARIO DE COMENTARIOS

Comentarios Adicionales:

I've waited this freeway for a couple of decades or more. I believe this freeway has long been needed, especially for saving semi trucks out of the downtown areas. The freeway would give a second route to get from west Pima to Chandler or further south in Tucson.

I cannot believe that after so many decades, there has been built without any objections, and yet this freeway which is definitely needed has been put on hold for decades because of a few people for altruistic.

I live in Laveen and am all for building it...away for my life time.

Let's get it done.

I like the 5th Ave Route.

Arthur M. Trilles

913-37 S Crater
PHX AZ 85043

602-663-1997
TELEPHONE CONVERSATION RECORD
SOUTH MOUNTAIN FREEWAY INFORMATION LINE

INCOMING CALL
DATE: 05/13
TIME: 3:10 PM
CALLER: MICHAEL TENNET
CALLER ADDRESS: 26621 S. LAKEWOOD DRIVE, SUN LAKES, AZ 85248
PHONE: EMAIL:

CALLER REMARKS/QUESTIONS:
I support the planning and construction of the South Mountain Freeway. The freeway will reduce Downtown Phoenix traffic, including the tanker and boxcar trucks. This is a great way for moving traffic through Phoenix. It would be an excellent idea to help improve the economy.

1  Comment noted.
TELEPHONE CONVERSATION RECORD
SOUTH MOUNTAIN FREEWAY INFORMATION LINE

INCOMING CALL
DATE: 7/23/13
TIME: 2:19 PM

CALLER: MELINDA TERRINGTON
CALLER ADDRESS: 113 E. LOBO DRIVE, PHOENIX, ARIZONA 85022
PHONE: 602-992-2473

CALLER REMARKS/QUESTIONS:
I do believe that the Loop 202 of the South Mountain below Ahwatukee should be built. I've lived here my whole life and I've always thought there should be a freeway down there. I thought it should be built before Ahwatukee was expanded and built upon. Thank you and I do hope that the freeway will go through because I do think it would alleviate a lot of pressure in Central Phoenix. Thank you.

1

Comment noted.
From what I have heard this will benefit certain business interests that stand the most to gain and that more thought should be put toward the environmental impact that this might have on the area. Maybe an unbiased study should be conducted without the pressure of the monied interests involved before proceeding ahead with irreparable damage being done to the communities involved.

**Code** Comment Document

David Terry

From what I have heard this will benefit certain business interests that stand the most to gain and that more thought should be put toward the environmental impact that this might have on the area. Maybe an unbiased study should be conducted without the pressure of the monied interests involved before proceeding ahead with irreparable damage being done to the communities involved.

**Purpose and Need, Lack of Support**

The Arizona Department of Transportation and Federal Highway Administration identified several issues and concerns that were frequently noted by commenters. Responses to these issues can be found in the Responses to Frequently Submitted Public Comments beginning on page B733 of this appendix.
I am AGAINST the build of the Loop 202 South Mountain Freeway along Pecos Road. I am a resident of the Ahwatukee neighborhood and ask the ADOT to find a different or another alternative. This will take away from my hard earned property value; it is a destruction of well established neighborhood, churches, schools and local communities.

gregards

tgt

Thomas Thaete

The Arizona Department of Transportation and Federal Highway Administration identified several issues and concerns that were frequently noted by commenters. Responses to these issues can be found in the Responses to Frequently Submitted Public Comments beginning on page B733 of this appendix.

A review of the literature reveals few detailed and comprehensive analyses of the relationship between the transportation infrastructure and residential property values (Transportation Research Record: Journal of the Transportation Research Board, No. 2174, Transportation Research Board of the National Academies, Washington, D.C., 2010, pp. 138 -47; “Impact of Highways on Property Values: Case Study of the Superstition Freeway Corridor”). A recent study by the California Department of Transportation concluded that freeway facilities did not substantially affect sales prices in residential areas adjacent to the facility. The study concluded that it is the visibility of the freeway that may influence selling price and not distance or noise. As a result, the researchers generally concluded that the more the visibility of a new freeway is reduced, the less it would determine the sales price of homes sold in the area.

Prospective home buyers and members of the church built after the freeway was conceived, according to State law, should have been informed of the proposed facility. (Sellers are obligated by Arizona common law to disclose all known material facts about a property to the buyer.)
Thank you,
Matthew Eberhart
Community Relations Officer
1655 W Jackson St. MD 126F
Phoenix, AZ 85007
602-712-2060
azdot.gov

From: eltheiseno@gmail.com [mailto:eltheiseno@gmail.com]
On Behalf Of Nicholas Theisen
Sent: Tuesday, June 25, 2013 4:21 PM
To: Projects
Subject: Oppose Loop 202 South Mountain Freeway

To whom it may concern,

I would like to express my formal opposition to the proposed 202 expansion project. The spending of public funds on a freeway around the south-side of South Mountain does not reflect the best interests of Arizona residents, and I believe in prioritizing public funds, it does not currently warrant funding ahead of other public transportation options (expanded light rail, Tucson-Phoenix rail, etc).

The Regional Freeway System, approved by voters in 1985, reflected a need for expanded freeways that existed at the time. This has created substantial benefits for the community in Maricopa County, but it has also shaped our society in a number of negative ways.

Unfortunately, population growth has followed the construction of the freeways, and rather than build up to take advantage of the many advantages urban density provides, Phoenix has grown ever-outward, to the detriment of more central communities. This has led to more cars on the roads driving longer distances, and in turn dirtier air, and greater health problems.

Current popular sentiment has turned, such that I believe a large portion of the population now wants to pull back from this course on which we have set ourselves.

"If you build it, they will come" is the general sentiment here. WE get to determine how we want to shape our society. If we want to create a society that commutes from Chandler to Avondale and vice versa, and expands ever-outward at the margins, then this plan makes sense. If we want to further promote Arizona as a drive-through State, and bring more regional trucks onto our roads by making it easy to bypass Phoenix, then we will be well served by this freeway. OR we could instead invest our public funds in making Phoenix and Maricopa County a destination. We could expand our light rail lines that have already sparked a tremendous amount of local development and given our citizens something to be proud of. Or we could connect our Capital City with our southern neighbor, Tucson, via a high-speed rail line, further reducing traffic on our freeways.

1 Alternatives, No-Action (No-Build) Alternative
The Arizona Department of Transportation and Federal Highway Administration identified several issues and concerns that were frequently noted by commenters. Responses to these issues can be found in the Responses to Frequently Submitted Public Comments beginning on page B733 of this appendix.

2 Purpose and Need, Lack of Support
The Southwest Loop Highway—the South Mountain Freeway predecessor—was integral to the Regional Freeway and Highway System approved by Maricopa County voters in 1985. Although other facilities were considered a higher priority early in development of the Regional Freeway and Highway System, the South Mountain Freeway has been included in every subsequent update. The same route was approved by the State Transportation Board in 1988. In 2004, Maricopa County voters approved Proposition 400, which was designed to fund completion of the remaining segments of the Regional Freeway and Highway System, including the proposed South Mountain Freeway (Final Environmental Impact Statement page 1-21).

3 Purpose and Need, Truck Bypass
The Arizona Department of Transportation and Federal Highway Administration identified several issues and concerns that were frequently noted by commenters. Responses to these issues can be found in the Responses to Frequently Submitted Public Comments beginning on page B733 of this appendix.
The choice is ours, and I strongly urge ADOT to choose to invest in one of the latter options. Thank you for your consideration.

Regards,

Nick

--
Nick Theisen
nicholas.theisen@gmail.com
(602) 820-1182
Alternatives

Federal law prohibits the denial of access to any community. Thus, traffic interchanges would be located along the freeway where it borders the Gila River Indian Community (see Draft Environmental Impact Statement page 3-51). Roadway connections on Gila River Indian Community land to the traffic interchanges would be the responsibility of the Gila River Indian Community, in coordination with appropriate jurisdictions.

Design

Construction of the proposed freeway would include widening along Interstate 10 to facilitate entrance and egress of vehicles between the two freeways. Additional information related to the Interstate 10 modifications can be found in Figure 3-26 on page 3-49 and Figure 3-29 on page 3-53 of the Draft Environmental Impact Statement. The design of the connection to Interstate 10 and the widening along Interstate 10 were developed in accordance with the Federal Highway Administration’s Interstate System Access Informational Guide and has received an initial determination of operational and engineering acceptability from the Federal Highway Administration.
Mary Thomas

I am an elder from the Gila River Indian community. My faith in our fellow human beings remains strong. It has not been a pleasant journey. We have been subjected to neglect, fraud, stereotyping, outright cruelty since they discovered our homelands. We have given up so much and still give of ourselves to this great state and nation, all we ask in return is respect for our land...it is our survival.

[Table]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Comment noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Comment Document</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Comment noted.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From: Projects
To: ADOT
Subject: FW: 202
Date: Wednesday, May 22, 2013 10:51:58 AM

From: kingbobthomas@gmail.com [mailto:kingbobthomas@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, May 21, 2013 1:28 PM
To: Projects
Subject: 202

Hi. I support the 202. It would provide greater access. Thank you.

Pastor Bob Thomas
4807 west Maldonado Rd
Laveen Az. 75339
602-733-7317

Sent from my HTC EVO 4G LTE exclusively from Sprint

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.
Audra Thomas  
I'm very much in favor of using the E1 Alternative, unless Gila River Indian Community and its Members decide otherwise, and tying the freeway into Loop 101 using the W101 alternatives. In terms of system planning, and looking at the transportation facility from a regional perspective, tying it into L101 makes the most sense. I worry that utilizing either the W59 or W71 alternatives will pour additional traffic onto a facility not able to address it, and further, will reduce the viability and attractiveness of the South Mountain Freeway as a transportation facility to those looking to move north/west and/or south/east.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Comment Document</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Alternatives, Gila River Indian Community Alignment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Alternatives, W59 Alternative Versus W101 Alternative</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Arizona Department of Transportation and Federal Highway Administration identified several issues and concerns that were frequently noted by commenters. Responses to these issues can be found in the Responses to Frequently Submitted Public Comments beginning on page B733 of this appendix.
### TELEPHONE CONVERSATION RECORD

**SOUTH MOUNTAIN FREEWAY INFORMATION LINE**

**INCOMING CALL**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>TIME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6/13/13</td>
<td>5:09 PM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CALLER**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>ADDRESS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ADA THOMAS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PHONE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EMAIL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CALLER REMARKS/QUESTIONS:**

I would support building the freeway.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Comment noted.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MR. STOKEBRAND: I sent an e-mail to ADOT regarding just how I support the 202. It's much needed for the people living -- it will bring much needed funds to the City of Phoenix in terms of tax revenue and for all us citizens who leave Laveen and City of Phoenix to go to Goodyear, Avondale, and other cities. I will be a lot happier to keep those tax funds inside of our city for community centers, things of that sort. And I'm someone who lives close, within half a mile of the proposed freeway and I still support it just because it will make my life better, easier to get around the city, and alleviate some of the congestion on Baseline Avenue. That's about it. The rest of it is pretty well documented, so I don't have anything else to add. Thank you.

MR. THOMAS: My name is Jim Thomas. I live in Goodyear, Arizona. I work at Broadway and 40th Street, so I drive I-10 every day and the traffic is bad in the morning and it's horrible in the afternoon. I normally get to the office between 5:30 and 6:00 and it takes me 35 minutes, it's about 30 miles. In the evenings, it takes me at least 45 minutes, sometimes an hour to get home so this would be very helpful. And I think, if they would take the bypass off of the 101 -- if you go down to 59th, you're just...
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Comment Document</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>adding trucks and a longer length of I-10 that will</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>congest the traffic even more, so the faster you can get</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>them off I-10, the better off we will all be.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Other than that, I hope that they build it</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>quickly, you know, cause this would not take forever to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>build.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Okay. Thank you very much.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>MR. HUSTON: I just want to say that I am</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>in favor of the project and after I've reviewed all the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>boards and the entire process, it seems to make sense</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>what they've narrowed it down to. I think, based on cost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>alone, it seems like 59th is the best alternative. If</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>cost weren't a factor, I think some of the ones that go</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>further to the west would also be nice to help tie into</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>the west valley. It seems like a long time coming.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>It seems like a great project. I think it</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>would be good for, not only our freeway system, but</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>putting people back to work. Overall I just think it</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>would be a really good thing for the community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>That's it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>MR. BAREHAND: My name is Harlan Barehand.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>I'm from the Gila River Indian Community. I'd like to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>thank ADOT for finally listening to us and not putting it</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>on the Reservation. I just got through seeing a video</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>next door; it was beautiful. I think it works out fine.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Comment Document

**South Mountain** is a sacred site and should not be desecrated in the name of progress. This freeway is unneeded, it's as if you are purposely destroying a beautiful park for nothing.

---

#### Issue Response Appendix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Cultural Resources</td>
<td>The Arizona Department of Transportation and Federal Highway Administration identified several issues and concerns that were frequently noted by commenters. Responses to these issues can be found in the Responses to Frequently Submitted Public Comments beginning on page B733 of this appendix.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Section 4(f) and Section 6(f)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Purpose and Need, Lack of Support</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Issue</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Cultural Resources</td>
<td>The Arizona Department of Transportation and Federal Highway Administration identified several issues and concerns that were frequently noted by commenters. Responses to these issues can be found in the Responses to Frequently Submitted Public Comments beginning on page B733 of this appendix.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

EDITH THOMAS: My name is Edith Thomas. I’m a member of the Gila Indian River community who just happens to be also an archeologist. I would like to bring several issues to the attention of the DEIS regarding the archeology of South Mountain. South Mountain is known to us. I am Akimel O’Odham, Pima. I grew up within the Gila Indian River community. I’m going to present two perspectives based on my own personal experience based on the traditions, him-da’g, of my People. I’d also like to present the archeological perspectives, which are also based on the Akimel O’Odham.

South Mountain is a culturally significant location for the members of the Gila River Indian community. It is part of our songs. Our songs are significant because it is a cultural perspective. Our songs are part of our historical record. It’s a recording or a recounting of the history of our People that dates back to over thousands of years ago. For our People this is a factual account that is recorded within the songs.

South Mountain is part of the migration pattern of my People, so it is not just a mountain as the non -- the non-members of the Gila Indian River community may view it. It’s not a mountain; it’s a sacred site.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Cultural Resources</td>
<td>For protection from vandalism and desecration, archaeological sites are not shown on maps provided to the public. The Arizona Department of Transportation will continue to survey the proposed alternatives for archaeological resources. Any negative impacts on archaeological sites would be mitigated through excavations.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. And that word “sacred” also has special meaning to us. It is not sacred in comparison to a church or to a religious aspect.

2. “Sacred” means to us that it’s part of who we are. It’s where we derive from. It’s where we originate. Everything is connected to us: The land, the plants, the animals. There is no differentiation between all of these things. They are not just objects. They are part of our whole life cycle, so to try to classify it as just a geological formation would not be accurate.

3. What I’m trying to convey to you is that South Mountain is extremely significant to us. Wednesday, South Mountain, is part of our story, part of who we are.

4. Also, based on my archeological expertise, we have several archeological sites that were not cited within the DEIS report. There are artifact scatters on the surface. As an archeologist, it is well documented that when you have an artifact scatter, that’s part of the community, there are significant remains underneath the surface of the ground. So when you have your maps or your location within the report, that was not shown.

5. I would like to bring my concerns or point out that there needs to be further archeological investigations conducted by ADOT or for the DEIS because this was not represented accurately. This is significant.
Environmental Justice/Lifestyle

The Draft Environmental Impact Statement describes a decade-long consultation and coordination effort led by the Arizona Department of Transportation and the Federal Highway Administration with the Gila River Indian Community and other Native American tribes. As a result of the consultation, the cultural importance of the South Mountains is acknowledged in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement in several locations, notably page 5-26. The proposed project would accommodate and preserve (to the fullest extent possible from the available alternatives) access to the South Mountains for religious practices.

Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act requires a government-to-government relationship between the Federal Government and Indian tribes as described beginning on page 4-140 of the Final Environmental Impact Statement. Section 106 requires federal agencies take into account the effects of their undertakings on historic properties and requires consultation with tribal authorities. Consultation has occurred with Gila River Indian Community government officials, the Tribal Historic Preservation Officer, the Cultural Resource Management Program, other tribes, and the State Historic Preservation Office and has led to concurrence from the Gila River Indian Community Tribal Historic Preservation Office and the State Historic Preservation Office on National Register of Historic Places eligibility recommendations (including traditional cultural properties like the South Mountains), project effects, and proposed mitigation and measures to minimize harm. This consultation has been ongoing and will continue until any commitments in a record of decision are completed.

The section entitled Title VI and Environmental Justice, beginning on page 4-29 in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement, presents acceptable methods, data, and assumptions to assess the potential for disproportionately high and adverse effects from the proposed action on environmental justice populations and disparate impacts to populations protected under Title VI. Based on the content of the section, no such effects would result from the action alternatives.

In light of comments received on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement, the above-referenced conclusions were confirmed in the preparation of the Final Environmental Impact Statement. To provide further clarity, the discussions of environmental justice and Title VI were separated and additional text explaining the relationship of environmental justice and Title VI to various environmental elements was added throughout Chapter 4, Affected Environment, Environmental Consequences, and Mitigation, as exemplified by the inserted text on page 4-29 of the Final Environmental Impact Statement.
Comment noted.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Public Involvement</td>
<td>Comment noted.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Draft Environmental Impact Statement**

**COMMENTS FORM**

Thank you for participating in the South Mountain Freeway Draft Environmental Impact Statement public comment process.

ADOT encourages all interested parties to submit written comments on any aspect of the Draft EIS. ADOT will consider all comments in preparing the Final EIS, which will build upon responses to all comments, final estimates on potential impacts, and ADOT's final recommendation.

When submitting comments, please be as specific as possible and substantiate your concerns and recommendations.

Comments must be received or postmarked by July 24, 2013.

**Comment Document**

1. Public Involvement
   - Comment noted.

**Name**: Benni Thompson
**Address**: 5638 S 48ND AVE
**City**: PHOENIX, State: AZ 85041
**Phone**: 602-237-3333

Comments must be received or postmarked by July 24, 2013. Comments can be deposited at today’s meeting, emailed to projects@adot.gov or mailed to: ADOT Loop 202 South Mountain Freeway Study, 1665 W. Jackson Street, MG 1241, Phoenix, AZ 85007.
### TELEPHONE CONVERSATION RECORD
SOUTH MOUNTAIN FREEWAY INFORMATION LINE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INCOMING CALL</th>
<th>TIME</th>
<th>CALLER ADDRESS</th>
<th>PHONE</th>
<th>EMAIL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DATE: 5/15/13</td>
<td>6:21 PM</td>
<td>1429 E. WATSON DRIVE, TEMPE, AZ 85283</td>
<td>480-839-6979</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CALLER REMARKS/QUESTIONS:**
I give my full support as a business owner in south Tempe, for the South Mountain Freeway expansion. Thank you.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Comment noted.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Arizona Department of Transportation and Federal Highway Administration identified several issues and concerns that were frequently noted by commenters. Responses to these issues can be found in the Responses to Frequently Submitted Public Comments beginning on page B733 of this appendix.

1. **Alternatives, No-Action (No-Build) Alternative**
   - If a well were adversely affected by construction activities, the well might need to be abandoned or the well owner would be compensated by drilling a new well according to state regulations/standards. (See text box on Final Environmental Impact Statement page 4-108.)

2. **Groundwater**
   - A review of the literature reveals few detailed and comprehensive analyses of the relationship between the transportation infrastructure and residential property values (Transportation Research Record: Journal of the Transportation Research Board, No. 2174, Transportation Research Board of the National Academies, Washington, D.C., 2010, pp. 138–47; “Impact of Highways on Property Values: Case Study of the Superstition Freeway Corridor”). A recent study by the California Department of Transportation concluded that freeway facilities did not substantially affect sales prices in residential areas adjacent to the facility. The study concluded that it is the visibility of the freeway that may influence selling price and not distance or noise. As a result, the researchers generally concluded that the more the visibility of a new freeway is reduced, the less it would determine the sales price of homes sold in the area.

3. **Economics, Socioeconomics**
   - While the City of Phoenix Police Department reported in 2005 that it did not have any statistics specific to crime adjacent to freeways, the Police Department did note that, based on its experience, there does not appear to be a correlation between crime rates and freeways. See Final Environmental Impact Statement sidebar on page 4-21.
TELEPHONE CONVERSATION RECORD
SOUTH MOUNTAIN FREEWAY INFORMATION LINE

INCOMING CALL
DATE: 7/23/13
TIME: 12:20 PM

CALLER: DAVID THOMPSON
CALLER ADDRESS: 2405 WEST OLNE AVENUE, LAVEEN, ARIZONA
PHONE: EMAIL:

CALLER REMARKS/QUESTIONS:
I am calling in support of the Loop 202 freeway. Been hoping for it to be done for quite awhile now. I expect it will reduce traffic congestion along Baseline significantly. I know friends that live in the East Valley that have to come in through I-10 West 60 to get into Phoenix and some of them have commented that coming around Loop 202 would be faster for them. Thank you.

Comment noted.
**TELEPHONE CONVERSATION RECORD**
**SOUTH MOUNTAIN FREEWAY INFORMATION LINE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Caller</th>
<th>Caller Address</th>
<th>Phone</th>
<th>Email</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6/11/13</td>
<td>6:06 PM</td>
<td>SANDRA THURSTON</td>
<td>15970 W. JACKSON STREET, GOODYEAR, ARIZONA</td>
<td>602-423-0027</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**叫话人备注/问题:**
And I'm glad you guys work for the freeway, for the 202. Thank you.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Comment noted.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Federal regulations stipulate that an environmental impact statement shall identify several issues and concerns that were frequently noted by commenters. Responses to these issues can be found in the Responses to Frequently Submitted Public Comments beginning on page B733 of this appendix.

### Purpose and Need

Although the region’s freeways are now congested during the peak travel period, conditions in 2035 without the proposed freeway would be substantially worse with more congested areas and congested conditions for longer periods of time (see Final Environmental Impact Statement pages 1-21 and 1-22). Congestion relief resulting from the proposed freeway would provide localized reductions of delays on arterial streets and at interchanges. Reduced travel times would result in lower exposure to elevated concentrations of mobile source air toxics occurring in traffic. Other benefits of the proposed freeway in comparison to the No-Action Alternative are presented in Table 3-9 on page 3-38 of the Final Environmental Impact Statement.

### Alternatives

Federal regulations stipulate that an environmental impact statement shall “rigorously explore and objectively evaluate all reasonable alternatives” (40 Code of Federal Regulations § 1502.14; see Final Environmental Impact Statement page 3-1). All alternatives were screened using a multidisciplinary set of criteria. Nonfreeway alternatives were considered (see Final Environmental Impact Statement pages 3-3 through 3-6). Among other things, the study took into account improving existing freeways, improving or expanding other travel modes, strategies to reduce travel demand, and various roadway configurations. This study examined not only the potential impacts from improvements, but also the consequences of building nothing, the No-Action Alternative. As proposed by the Maricopa Association of Governments, the South Mountain Freeway would be part of the Regional Freeway and Highway System. Other transportation improvements such as mass transit and local roads are specified in the Regional Transportation Plan and were considered during the evaluation of this proposed new freeway. As noted in the Final Environmental Impact Statement (see page 3-60), the proposed freeway would provide opportunities to enhance operation of future mass transit improvements.

### Air Quality

The Arizona Department of Transportation and Federal Highway Administration identified several issues and concerns that were frequently noted by commenters. Responses to these issues can be found in the Responses to Frequently Submitted Public Comments beginning on page B733 of this appendix.

### Code | Issue | Response
--- | --- | ---
1 | Alternatives, No-Action (No-Build) Alternative | The Arizona Department of Transportation and Federal Highway Administration identified several issues and concerns that were frequently noted by commenters. Responses to these issues can be found in the Responses to Frequently Submitted Public Comments beginning on page B733 of this appendix. Although the region’s freeways are now congested during the peak travel period, conditions in 2035 without the proposed freeway would be substantially worse with more congested areas and congested conditions for longer periods of time (see Final Environmental Impact Statement pages 1-21 and 1-22). Congestion relief resulting from the proposed freeway would provide localized reductions of delays on arterial streets and at interchanges. Reduced travel times would result in lower exposure to elevated concentrations of mobile source air toxics occurring in traffic. Other benefits of the proposed freeway in comparison to the No-Action Alternative are presented in Table 3-9 on page 3-38 of the Final Environmental Impact Statement. Federal regulations stipulate that an environmental impact statement shall “rigorously explore and objectively evaluate all reasonable alternatives” (40 Code of Federal Regulations § 1502.14; see Final Environmental Impact Statement page 3-1). All alternatives were screened using a multidisciplinary set of criteria. Nonfreeway alternatives were considered (see Final Environmental Impact Statement pages 3-3 through 3-6). Among other things, the study took into account improving existing freeways, improving or expanding other travel modes, strategies to reduce travel demand, and various roadway configurations. This study examined not only the potential impacts from improvements, but also the consequences of building nothing, the No-Action Alternative. As proposed by the Maricopa Association of Governments, the South Mountain Freeway would be part of the Regional Freeway and Highway System. Other transportation improvements such as mass transit and local roads are specified in the Regional Transportation Plan and were considered during the evaluation of this proposed new freeway. As noted in the Final Environmental Impact Statement (see page 3-60), the proposed freeway would provide opportunities to enhance operation of future mass transit improvements. 

### Code | Issue
--- | ---
2 | Purpose and Need | Although the region’s freeways are now congested during the peak travel period, conditions in 2035 without the proposed freeway would be substantially worse with more congested areas and congested conditions for longer periods of time (see Final Environmental Impact Statement pages 1-21 and 1-22). Congestion relief resulting from the proposed freeway would provide localized reductions of delays on arterial streets and at interchanges. Reduced travel times would result in lower exposure to elevated concentrations of mobile source air toxics occurring in traffic. Other benefits of the proposed freeway in comparison to the No-Action Alternative are presented in Table 3-9 on page 3-38 of the Final Environmental Impact Statement.

### Code | Issue
--- | ---
3 | Alternatives | Federal regulations stipulate that an environmental impact statement shall “rigorously explore and objectively evaluate all reasonable alternatives” (40 Code of Federal Regulations § 1502.14; see Final Environmental Impact Statement page 3-1). All alternatives were screened using a multidisciplinary set of criteria. Nonfreeway alternatives were considered (see Final Environmental Impact Statement pages 3-3 through 3-6). Among other things, the study took into account improving existing freeways, improving or expanding other travel modes, strategies to reduce travel demand, and various roadway configurations. This study examined not only the potential impacts from improvements, but also the consequences of building nothing, the No-Action Alternative. As proposed by the Maricopa Association of Governments, the South Mountain Freeway would be part of the Regional Freeway and Highway System. Other transportation improvements such as mass transit and local roads are specified in the Regional Transportation Plan and were considered during the evaluation of this proposed new freeway. As noted in the Final Environmental Impact Statement (see page 3-60), the proposed freeway would provide opportunities to enhance operation of future mass transit improvements.

### Code | Issue
--- | ---
4 | Air Quality | The Arizona Department of Transportation and Federal Highway Administration identified several issues and concerns that were frequently noted by commenters. Responses to these issues can be found in the Responses to Frequently Submitted Public Comments beginning on page B733 of this appendix.

### Code | Issue
--- | ---
5 | Health Effects | 

### Code | Issue
--- | ---
6 | Section 4(f) and Section 6(f) | 

### Code | Issue
--- | ---
7 | Biology, Plants, and Wildlife | 

(Responses continue on next page)
Unplanned growth is often termed “urban sprawl.” Generally, this term is used in the context of rapid and uncontrolled urban growth onto previously undeveloped land—usually on the outskirts of an existing urban area. Projects like the proposed freeway are often identified as contributors to urban sprawl. Freeway projects are often cited as making land at the urban fringe more accessible and, therefore, more attractive for development. However, examination of data comparing population and land use between 1975 and 2000 suggests major transportation projects like the proposed freeway do not induce growth in the region (see Final Environmental Impact Statement pages 4-170 through 4-174). The proposed action would be implemented in a historically quickly urbanizing area (most noticeably in the Western Section of the Study Area, although the nationwide recession which began in 2007 slowed growth). In the Eastern Section of the Study Area, the proposed freeway would abut public parkland, Native American land, and a near-fully developed area—therefore, any contribution to accelerated or induced growth would be constrained. The proposed freeway would be built in an area planned for urban growth as established in local jurisdictions’ land use plans for at least the last 25 years.
I just want to officially voice my objection for the following reasons:

* The original proposed freeway was not as extensive as what is currently planned. This is much greater noise, pollution, congestion and therefore accidents than what the original residents (such as myself) had planned.
* A bypass already exists in Case Grande. If this is inadequate, it would be less expensive to upgrade this system.
* The study does not include Pima County, why? This area is still growing and has the higher growth potential.
* A compromise to all parties would be to continue Pecos road connecting the West side of town - no Freeway.

The alignment identified as the Preferred Alternative (W59 and E1 Alternatives) closely follows the alignment identified in the 1988 Environmental Assessment and Design Concept Report (see Final Environmental Impact Statement Figure 1-2 on page 1-6 and text on page 1-8 for more information). In 1988, the freeway was proposed as having three general purpose lanes in each direction with an open median for a future high-occupancy vehicle lane in each direction. This configuration is similar to the existing loop freeways. The current proposed freeway, as depicted in Figure 3-34 on page 3-58 of the Final Environmental Impact Statement includes constructing three general purpose lanes and a high-occupancy vehicle lane in each direction. With respect to the number of lanes and location, the proposed freeway has remained relatively the same.

The Arizona Department of Transportation and Federal Highway Administration identified several issues and concerns that were frequently noted by commenters. Responses to these issues can be found in the Responses to Frequently Submitted Public Comments beginning on page B733 of this appendix.

Although the region’s freeways are now congested during the peak travel period, conditions in 2035 without the proposed freeway would be substantially worse with more congested areas and congested conditions for longer periods of time (see Final Environmental Impact Statement pages 1-21 and 1-22). By 2035, east- and westbound motorists on Interstate 10 between State Route 101L (Agua Fria Freeway) and State Route 202L (Santan Freeway) are expected to experience stop-and-go driving for over 3 hours every day. This is for a distance of nearly 30 miles. A new freeway in the Study Area would distribute commuters over an additional freeway facility. As a result, the duration of stop-and-go traffic on the region’s freeways would be reduced.

The proposed freeway is part of a transportation system developed to improve mobility in the region by increasing capacity and providing alternatives to allow traffic to bypass already congested routes (see Final Environmental Impact Statement pages 1-21, 1-22, 3-1, and 3-3). Like other “loop” freeways in the Phoenix metropolitan area, the proposed South Mountain Freeway would be a commuter corridor, helping to move local traffic between the eastern and western portions of Maricopa County. The State Route 85/Interstate 8 Alternative was evaluated for the proposed project. The reasons this alternative was eliminated from further study are presented on page 3-9 of the Final Environmental Impact Statement.

The Maricopa Association of Governments regional travel demand model does include Pinal County. The potential freeway users with origins or destinations in Pinal County are included in Final Environmental Impact Statement Figure 3-18, on page 3-36. They would represent 10 percent of the total freeway users.
The study evaluated the concept of extending Pecos Road as a parkway. In the best-case scenario, a parkway would carry approximately 105,000 vehicles per day, well below the average daily traffic on the proposed freeway, which would range from 117,000 to 190,000 vehicles per day (see Final Environmental Impact Statement page 3-19). As a result, the Arizona Parkway would lack sufficient capacity to meet projected travel demand. The Arizona Parkway would not adequately address the projected transportation system capacity deficiency, would not remove a sufficient amount of traffic from arterial streets, and, therefore, would not meet the project's purpose and need. For these reasons, the Arizona Parkway was eliminated from further consideration.
## Traffic
The alignment identified as the Preferred Alternative (W59 and E1 Alternatives) closely follows the alignment identified in the 1988 Environmental Assessment and Design Concept Report (see Draft Environmental Impact Statement Figure 1-2 on page 1-6 and text on page 1-8 for more information). In 1988, the freeway was proposed as having three general purpose lanes in each direction with an open median for a future high-occupancy vehicle lane in each direction. This configuration is similar to the existing loop freeways. The current proposed freeway, as depicted in Figure 3-34 on page 3-58 of the Final Environmental Impact Statement includes constructing three general purpose lanes and a high-occupancy vehicle lane in each direction. With respect to the number of lanes and location, the proposed freeway has remained relatively the same.

## Noise
The Arizona Department of Transportation and Federal Highway Administration identified several issues and concerns that were frequently noted by commenters. Responses to these issues can be found in the Responses to Frequently Submitted Public Comments beginning on page B733 of this appendix.

## Air Quality

## Purpose and Need
Although the region’s freeways are now congested during the peak travel period, conditions in 2035 without the proposed freeway would be substantially worse with more congested areas and congested conditions for longer periods of time (see Final Environmental Impact Statement pages 1-21 and 1-22). By 2035, east- and westbound motorists on Interstate 10 between State Route 101L (Agua Fria Freeway) and State Route 202L (Santan Freeway) are expected to experience stop-and-go driving for over 3 hours every day. This is for a distance of nearly 30 miles. A new freeway in the Study Area would distribute commuters over an additional freeway facility. As a result, the duration of stop-and-go traffic on the region’s freeways would be reduced.

## Alternatives
The proposed freeway is part of a transportation system developed to improve mobility in the region by increasing capacity and providing alternatives to allow traffic to bypass already congested routes (see Final Environmental Impact Statement pages 1-21, 1-22). By 2035, east- and westbound motorists on Interstate 10 between State Route 101L (Agua Fria Freeway) and State Route 202L (Santan Freeway) are expected to experience stop-and-go driving for over 3 hours every day. This is for a distance of nearly 30 miles. A new freeway in the Study Area would distribute commuters over an additional freeway facility. As a result, the duration of stop-and-go traffic on the region’s freeways would be reduced.

## Alternatives
The proposed freeway is part of a transportation system developed to improve mobility in the region by increasing capacity and providing alternatives to allow traffic to bypass already congested routes (see Final Environmental Impact Statement pages 1-21, 1-22, 3-1, and 3-3). Like other “loop” freeways in the Phoenix metropolitan area, the proposed South Mountain Freeway would be a commuter corridor, helping to move local traffic between the eastern and western portions of Maricopa County. The State Route 85/Interstate 8 Alternative was evaluated for the proposed project. The reasons this alternative was eliminated from further study are presented on page 3-9 of the Final Environmental Impact Statement.

## Alternatives
The Maricopa Association of Governments regional travel demand model does include Pinal County. The potential freeway users with origins or destinations in Pinal County are included in Final Environmental Impact Statement Figure 3-18, on page 3-36. They would represent 10 percent of the total freeway users.

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Traffic</td>
<td>The alignment identified as the Preferred Alternative (W59 and E1 Alternatives) closely follows the alignment identified in the 1988 Environmental Assessment and Design Concept Report (see Draft Environmental Impact Statement Figure 1-2 on page 1-6 and text on page 1-8 for more information). In 1988, the freeway was proposed as having three general purpose lanes in each direction with an open median for a future high-occupancy vehicle lane in each direction. This configuration is similar to the existing loop freeways. The current proposed freeway, as depicted in Figure 3-34 on page 3-58 of the Final Environmental Impact Statement includes constructing three general purpose lanes and a high-occupancy vehicle lane in each direction. With respect to the number of lanes and location, the proposed freeway has remained relatively the same.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Noise</td>
<td>The Arizona Department of Transportation and Federal Highway Administration identified several issues and concerns that were frequently noted by commenters. Responses to these issues can be found in the Responses to Frequently Submitted Public Comments beginning on page B733 of this appendix.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Air Quality</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Purpose and Need</td>
<td>Although the region’s freeways are now congested during the peak travel period, conditions in 2035 without the proposed freeway would be substantially worse with more congested areas and congested conditions for longer periods of time (see Final Environmental Impact Statement pages 1-21 and 1-22). By 2035, east- and westbound motorists on Interstate 10 between State Route 101L (Agua Fria Freeway) and State Route 202L (Santan Freeway) are expected to experience stop-and-go driving for over 3 hours every day. This is for a distance of nearly 30 miles. A new freeway in the Study Area would distribute commuters over an additional freeway facility. As a result, the duration of stop-and-go traffic on the region’s freeways would be reduced.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Alternatives</td>
<td>The proposed freeway is part of a transportation system developed to improve mobility in the region by increasing capacity and providing alternatives to allow traffic to bypass already congested routes (see Final Environmental Impact Statement pages 1-21, 1-22, 3-1, and 3-3). Like other “loop” freeways in the Phoenix metropolitan area, the proposed South Mountain Freeway would be a commuter corridor, helping to move local traffic between the eastern and western portions of Maricopa County. The State Route 85/Interstate 8 Alternative was evaluated for the proposed project. The reasons this alternative was eliminated from further study are presented on page 3-9 of the Final Environmental Impact Statement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Alternatives</td>
<td>The Maricopa Association of Governments regional travel demand model does include Pinal County. The potential freeway users with origins or destinations in Pinal County are included in Final Environmental Impact Statement Figure 3-18, on page 3-36. They would represent 10 percent of the total freeway users.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

(Responses continue on next page)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Alternatives</td>
<td>The study evaluated the concept of extending Pecos Road as a parkway. In the best-case scenario, a parkway would carry approximately 105,000 vehicles per day, well below the average daily traffic on the proposed freeway, which would range from 117,000 to 190,000 vehicles per day (see Final Environmental Impact Statement page 3-19). As a result, the Arizona Parkway would lack sufficient capacity to meet projected travel demand. The Arizona Parkway would not adequately address the projected transportation system capacity deficiency, would not remove a sufficient amount of traffic from arterial streets, and, therefore, would not meet the project's purpose and need. For these reasons, the Arizona Parkway was eliminated from further consideration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Issue</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Comment noted.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From: na [mailto:taftsheffield@aol.com]
Sent: Friday, May 17, 2013 6:45 PM
To: Projects
Subject: I approve south mountain freeway.

5/18/13

Yes I agree the south mountain freeway should be built. I also support any freeway starting from AZ Casino/ Mcdowell rd extending to 202. This is not an argument or debate. Its what is needed no matter what some individuals may think. Consider the in domain law. Dot what are you waiting for.

Thanks
Tim
In 2006, the City of Phoenix conducted a traffic circulation study to evaluate the
issue of noise and cultural resources. As discussed in the Noise Analysis Technical Report prepared for the Final
Environmental Impact Statement, the proposed South Mountain Freeway was
identified several issues and concerns that were frequently noted by commenters.
Responses to these issues can be found in the Responses to Frequently Submitted Public Comments beginning on page B733 of this appendix.

We bought our home in Ahwatukee Foothills because my daughter and I suffer from asthma and we
place high value on the better quality of air in the area, in particular during the summer months. We
treasure the relative quiet and small-town feeling of Ahwatukee Foothills, the easy access to quiet and
scenic hiking trails in our backyard of South Mountain Park, the low-traffic roads near our schools and in
our neighborhoods, and its proximity to our Gila River Indian Community neighbors, which affords us a
permanent treasure that will be destroyed by the freeway.

ADOT must desist from proposing to build 202 on Pecos Road. This proposed leg of the freeway will
degrade the quality of life in Ahwatukee Village, disrupt wildlife and recreational use in South Mountain
Park Preserve and destroy a Gila River Indian Community sacred site.

Thank you,
Matt Eberhart
Community Relations Officer
1855 W Jackson St. MD 128F
Phoenix, AZ 85007
602-712-2060

From: Jeannine Maldonado [mailto:jeanninemal@me.com]
Sent: Friday, July 05, 2013 9:23 AM
Cc: Matthew Eberhart

I wish to comment on the South Mountain Freeway Loop 202 Draft Environmental Impact Statement.

ADOT must desist from proposing to build 202 on Pecos Road. This proposed leg of the freeway will
degrade the quality of life in Ahwatukee Village, disrupt wildlife and recreational use in South Mountain
Park Preserve and destroy a Gila River Indian Community sacred site.

But by building the South Mountain Freeway on Pecos Road and through South Mountain Park Preserve:
1) There will be a substantial increase in vehicle traffic in the Ahwatukee Foothills neighborhood and
local arterial streets.
   In addition, the proposed freeway will become the truckers route of choice.
2) The overall impact on the quality of life in the Ahwatukee Foothills area will suffer tremendously as
   sound walls cannot prevent the noise rising over due to elevation (upwards) in the Foothills.
3) Ahwatukee would have two elementary, one middle and one high school either immediately adjoining
   or within 1/8 of a mile of the proposed freeway. The air quality our children breathe will suffer
   permanent damage as the estimated 140,000 vehicles/day traverse the proposed freeway.

ADOT must desist from proposing to build 202 on Pecos Road. This proposed leg of the freeway will
degrade the quality of life in Ahwatukee Village, disrupt wildlife and recreational use in South Mountain
Park Preserve and destroy a Gila River Indian Community sacred site.

We bought our home in Ahwatukee Foothills because my daughter and I suffer from asthma and we
place high value on the better quality of air in the area, in particular during the summer months. We
place high value on the better quality of air in the area, in particular during the summer months. We

In 2006, the City of Phoenix conducted a traffic circulation study to evaluate the
issue of noise and cultural resources. As discussed in the Noise Analysis Technical Report prepared for the Final
Environmental Impact Statement, the proposed South Mountain Freeway was
identified several issues and concerns that were frequently noted by commenters.
Responses to these issues can be found in the Responses to Frequently Submitted Public Comments beginning on page B733 of this appendix.

ADOT must desist from proposing to build 202 on Pecos Road. This proposed leg of the freeway will
degrade the quality of life in Ahwatukee Village, disrupt wildlife and recreational use in South Mountain
Park Preserve and destroy a Gila River Indian Community sacred site.

Thank you,
Matt Eberhart
Community Relations Officer
1855 W Jackson St. MD 128F
Phoenix, AZ 85007
602-712-2060

From: Jeannine Maldonado [mailto:jeanninemal@me.com]
Sent: Friday, July 05, 2013 9:23 AM
Cc: Matthew Eberhart

I wish to comment on the South Mountain Freeway Loop 202 Draft Environmental Impact Statement.

ADOT must desist from proposing to build 202 on Pecos Road. This proposed leg of the freeway will
degrade the quality of life in Ahwatukee Village, disrupt wildlife and recreational use in South Mountain
Park Preserve and destroy a Gila River Indian Community sacred site.

But by building the South Mountain Freeway on Pecos Road and through South Mountain Park Preserve:
1) There will be a substantial increase in vehicle traffic in the Ahwatukee Foothills neighborhood and
local arterial streets.
   In addition, the proposed freeway will become the truckers route of choice.
2) The overall impact on the quality of life in the Ahwatukee Foothills area will suffer tremendously as
   sound walls cannot prevent the noise rising over due to elevation (upwards) in the Foothills.
3) Ahwatukee would have two elementary, one middle and one high school either immediately adjoining
   or within 1/8 of a mile of the proposed freeway. The air quality our children breathe will suffer
   permanent damage as the estimated 140,000 vehicles/day traverse the proposed freeway.

ADOT must desist from proposing to build 202 on Pecos Road. This proposed leg of the freeway will
degrade the quality of life in Ahwatukee Village, disrupt wildlife and recreational use in South Mountain
Park Preserve and destroy a Gila River Indian Community sacred site.

We bought our home in Ahwatukee Foothills because my daughter and I suffer from asthma and we
place high value on the better quality of air in the area, in particular during the summer months. We
place high value on the better quality of air in the area, in particular during the summer months. We

In 2006, the City of Phoenix conducted a traffic circulation study to evaluate the
issue of noise and cultural resources. As discussed in the Noise Analysis Technical Report prepared for the Final
Environmental Impact Statement, the proposed South Mountain Freeway was
identified several issues and concerns that were frequently noted by commenters.
Responses to these issues can be found in the Responses to Frequently Submitted Public Comments beginning on page B733 of this appendix.

ADOT must desist from proposing to build 202 on Pecos Road. This proposed leg of the freeway will
degrade the quality of life in Ahwatukee Village, disrupt wildlife and recreational use in South Mountain
Park Preserve and destroy a Gila River Indian Community sacred site.

But by building the South Mountain Freeway on Pecos Road and through South Mountain Park Preserve:
1) There will be a substantial increase in vehicle traffic in the Ahwatukee Foothills neighborhood and
local arterial streets.
   In addition, the proposed freeway will become the truckers route of choice.
2) The overall impact on the quality of life in the Ahwatukee Foothills area will suffer tremendously as
   sound walls cannot prevent the noise rising over due to elevation (upwards) in the Foothills.
3) Ahwatukee would have two elementary, one middle and one high school either immediately adjoining
   or within 1/8 of a mile of the proposed freeway. The air quality our children breathe will suffer
   permanent damage as the estimated 140,000 vehicles/day traverse the proposed freeway.

ADOT must desist from proposing to build 202 on Pecos Road. This proposed leg of the freeway will
degrade the quality of life in Ahwatukee Village, disrupt wildlife and recreational use in South Mountain
Park Preserve and destroy a Gila River Indian Community sacred site.

We bought our home in Ahwatukee Foothills because my daughter and I suffer from asthma and we
place high value on the better quality of air in the area, in particular during the summer months. We
place high value on the better quality of air in the area, in particular during the summer months. We

4) Destruction of a portion of South Mountain Park Preserve, which the Gila River Indian Community view as a sacred mountain, is unacceptable.

5) The proposed routes through South Mountain Park Preserve will permanently damage native Arizona plants and wildlife.

6) Growing business opportunities is not a need for residents in Ahwatukee. We find there is already in place everything we need and want.

In summary, I object to the building of the South Mountain Freeway on Pecos Road and through South Mountain Park Preserve as it will do permanent harm to our environment.

ADOT should seriously reconsider the alternative of building 202 through uninhabited parts of Maricopa.

Jeannine Maldonado Timmes
410 E Brookwood Ct.
Phoenix AZ, 85048

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.

Health Effects

The Arizona Department of Transportation and Federal Highway Administration identified several issues and concerns that were frequently noted by commenters. Responses to these issues can be found in the Responses to Frequently Submitted Public Comments beginning on page B73 of this appendix.

Purpose and Need, Lack of Support

12 Alternatives

A Riggs Road Alternative was considered. It would replace 51st Avenue south of its connection to Interstate 10 (Papago Freeway) for approximately 21 miles. It would then replace approximately 4 miles of Bethline Road in an easterly direction. At the Riggs Road/State Route 347 intersection, the alternative would replace approximately 3 miles of Riggs Road before connecting to Interstate 10 (Maricopa Freeway) (see Final Environmental Impact Statement page 3-9). While the Riggs Road Alternative would serve regional mobility needs, particularly of those living in the Maricopa area, meeting this travel demand would not address specific planning goals for an integrated regional transportation network. The Regional Transportation Plan identifies the proposed South Mountain Freeway as a critical link in the Regional Freeway and Highway System. The Riggs Road Alternative would not complete the Phoenix metropolitan area’s loop system as part of State Route 202L, thereby causing substantial out-of-direction travel for motorists. Therefore, the Riggs Road Alternative would not meet the project’s purpose and need criteria and was eliminated from further study.

In addition, nearly two-thirds of any alternative using Riggs Road would be on Gila River Indian Community land. Tribal sovereignty is based in the inherent authority of Native American tribes to govern themselves. While this notion of sovereignty is manifested in many areas, generally Native American land is held in trust by the United States. Native American communities have the authority to regulate land uses and activities on their lands. States have very limited authority over activities within tribal land (see page 2-1 of the Final Environmental Impact Statement). From a practical standpoint, this means that the Arizona Department of Transportation and Federal Highway Administration do not have the authority to survey tribal land, make land use (including transportation) determinations directly affecting tribal land, or condemn tribal land for public benefit through an eminent domain process.

13 Alternatives

The proposed freeway is part of a transportation system developed to improve mobility in the region by increasing capacity and providing alternatives to allow traffic to bypass already congested routes (see Final Environmental Impact Statement pages 1-21, 1-22, 3-1, and 3-3). Like other “loop” freeways in the Phoenix metropolitan area, the proposed South Mountain Freeway would be a commuter corridor, helping to move local traffic between the eastern and western portions of Maricopa County. The State Route 85/Interstate 8 Alternative was evaluated for the proposed project. The reasons this alternative was eliminated from further study are presented on page 3-9 of the Final Environmental Impact Statement.
In 2006, the City of Phoenix conducted a traffic circulation study to evaluate the impacts of the freeway on the local street system. The City study found no adverse effects on the local street system from the proposed freeway (see Appendix 3-1 of the Final Environmental Impact Statement). The daily traffic volume on 17th Street in 2011 was approximately 4,500 vehicles per day just north of Pecos Road (see phoenix.gov/streets/traffic/volumemap). With the proposed freeway in place, an additional 4,000 vehicles day would use 17th Avenue to access residences west of 17th Avenue. The total daily traffic would be well below the capacity of a two-lane road (approximately 15,000 vehicles per day).

Responses to these issues can be found in the Responses to Frequently Submitted Public Comments beginning on page B733 of this appendix.

The Arizona Department of Transportation and Federal Highway Administration identified several issues and concerns that were frequently noted by commenters. Responses to these issues can be found in the Responses to Frequently Submitted Public Comments beginning on page B733 of this appendix.

The Arizona Department of Transportation and Federal Highway Administration identified several issues and concerns that were frequently noted by commenters. Responses to these issues can be found in the Responses to Frequently Submitted Public Comments beginning on page B733 of this appendix.

The Arizona Department of Transportation and Federal Highway Administration identified several issues and concerns that were frequently noted by commenters. Responses to these issues can be found in the Responses to Frequently Submitted Public Comments beginning on page B733 of this appendix.

Where existing residential uses are adjacent to the proposed freeway, noise mitigation would be implemented according to the Arizona Department of Transportation policy (see Final Environmental Impact Statement page 2-91).

Noise barriers are designed to provide a substantial reduction in noise levels along freeways, but do not and cannot eliminate noise from passing into nearby neighborhoods. Just because noise can be heard does not mean that noise barriers are ineffective. Even at the levels considered "acceptable" by the Arizona Department of Transportation Noise Abatement Policy and Federal Highway Administration regulations, noise is still readily audible and can be heard for some distance from the freeway.

While the E1 Alternative is adjacent to the largely residential areas of Ahwatukee Foothills Village (to the north), a freeway has been planned in this location for many years (see Final Environmental Impact Statement pages 4-17 and 4-21). Where existing residential uses are adjacent to the proposed freeway, noise mitigation would be implemented according to the Arizona Department of Transportation policy (see Final Environmental Impact Statement page 4-91).

As discussed in the Noise Analysis Technical Report prepared for the Final Environmental Impact Statement, the proposed South Mountain Freeway was modeled in the latest version of the Traffic Noise Model (version 2.5). This is a three-dimensional model that factors in elements of the proposed freeway using x, y, and z coordinates. The model did account for the elevations of the freeway, nearby homes that may be elevated above the road, and any recommended barriers between the homes and freeway. This is the same procedure and same model used for other freeway projects in the Phoenix metropolitan area and across the country.

The Arizona Department of Transportation and Federal Highway Administration identified several issues and concerns that were frequently noted by commenters. Responses to these issues can be found in the Responses to Frequently Submitted Public Comments beginning on page B733 of this appendix.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Comment Document</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td><strong>Section 4(f) and Section 6(f)</strong> The Arizona Department of Transportation and Federal Highway Administration identified several issues and concerns that were frequently noted by commenters. Responses to these issues can be found in the <em>Responses to Frequently Submitted Public Comments</em> beginning on page B733 of this appendix.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Cultural Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Biology, Plants, and Wildlife</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Alternatives, Gila River Indian Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Alternatives A Riggs Road Alternative was considered. It would replace 51st Avenue south of its connection to Interstate 10 (Papago Freeway) for approximately 21 miles. It would then replace approximately 4 miles of Bethline Road in an easterly direction. At the Riggs Road/State Route 347 intersection, the alternative would replace approximately 3 miles of Riggs Road before connecting to Interstate 10 (Maricopa Freeway) (see Final Environmental Impact Statement page 3-9). While the Riggs Road Alternative would serve regional mobility needs, particularly of those living in the Maricopa area, meeting this travel demand would not address specific planning goals for an integrated regional transportation network. The Regional Transportation Plan identifies the proposed South Mountain Freeway as a critical link in the Regional Freeway and Highway System. The Riggs Road Alternative would not complete the Phoenix metropolitan area’s loop system as part of State Route 202L, thereby causing substantial out-of-direction travel for motorists. Therefore, the Riggs Road Alternative would not meet the project’s purpose and need criteria and was eliminated from further study. In addition, nearly two-thirds of any alternative using Riggs Road would be on Gila River Indian Community land. Tribal sovereignty is based in the inherent authority of Native American tribes to govern themselves. While this notion of sovereignty is manifested in many areas, generally Native American land is held in trust by the United States. Native American communities have the authority to regulate land uses and activities on their lands. States have very limited authority over activities within tribal land (see page 2-1 of the Final Environmental Impact Statement). From a practical standpoint, this means that the Arizona Department of Transportation and Federal Highway Administration do not have the authority to survey tribal land, make land use (including transportation) determinations directly affecting tribal land, or condemn tribal land for public benefit through an eminent domain process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Alternatives The proposed freeway is part of a transportation system developed to improve mobility in the region by increasing capacity and providing alternatives to allow traffic to bypass already congested routes (see Final Environmental Impact Statement pages 1-21, 1-22, 3-1, and 3-3). Like other “loop” freeways in the Phoenix metropolitan area, the proposed South Mountain Freeway would be a commuter corridor, helping to move local traffic between the eastern and western portions of Maricopa County. The State Route 85/Interstate 8 Alternative was evaluated for the proposed project. The reasons this alternative was eliminated from further study are presented on page 3-9 of the Final Environmental Impact Statement.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TELEPHONE CONVERSATION RECORD
SOUTH MOUNTAIN FREEWAY INFORMATION LINE

INCOMING CALL
DATE: 7/23/13
TIME: 6:39 PM

CALLER: AARON TIMMONS
CALLER ADDRESS: 15393 WEST MONTECITO AVENUE, GOODYEAR, ARIZONA 85395
PHONE: EMAIL:

CALLER REMARKS/QUESTIONS:
I support the 202, Loop extension, South Mountain freeway. Thank you.

1

Comment noted.
From: Jenn Tingwald [mailto:jennifertingwald@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, May 21, 2013 4:56 PM
To: Projects
Subject: Loop 202 South Mountain

To Whom it May Concern:

I am writing to inform you of my support of the Loop 202 South Mountain project that is currently pending.

As a resident of South Phoenix (on the border of Laveen - off of 51st Avenue and Ellwood) I strongly support this initiative, even though I know that it will literally place a freeway in my back yard. As a home owner and business owner, this project is imperative to the vitality of the southwest valley.

Please, continue moving forward this project. The revenue it will bring to this area is badly needed, and the ability to connect to the rest of the city will vastly improve our way of life.

Sincerely,

Jennifer Tingwald

---

Confidentiality and Nondisclosure Notice: This email transmission and any attachments are intended for the person Listed 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.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Comment Document</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Alternatives, E1 Alternative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Alternatives, Gila River Indian Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Air Quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Noise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Noise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Neighborhoods/Communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Traffic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Traffic</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**From:** Jason.Tollefson@Microchip.com  [mailto:Jason.Tollefson@Microchip.com]

**Sent:** Thursday, May 02, 2013 9:27 AM

**To:** Projects

**Subject:** South Mountain Study Team

Hi South Mountain Team,

As a Foothills Club West resident I am opposed to the Pecos alignment in entirety. I would support an alignment that is 1-2 miles south on the Gila River Reservation.

I do not support the Pecos alignment for the following reasons:

- **Pollution**
- **Traffic Noise**
- **Truck Noise**
- **Crime**
- **Loss of Bike way**
- **Increased traffic density in community**
- **Increased accidents**

Thanks,

---

The Arizona Department of Transportation and Federal Highway Administration identified several issues and concerns that were frequently noted by commenters. Responses to these issues can be found in the Responses to Frequently Submitted Public Comments beginning on page B733 of this appendix.

The Maricopa Association of Governments regional travel demand model forecasts approximately 10 percent truck traffic on the South Mountain Freeway in 2035 (see Final Environmental Impact Statement page 3-64). This percentage is similar to current conditions on Interstate 10 between Loop 101 and Interstate 17 and on U.S. Route 60. Air quality and noise modeling for the Draft and Final Environmental Impact Statements used this forecast truck traffic (see Final Environmental Impact Statement pages 4-68 and 4-100, respectively). Noise mitigation is designed for this predicted noise level, including the noise from trucks.

While the City of Phoenix Police Department reported in 2005 that it did not have any statistics specific to crime adjacent to freeways, the Police Department did note that, based on its experience, there does not appear to be a correlation between crime rates and freeways. See Final Environmental Impact Statement sidebar on page 4-21.

The study has considered concepts for parallel multiuse paths; however, the main line of the proposed freeway would not have a bicycle route as part of the design. The design of the traffic interchanges includes provisions for pedestrian and bicycle movement in accordance with current design guidelines and regulations. While not currently included, enhancements such as pedestrian bridges or multiuse paths may be added during the final design phase through coordination with the City of Phoenix (see page 3-60 of the Final Environmental Impact Statement). The cost and maintenance of these enhancements would be the responsibility of the City of Phoenix.

In 2006, the City of Phoenix conducted a traffic circulation study to evaluate the impacts of the freeway on the local street system. The City study found no adverse effects on the local street system from the proposed freeway (see Appendix 3-1 in the Final Environmental Impact Statement). The daily traffic volume on 17th Street in 2011 was approximately 4,500 vehicles per day just north of Pecos Road (see phoenix.gov/streets/traffic/volumemap). With the proposed freeway in place, an additional 4,000 vehicles day would use 17th Avenue to access residences west of 17th Avenue. The total daily traffic would be well below the capacity of a two-lane road (approximately 15,000 vehicles per day).
MR. TOLLEFSON: I’m Jason Tollefson. So I think the one thing after talking with several of the project team members that stands out in my mind is that there is no replacement for recreation on Pecos. So currently there’s a lot of people that go out all week long on Pecos Road riding bikes and jogging, whatever, and there’s no alternative once this project happens. So that’s a pretty big concern for me because I use that and lots of people I know use that.

A second overall concern is noise. And I saw that the plan currently is to raise the freeway from the current grade. And talking with one of the planning engineers, he noted that that actually increases noise level. So I understand the way to try and mitigate that is a wall, but my location and my house is such that if the freeway is additionally raised and then there’s a wall, it’s going to have a severe obstruction to my view from my home, and also concerns me with the noise. The fact that it’s that much higher and could transmit over to my house, which we already get Pecos noise, and this will probably be more.

And then I guess the last concern is truck noise. I believe that this freeway will be

The study has considered concepts for parallel multiuse paths; however, the main line of the proposed freeway would not have a bicycle route as part of the design. The design of the traffic interchanges includes provisions for pedestrian and bicycle movement in accordance with current design guidelines and regulations. While not currently included, enhancements such as pedestrian bridges or multiuse paths may be added during the final design phase through coordination with the City of Phoenix (see page 3-60 of the Final Environmental Impact Statement). The cost and maintenance of these enhancements would be the responsibility of the City of Phoenix.

The Arizona Department of Transportation and Federal Highway Administration identified several issues and concerns that were frequently noted by commenters. Responses to these issues can be found in the Responses to Frequently Submitted Public Comments beginning on page B733 of this appendix.

For most of the alignments of each of the action alternatives, the proposed freeway would be elevated above the natural grade of the surrounding land. This elevated profile would allow noise to carry farther, creating noise impacts at greater distances from the freeway. Depressing the profile of the freeway below grade might reduce traffic noise levels adjacent to depressed sections. However, it would be necessary to also construct at-grade noise barriers to achieve noise reduction goals at receiver locations adjacent to depressed freeway sections (see page 4-99 in the Final Environmental Impact Statement). This strategy would reduce visual impacts associated with high noise barriers on elevated freeways, but would entail ground-level noise barriers and their associated interference with views. Thus, with either approach to noise reduction, views of nearby mountains could be disrupted. The specific impacts would depend on the geometrics of the height of any noise barriers constructed, the intervening topography, and the distance of the barriers from the residences in question.

As discussed in the Noise Analysis Technical Report prepared for the Final Environmental Impact Statement, the proposed South Mountain Freeway was modeled in the latest version of the Traffic Noise Model (version 2.5). This is a three-dimensional model that factors in elements of the proposed freeway using x, y, and z coordinates. The model did account for the elevations of the freeway, nearby homes that may be elevated above the road, and any recommended barriers between the homes and freeway. This is the same procedure and same model used for other freeway projects in the Phoenix metropolitan area and across the country.

Noise barriers are designed to provide a substantial reduction in noise levels along freeways, but do not and cannot eliminate noise from passing into nearby neighborhoods. Just because noise can be heard does not mean that noise barriers are ineffective. Even at the levels considered “acceptable” by the Arizona Department of Transportation Noise Abatement Policy and Federal Highway Administration regulations, noise is still readily audible and can be heard for some distance from the freeway.

(Responses continue on next page)
1 used quite a bit as a bypass to Phoenix, and so
2 that's going to bring just additional noise 24/7.
3 It's one thing to have commuter noise, you know,
4 which -- which goes down in the evenings, but truck
5 noise is something that I think won't cease because
6 truckers are trucking 24/7. So that's -- those are
7 my concerns and hopefully they're taken into
8 consideration.

So I just want to make it clear that I'm
not opposed to a freeway, but I'm opposed to the
current alignment of the freeway. I noticed during
the selection process there were lots of
alternatives. Of course some of them are very
difficult because they involve the Indian
reservation, but I oppose that.

And the last thing I'd like to add to
that is it really doesn't -- in my opinion, it
doesn't help this community as much as it helps the
communities outside of this community because it
helps the people on the west side get to the east
side, and the people on the east side get to the west
side, but it really doesn't benefit us who live here
that much.

We already have easy access out to the
freeway, and personally I'm willing to do the commute

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Comment Document</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>used quite a bit as a bypass to Phoenix, and so</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>that's going to bring just additional noise 24/7.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>It's one thing to have commuter noise, you know,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>which -- which goes down in the evenings, but truck</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>noise is something that I think won't cease because</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>truckers are trucking 24/7. So that's -- those are</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>my concerns and hopefully they're taken into</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>consideration.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Noise</td>
<td>The Maricopa Association of Governments regional travel demand model forecasts approximately 10 percent truck traffic on the South Mountain Freeway in 2035 (see Final Environmental Impact Statement page 3-64). This percentage is similar to current conditions on Interstate 10 between Loop 101 and Interstate 17 and on U.S. Route 60. Air quality and noise modeling for the Draft and Final Environmental Impact Statements used this forecast truck traffic (see Final Environmental Impact Statement pages 4-68 and 4-100, respectively). Noise mitigation is designed for this predicted noise level, including the noise from trucks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Purpose and Need, Truck Bypass</td>
<td>The Arizona Department of Transportation and Federal Highway Administration identified several issues and concerns that were frequently noted by commenters. Responses to these issues can be found in the Responses to Frequently Submitted Public Comments beginning on page B733 of this appendix.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Alternatives, E1 Alternative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Purpose and Need, Lack of Support</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1 to the west side and take some additional time
2 because I really have no reason to be out there. All
3 my business is in the east and downtown area, so
4 those are my comments.
According to the Arizona Department of Transportation, 2013, No public vote was held as part of the Draft Environmental Impact Statement. The Arizona Department of Transportation and Federal Highway Administration identified several issues and concerns that were frequently noted by commenters. Responses to these issues can be found in the Responses to Frequently Submitted Public Comments beginning on page B733 of this appendix.

The proposed freeway would be eight lanes wide, not ten lanes. See Figure 3-34, on Final Environmental Impact Statement page 3-58.

No public vote was held as part of the Draft Environmental Impact Statement review process. Members of the public were encouraged to participate and submit their comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement during the 90-day comment period.

The proposed Loop 202 South Mountain Freeway has been a critical part of the Maricopa Association of Governments’ Regional Freeway and Highway System since it was first included in funding approved by Maricopa County voters in 1985. It was also part of the Regional Transportation Plan funding passed by Maricopa County voters in 2004 through Proposition 400.

The Arizona Department of Transportation and Federal Highway Administration identified several issues and concerns that were frequently noted by commenters. Responses to these issues can be found in the Responses to Frequently Submitted Public Comments beginning on page B733 of this appendix.

Responses to Frequently Submitted Public Comments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Section 4(f) and Section 6(f)</td>
<td>The proposed freeway would be eight lanes wide, not ten lanes. See Figure 3-34, on Final Environmental Impact Statement page 3-58.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Design</td>
<td>The proposed freeway would be eight lanes wide, not ten lanes. See Figure 3-34, on Final Environmental Impact Statement page 3-58.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Public Involvement</td>
<td>No public vote was held as part of the Draft Environmental Impact Statement review process. Members of the public were encouraged to participate and submit their comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement during the 90-day comment period. The proposed Loop 202 South Mountain Freeway has been a critical part of the Maricopa Association of Governments’ Regional Freeway and Highway System since it was first included in funding approved by Maricopa County voters in 1985. It was also part of the Regional Transportation Plan funding passed by Maricopa County voters in 2004 through Proposition 400.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Air Quality</td>
<td>The Arizona Department of Transportation and Federal Highway Administration identified several issues and concerns that were frequently noted by commenters. Responses to these issues can be found in the Responses to Frequently Submitted Public Comments beginning on page B733 of this appendix.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Air Quality</td>
<td>According to the Arizona Department of Transportation, 2013, Air Quality Assessment South Mountain Freeway 2021. Draft Report, review of wind data from the Gila River Indian Community monitoring site at St. Johns suggests that during the morning hours and associated with mountain-drainage air flows and stable atmospheric conditions, wind flows are from the southeast and follow the Gila River channel to the north. Locations to the east of St. Johns tend to flow from the east to the lower elevations along the Gila River. During the warmer hours’ improved mixing, flows typically follow the river channel and come from the north and northwest. Likewise, during a 1-month-long meteorological monitoring period (November 20, 2006, through December 21, 2006) at Pecos Road and 40th Street and a second 1-month-long monitoring period at Pecos Road and 24th and 40th streets (April 19, 2007, through May 21, 2007), winds during the morning hours typically were from the northeast. During the warmer hours, and with improved mixing, winds typically were from the west.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Purpose and Need, Truck Bypass</td>
<td>The Arizona Department of Transportation and Federal Highway Administration identified several issues and concerns that were frequently noted by commenters. Responses to these issues can be found in the Responses to Frequently Submitted Public Comments beginning on page B733 of this appendix.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Alternatives</td>
<td>The proposed freeway is part of a transportation system developed to improve mobility in the region by increasing capacity and providing alternatives to allow traffic to bypass already congested routes (see Final Environmental Impact Statement pages 1-21, 1-22, 3-1, and 3-3). Like other “loop” freeways in the Phoenix metropolitan area, the proposed South Mountain Freeway would be a commuter corridor, helping to move local traffic between the eastern and western portions of Maricopa County. The State Route 85/Interstate 8 Alternative was evaluated for the proposed project. The reasons this alternative was eliminated from further study are presented on page 3-9 of the Final Environmental Impact Statement.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Responses continue on next page)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Comment Document</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Neighborhoods/ Communities</td>
<td>Prospective home buyers and members of the church built after the freeway was conceived, according to State law, should have been informed of the proposed facility. (Sellers are obligated by Arizona common law to disclose all known material facts about a property to the buyer.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
From: Projects
To: ADOT
Subject: FW: Thumbs up to S. Mountain loop 202
Date: Thursday, July 18, 2013 10:41:39 AM
Attachments: image001.png

Thank you,
Matthew Eberhart
Community Relations Officer
1655 W Jackson St. MD 126F
Phoenix, AZ 85007
602-712-2060
azdot.gov

From: Kroni McMogulson [mailto:4daylive@gmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, July 18, 2013 10:40 AM
To: Projects
Subject: Thumbs up to S. Mountain loop 202

Let's build a better Arizona. Let's build the South Mountain 202 loop.

Thanks
Tom

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.
### Purpose and Need

The proposed freeway is a response to existing and anticipated travel demand in the metropolitan Phoenix area. It is not meant to increase travel beyond what is expected to be generated from existing and anticipated population and employment growth and related land development. It is important to consider that improvements proposed for any type of transportation system (e.g., a new bus route, rail transit line, commuter rail service) would likely lead to changes in travel behavior, which, in turn, would lead to increased use of the particular system. Improvements made to a given transportation system are meant to attract new users (see Final Environmental Impact Statement pages 4-170 through 4-174). If this were not a primary goal, the improvements would be neither effective nor warranted. For the proposed action, a goal is to attract users of other segments of the Regional Freeway and Highway System and the local arterial street network, now and in the future, to the proposed action to optimize, in part, the entire regional transportation system (as outlined in the proposed action’s purpose and need in Chapter 1).

### Purpose and Need

Although the region’s freeways are now congested during the peak travel period, conditions in 2035 without the proposed freeway would be substantially worse with more congested areas and congested conditions for longer periods of time (see Final Environmental Impact Statement pages 1-21 and 1-22).

By 2035, east- and westbound motorists on Interstate 10 between State Route 101L (Agua Fria Freeway) and State Route 202L (Santan Freeway) are expected to experience stop-and-go driving for over 3 hours every day. This is for a distance of nearly 30 miles. A new freeway in the Study Area would distribute commuters over more congested areas and congested conditions for longer periods of time (see Final Environmental Impact Statement pages 1-22). The improvements would be neither effective nor warranted. For the proposed action, a goal is to attract users of other segments of the Regional Freeway and Highway System and the local arterial street network, now and in the future, to the proposed action to optimize, in part, the entire regional transportation system (as outlined in the proposed action’s purpose and need in Chapter 1).

### Purpose and Need

The proposed freeway is a response to existing and anticipated travel demand in the metropolitan Phoenix area. It is not meant to increase travel beyond what is expected to be generated from existing and anticipated population and employment growth and related land development. It is important to consider that improvements proposed for any type of transportation system (e.g., a new bus route, rail transit line, commuter rail service) would likely lead to changes in travel behavior, which, in turn, would lead to increased use of the particular system. Improvements made to a given transportation system are meant to attract new users (see Final Environmental Impact Statement pages 4-170 through 4-174). If this were not a primary goal, the improvements would be neither effective nor warranted. For the proposed action, a goal is to attract users of other segments of the Regional Freeway and Highway System and the local arterial street network, now and in the future, to the proposed action to optimize, in part, the entire regional transportation system (as outlined in the proposed action’s purpose and need in Chapter 1).

### Purpose and Need

The worldwide recession that began in late 2007 generated a substantial downturn in growth rates for new housing and employment across the United States. Arizona particularly suffered the effects of this recession because, beginning in the early 2000s, Arizona in general and Maricopa County specifically experienced some of the fastest population, housing, and employment growth rates in the country. Because the need for the proposed freeway is predicated in part on projected growth, one might conclude the recession reduced that need. An economic downturn associated with a given recession is, however, generally considered a short-term phenomenon with respect to the longer-term planning horizon established for the proposed freeway. Socioeconomic indicators have steadied and consistently increased in the region since the early 1990s. The critical factors underlying these indicators remain unchanged. (See the sidebar on Final Environmental Impact Statement page 1-11.)

### Purpose and Need

The proposed freeway is a response to existing and anticipated travel demand in the metropolitan Phoenix area. It is not meant to increase travel beyond what is expected to be generated from existing and anticipated population and employment growth and related land development. It is important to consider that improvements proposed for any type of transportation system (e.g., a new bus route, rail transit line, commuter rail service) would likely lead to changes in travel behavior, which, in turn, would lead to increased use of the particular system. Improvements made to a given transportation system are meant to attract new users (see Final Environmental Impact Statement pages 4-170 through 4-174). If this were not a primary goal, the improvements would be neither effective nor warranted. For the proposed action, a goal is to attract users of other segments of the Regional Freeway and Highway System and the local arterial street network, now and in the future, to the proposed action to optimize, in part, the entire regional transportation system (as outlined in the proposed action’s purpose and need in Chapter 1).

### Purpose and Need

The proposed freeway is a response to existing and anticipated travel demand in the metropolitan Phoenix area. It is not meant to increase travel beyond what is expected to be generated from existing and anticipated population and employment growth and related land development. It is important to consider that improvements proposed for any type of transportation system (e.g., a new bus route, rail transit line, commuter rail service) would likely lead to changes in travel behavior, which, in turn, would lead to increased use of the particular system. Improvements made to a given transportation system are meant to attract new users (see Final Environmental Impact Statement pages 4-170 through 4-174). If this were not a primary goal, the improvements would be neither effective nor warranted. For the proposed action, a goal is to attract users of other segments of the Regional Freeway and Highway System and the local arterial street network, now and in the future, to the proposed action to optimize, in part, the entire regional transportation system (as outlined in the proposed action’s purpose and need in Chapter 1).
Unplanned growth is often termed “urban sprawl.” Generally, this term is used in the context of rapid and uncontrolled urban growth onto previously undeveloped land—usually on the outskirts of an existing urban area. Projects like the proposed freeway are often identified as contributors to urban sprawl. Freeway projects are often cited as making land at the urban fringe more accessible and, therefore, more attractive for development. However, examination of data comparing population and land use between 1975 and 2000 suggests major transportation projects like the proposed freeway do not induce growth in the region (see Final Environmental Impact Statement pages 4-170 through 4-174). The proposed action would be implemented in a historically quickly urbanizing area (most noticeably in the Western Section of the Study Area, although the nationwide recession which began in 2007 slowed growth). In the Eastern Section of the Study Area, the proposed freeway would abut public parkland, Native American land, and a near-fully developed area—therefore, any contribution to accelerated or induced growth would be constrained. The proposed freeway would be built in an area planned for urban growth as established in local jurisdictions’ land use plans for at least the last 25 years.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Comment Document</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td><img src="image.png" alt="Comment Document" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Comment noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Comment Document</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Heather Tommasi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Document Created: 7/24/2013 8:40:05 PM by Web Comment Form</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Please approve the loop 202 freeway. It will improve so many lives and the economy.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Let's finish this! :)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Comment noted.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
You are proposing to link the new 202 to Interstate 10 at about 51st Avenue. I am sure this is the easiest place to place the junction in terms of acquiring right-of-way. It is an area whose citizens will offer little resistance to eminent domain.

The problem with this alignment and subsequent junction is that it will create one of the worst bottlenecks that Arizona has ever seen. The expansion of Interstate 10 to accommodate the huge number of westbound trucks that will choose this route to avoid the center of Phoenix will need to be immense. I have already seen how you folks join routes:

Exhibit 1: the junction of northbound 51 to westbound 101- a nasty little bottleneck.
Exhibit 2: the junction of the westbound 101 to northbound I-17-another unfortunate piece of bottleneck engineering.

A more sensible alignment (albeit more problematic and costly) would be to join the 202 to the existing 101 and avoid that already congested corridor of Interstate 10 between 51st and 99th Avenues.

I know, this makes way too much sense.
Thanks for listening.

Frank Tonis
Associate Broker
HomeSmart Real Estate.
This proposal does not cover even half of the impact this extension of Loop 202 will have on the population in Ahwatukee and surrounding area. The air quality will be severely impacted. The noise generated by the traffic will be trapped in the residential area by the mountain. There is no reason to construct this freeway. It will be simply a truck by-pass. Very few people in the Ahwatukee area will benefit from this. Those who feel the freeway will benefit them when commuting to their work should consider moving closer.

Jerry Tooley

The Arizona Department of Transportation and Federal Highway Administration identified several issues and concerns that were frequently noted by commenters. Responses to these issues can be found in the Responses to Frequently Submitted Public Comments beginning on page B733 of this appendix.

As discussed in the Noise Analysis Technical Report prepared for the Final Environmental Impact Statement, the proposed South Mountain Freeway was modeled in the latest version of the Traffic Noise Model (version 2.5). This is a three-dimensional model that factors in elements of the proposed freeway using x, y, and z coordinates. The model did account for the elevations of the freeway, nearby homes that may be elevated above the road, and any recommended barriers between the homes and freeway. This is the same procedure and same model used for other freeway projects in the Phoenix metropolitan area and across the country.

The Arizona Department of Transportation and Federal Highway Administration identified several issues and concerns that were frequently noted by commenters. Responses to these issues can be found in the Responses to Frequently Submitted Public Comments beginning on page B733 of this appendix.
Nor should we ignore the many deaths, semi rollovers, and the expensive public responders to the many and frequent crash freeway accidents.

Now, what we need is safe, efficient, useful, sustainable, affordable, state-of-art regional connective transportation.

And even considering a fast train, high-speed elevated train, from Tucson to Phoenix around this Broadway Curve as a viable alternative.

MANUEL TOPETE: And I live in Laveen, 51st and Baseline. And I can't wait for this to happen. As simple as that.

My only regret is I won't live to see it.

Just I wish it was already done. I think you should also hear this, aside from all this bad.

KARIN GRAY: I have been a resident of Ahwatukee for over ten years, moved here from Texas, and absolutely love South Mountain. One of the reasons I moved to that area was to have access to all 15 miles of the Nation Trail, from one end to the other on South Mountain, the biggest city park in the United States.
To whom it may concern:

It thoroughly disgusts me your idea to degrade the value of properties in the Ahwatukee area by insisting in building the Loop 202 project. It is preposterous that after developing this area as a quiet residential zone and 20 something years planning this road to benefit a few at best, you still vow to disrupt our tranquil lives by building such a monstrosity so close to our homes. I suppose that I don’t have to reiterate my opposition to such a project, but I will go further than that. If you insist on building this road, you will lose another taxpayer from the state because I will move from Arizona. I will also tell you that around this area there are many people sharing my sentiments with regards to the project and moving from the state if this venture ever comes to fruition.

Sincerely,

Jose A. Torres

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Comment Document</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Acquisitions and Relocations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Neighborhoods/Communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Acquisitions and Relocations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Acquisitions and Relocations</td>
<td>A review of the literature reveals few detailed and comprehensive analyses of the relationship between the transportation infrastructure and residential property values. A recent study by the California Department of Transportation concluded that freeway facilities did not substantially affect sales prices in residential areas adjacent to the facility. The study concluded that it is the visibility of the freeway that may influence selling price and not distance or noise. As a result, the researchers generally concluded that the more the visibility of a new freeway is reduced, the less it would determine the sales price of homes sold in the area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Neighborhoods/Communities</td>
<td>While the E1 Alternative is adjacent to the largely residential areas of Ahwatukee Foothills Village (to the north), a freeway has been planned in this location for many years (see Final Environmental Impact Statement pages 4-17 and 4-21). Where existing residential uses are adjacent to the proposed freeway, noise mitigation would be implemented according to the Arizona Department of Transportation policy (see Final Environmental Impact Statement page 4-91).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Acquisitions and Relocations</td>
<td>There is no evidence that the proposed facility would cause people to leave the area. The regions’ benefits would remain, and improved access to residences and businesses would make them more desirable.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
From: Jose Torres
To: Projects
Subject: Loop 202 Project
Date: Sunday, June 16, 2013 9:42:56 AM

To whom it may concern:

It thoroughly disgusts me your idea to degrade the value of properties in the Ahwatukee area by insisting in building the Loop 202 project. It is preposterous that after developing this area as a quiet residential zone and 20 something years planning this road to benefit a few at best, you still vow to disrupt our tranquil lives by building such a monstrosity so close to our homes. I suppose that I don’t have to reiterate my opposition to such a project, but I will go further than that. If you insist on building this road, you will lose another taxpayer from the state because I will move from Arizona. I will also tell you that around this area there are many people sharing my sentiments in regards to the project and moving from the state if this venture ever comes to fruition.

Sincerely,

Jose A. Torres

---

1. Acquisitions and Relocations
   A review of the literature reveals few detailed and comprehensive analyses of the relationship between the transportation infrastructure and residential property values. A recent study by the California Department of Transportation concluded that freeway facilities did not substantially affect sales prices in residential areas adjacent to the facility. The study concluded that it is the visibility of the freeway that may influence selling price and not distance or noise. As a result, the researchers generally concluded that the more the visibility of a new freeway is reduced, the less it would determine the sales price of homes sold in the area.

2. Neighborhoods/Communities
   While the E1 Alternative is adjacent to the largely residential areas of Ahwatukee Foothills Village (to the north), a freeway has been planned in this location for many years (see Final Environmental Impact Statement pages 4-17 and 4-21). Where existing residential uses are adjacent to the proposed freeway, noise mitigation would be implemented according to the Arizona Department of Transportation policy (see Final Environmental Impact Statement page 4-91).

3. Acquisitions and Relocations
   There is no evidence that the proposed facility would cause people to leave the area. The regions’ benefits would remain, and improved access to residences and businesses would make them more desirable.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Comment Document</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Why is map 16 missing off-ramp and on-ramps? It's missing off/on-ramps southbound on lower buckeye and northbound on Broadway. It really would not make sense to have to drive a mile and wait for another stoplight. Especially people driving north from Broadway. This would create a jam of people coming north from broadway and people going north on lower buckeye. Thanks!</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Design</td>
<td>The interchanges at Broadway Road and Lower Buckeye Road have been designed as half-diamond interchanges due to the future State Route 30 traffic interchange that is planned to connect to State Route 202L in this location. A full diamond interchange would create potential weaving issues with the addition of the system ramps from the future State Route 30 traffic interchange.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
From: Mary and Dallas [mailto:dmtousley1@cox.net]
Sent: Monday, May 20, 2013 4:50 PM
To: Projects
Subject: LOOP 202

Ref: Loop 202 South Mountain Freeway

Please let it be known that we as property and home owners in the Ahwatukee Foothills do strongly oppose this freeway in this area. It will become a Truck Route for all trucks adding pollution to this area. Especially, Mexican trucks using this route which will add pollution due to their diesel fuel mixtures regarding sulphur. Chemical spills are another great concern.

Plus all the homes that will have to be destroyed disrupting many families.
Again I would like to appeal to you to NOT build this freeway in this area.

Thank you
Dallas & Mary Tousley
16035 S. 13th Place
Phoenix, AZ 85048
480-460-8770

1. Purpose and Need, Truck Bypass
   The Arizona Department of Transportation and Federal Highway Administration identified several issues and concerns that were frequently noted by commenters. Responses to these issues can be found in the Responses to Frequently Submitted Public Comments beginning on page B733 of this appendix.

2. Trucks

3. Hazardous Materials

4. Neighborhoods/Communities
   Prospective home buyers and members of the church built after the freeway was conceived, according to State law, should have been informed of the proposed facility. (Sellers are obligated by Arizona common law to disclose all known material facts about a property to the buyer.)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Comment Document</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>TELEPHONE CONVERSATION RECORD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SOUTH MOUNTAIN FREEWAY INFORMATION LINE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DATE</td>
<td>INCOMING CALL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/15/13</td>
<td>11:09 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CALLER</td>
<td>CALLED ADDRESS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANDREA &amp; ANDREW TOWN</td>
<td>517 W. KNOX, CHANDLER, AZ 85225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CALLER REMARKS/QUESTIONS:</td>
<td>EMAIL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We do support the new highway. Thank you and have a good day.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Code</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From:</td>
<td>Projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject:</td>
<td>FW:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From: tom townsend [mailto:tomjt1944@yahoo.com]
Sent: Saturday, May 18, 2013 5:28 AM
To: Projects
Subject: i am against the 202 using pecos road, any reasonable person would opt for a more southern route meeting the west 101

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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Alternatives, E1 Alternative</td>
<td>The Arizona Department of Transportation and Federal Highway Administration identified several issues and concerns that were frequently noted by commenters. Responses to these issues can be found in the Responses to Frequently Submitted Public Comments beginning on page B733 of this appendix.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Alternatives, Gila River Indian Community Alignment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 1 | 2 |
1 kind of crap won't be happening anymore.
2 Thanks.
3 Thanks for typing.
4 THE FACILITATOR: Good afternoon. I'd like
to introduce the 2:00 to 4:00 p.m. panel, with the
Arizona Department of Transportation, Brock Barnhart,
with the Federal Highway Administration, Director
Moreno, and with the Arizona Department of
Transportation, Brent Cain.
5 Our next speaker is Richard Tracy, Sr.
6 Mr. Tracy, you now can pick up the
7 microphone.
8 MR. TRACY: Can I have about five minutes
to catch my breath?
9 THE FACILITATOR: Most certainly.
10 MR. TRACY: It wasn't always this way, you
11 know. I just lived here 43 years too long.
12 THE FACILITATOR: Welcome, Mr. Tracy, you
13 have three minutes.
14 MR. TRACY: All right. Thank you very
15 much. It was quite difficult for me to come here.
16 It's been difficult for me to attend meetings all
17 over the Valley and send letters, and disappointing
18 when nobody pays any attention to it. I hope this
19 is -- okay, as I say, it was difficult to come here.
THE FACILITATOR: Before you start, I'm going to reset your clock so you have a full three minutes.

MR. TRACY: Fine. Thank you. And it was difficult to go to many meetings around the Valley, because I spoke for such things as having the stadium in the middle of the community. It's over on the outskirts. I spoke against people who wanted to have the light rail to the Mormon Temple rather than to the stadium where 20 or 30 people congregate and spend three or four hours going and coming from events.

The selfish people in this community are their worst enemy. We've had a lot of projects fail, and this is going to be another one. We have a traffic jam at 60 and 18. A continuation of 60 across to Avondale will relieve that traffic jam. A highway on the other side of South Mountain will give the casinos another opportunity to destroy our economy.

I have prepared a number of things that I would like somebody that's in authority to review. They don't only deal with the 202; they deal with the whole community. Because you're not just deciding what's going to happen out there, you're deciding on page 3-12 of the Final Environmental Impact Statement.

The alternative proposed by the commenter is similar to the U.S. Route 60 Extension and Interstate 10 Spur alternatives evaluated for the proposed project.

The reasons these alternatives were eliminated from further study are presented on page 3-12 of the Final Environmental Impact Statement.
1 what's going to happen at Washington and Central. We have a large area between Baseline and Washington Street that should be rejuvenated. The transportation should be available. When I went to school, I had the subway, I had buses. There are people here who cannot work because they don't have a car. It's an absolute necessity. 110 degrees.

But the 202 is important to the people who, for example, recommend that we go with the light rail out to the trailer park area instead of to the west side where there are people jammed up in the morning. I ask for a fair review of this. Believe me, when it comes to corruption, Phoenix has led the nation. And this is another attempt by certain people to gain what should be given to the populace. As I say, the west side and the south side of Phoenix should be built up so we have decent transportation, so people like me don't get COPD.

I thank you for your opportunity to do something constructive for a change. The hockey stadium out in the middle of Glendale is going to go bankrupt. It's a threat to people who can't afford it. It should be in Scottsdale, but ASU took that property for their own benefit. They could have put that Windsong anywhere in the County --
THE FACILITATOR: Thank you, Mr. Tracy.

MR. TRACY: -- the middle of Scottsdale, which should be -- our population area should be the arena. Thank you.

THE FACILITATOR: Thank you. If you have additional feedback, we really encourage you to go next door and speak with a court reporter.

Thank you, Mr. Tracy.

MR. TRACY: Thank you.

THE FACILITATOR: Our next speaker is Stan Hemry.

MR. HEMRY: Hello.

THE FACILITATOR: Welcome, Mr. Hemry. You have three minutes.

MR. HEMRY: All right. Thank you. On this Environmental Impact Statement, I didn't see an inclusion of it about the ecosystem that's in that area and the watersheds coming from both the western range of the South Mountains, and off the Estrella Mountains, and I'd like to see more of that. I want to know what systems will be impacted when a, you know, like a carbon emitting bisection of that area takes place. And there's no animal studies done as to the migration patterns of the animals. So I think this study is probably
MR. TRACY: I am Richard Tracy, 2238 South Cottonwood Street in Mesa, Arizona. I have been a resident here for 43 years, lived in an area within a mile of the Black Canyon, and it contributed to the fact that I have COPD now — COPD. I'm sorry. It's like H. But I'm on 24-hour oxygen as a result of living too close to the freeway.

The 202 Extension is just a pie-in-the-sky idea of some Las Vegas and Phoenix people who wish to create more casinos, various other economic advantages. It's a highway to nowhere. It will not reduce the congestion we have on our roads. It may — important place is what they call the curve or the bend between Route 60 on 10 and into Washington Street. And that traffic could be relieved with a road that would continue 60 into Phoenix. There are many, many roads off of that Baseline alignment that would be served. The community along Baseline should be rejuvenated.

There's no doubt in my mind the selfish interests did such things as making sure that the light rail went to the unnecessary Mormon temple rather than to the stadium. They fought efforts to put the stadium for the Cardinal football team in the center of the community. As a result, people are traveling three and four hours to get to and from when they have a sporting event, which is

The Arizona Department of Transportation and Federal Highway Administration identified several issues and concerns that were frequently noted by commenters. Responses to these issues can be found in the Responses to Frequently Submitted Public Comments beginning on page B733 of this appendix.

Although the region's freeways are now congested during the peak travel period, conditions in 2035 without the proposed freeway would be substantially worse with more congested areas and congested conditions for longer periods of time (see Final Environmental Impact Statement pages 1-21 and 1-22).

By 2035, east- and westbound motorists on Interstate 10 between State Route 101L (Agua Fria Freeway) and State Route 202L (Santan Freeway) are expected to experience stop-and-go driving for over 3 hours every day. This is for a distance of nearly 30 miles. A new freeway in the Study Area would distribute commuters over an additional freeway facility. As a result, the duration of stop-and-go traffic on the region's freeways would be reduced.

The alternative proposed by the commenter is similar to the U.S. Route 60 Extension and Interstate 10 Spur alternatives evaluated for the proposed project. The reasons these alternatives were eliminated from further study are presented on page 3-12 of the Final Environmental Impact Statement.
1 totally unnecessary.
2 Chasing the hockey group out to Glendale rather than putting it in Scottsdale, again, was a selfish effort by certain leaders, the same people who now are trying to get the 202 rather than a very useful road that would go from 10 over to the 59th Avenue would relieve the traffic, would relieve the effort in downtown Phoenix which has everybody routed through the small area of Washington or McDowell. It's a plan for the future to have a freeway in the alignment between Baseline and Broadway.

I have many articles that I'd like to submit. And one of them, of course, is the fact that Phoenix leads the nation in scams. And anytime there's been a fraud on a large scale, Phoenix has been the leader. We are last in the educational support. We're last in helping people who need help.

The community is divided between the very rich and the very poor, which is not a healthy situation. But it has existed, and it's perpetuated by outfits like John Birch Society and today the Tea Party and various other interests rather than a blended community which would help everybody. We don't have that here, and it's unfortunate.

I was fortunate. I went to college and
1 school. I didn’t need a car. I could use the bus. And
2 people all over this country that have many advantages
3 that we don’t have here for our average middle class
4 citizen. And this particular road will deprive us of a
5 road and light rail where it’s really needed, where it
6 would really help.
7 And I appreciate this opportunity. It was
difficult, in my condition, to come down here. But I’m
glad I did, and I appreciate the young lady being so
patient. Thank you.
8 Can I put this with my material?
9 MR. FRANKLIN: All right. Now, this is a
10 speech that I was going to have for the room, but I
11 just -- I have to go and run, so...
12 Good afternoon, Panel. My name is Ross
13 Franklin. That’s R-o-s-s, F-r-a-n-k-l-i-n. And I’m a
14 resident of Laveen, Arizona. I appreciate you letting us
15 all speak in front of you today. You will hear much
16 emotional testimony today regarding the impact of building
17 the Loop 202 western loop connector. I will stick to the
18 facts and leave the emotion to others.
19 Over the past 15 years, the population of
20 Laveen and Southwest Phoenix has doubled. The EIS
21 projects that number to more than double again over the
22 next 25 years. While new highways like the Eastern

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Comment Document</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>school. I didn’t need a car. I could use the bus. And</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>people all over this country that have many advantages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>that we don’t have here for our average middle class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>citizen. And this particular road will deprive us of a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>road and light rail where it’s really needed, where it</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>would really help.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>And I appreciate this opportunity. It was difficult, in my condition, to come down here. But I’m glad I did, and I appreciate the young lady being so patient. Thank you.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Can I put this with my material?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>MR. FRANKLIN: All right. Now, this is a speech that I was going to have for the room, but I just -- I have to go and run, so...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Good afternoon, Panel. My name is Ross Franklin. That’s R-o-s-s, F-r-a-n-k-l-i-n. And I’m a resident of Laveen, Arizona. I appreciate you letting us all speak in front of you today. You will hear much emotional testimony today regarding the impact of building the Loop 202 western loop connector. I will stick to the facts and leave the emotion to others.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Over the past 15 years, the population of Laveen and Southwest Phoenix has doubled. The EIS projects that number to more than double again over the next 25 years. While new highways like the Eastern</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Arizona Department of Transportation and Federal Highway Administration identified several issues and concerns that were frequently noted by commenters. Responses to these issues can be found in the Responses to Frequently Submitted Public Comments beginning on page B733 of this appendix.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Alternatives, Nonfreeway Alternatives</td>
<td>The Arizona Department of Transportation and Federal Highway Administration identified several issues and concerns that were frequently noted by commenters. Responses to these issues can be found in the Responses to Frequently Submitted Public Comments beginning on page B733 of this appendix.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Alternatives</td>
<td>Federal regulations stipulate that an environmental impact statement shall “rigorously explore and objectively evaluate all reasonable alternatives” (40 Code of Federal Regulations § 1502.14; see Final Environmental Impact Statement page 3-1). All alternatives were screened using a multidisciplinary set of criteria. Nonfreeway alternatives were considered (see Final Environmental Impact Statement pages 3-3 through 3-6). Among other things, the study took into account improving existing freeways, improving or expanding other travel modes, strategies to reduce travel demand, and various roadway configurations. This study examined not only the potential impacts from improvements, but also the consequences of building nothing, the No-Action Alternative. As proposed by the Maricopa Association of Governments, the South Mountain Freeway would be part of the Regional Freeway and Highway System. Other transportation improvements such as mass transit and local roads are specified in the Regional Transportation Plan and were considered during the evaluation of this proposed new freeway. As noted in the Final Environmental Impact Statement (see page 3-60), the proposed freeway would provide opportunities to enhance operation of future mass transit improvements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Alternatives</td>
<td>The proposed project is part of the Regional Transportation Plan for the Maricopa Association of Governments region. In 2004, the voters of Maricopa County approved the Regional Transportation Plan and the extension of a half-cent sales tax to fund its projects. The funding for the right-of-way acquisition and construction of the proposed project would come from a combination of federal (National Highway Performance Program) and County (half-cent sales tax, also known as Regional Area Road Funds) sources. Use of these funds for construction of the proposed freeway would not affect available funds for statewide projects nor would not constructing this facility make available additional funds for other statewide projects.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
If the extension of 202 was important to traffic and clean air it would not have needed millions of PR and twenty years to build. My fear is each group make it impossible to develop a sustainable community. We needed a stadium and it ended up ten miles from the center. Same the Arena. Things fail here because of pretty greedy inconsistent leadership. The 202 extension is not as important as a rail line from Tucson or Mexico to Vages. It is not going to benefit any one but the highway builders and the casinos. Light rail from Baseline to Washington St and extra Lanes I-10 where 60 joins it will save lives money and jobs. 202 will give us fewer jobs and tourists. Damage a Park that will grow in importance as the population grows. From an COPD family please reduce not increase auto use with sprawl.

Richard T Tracy

The Arizona Department of Transportation and Federal Highway Administration identified several issues and concerns that were frequently noted by commenters. Responses to these issues can be found in the Responses to Frequently Submitted Public Comments beginning on page B733 of this appendix.

Federal regulations stipulate that an environmental impact statement shall “rigorously explore and objectively evaluate all reasonable alternatives” (40 Code of Federal Regulations § 1502.14; see Final Environmental Impact Statement page 3-1). All alternatives were screened using a multidisciplinary set of criteria. Nonfreeway alternatives were considered (see Final Environmental Impact Statement pages 3-3 through 3-6). Among other things, the study took into account improving existing freeways, improving or expanding other travel modes, strategies to reduce travel demand, and various roadway configurations. This study examined not only the potential impacts from improvements, but also the consequences of building nothing, the No-Action Alternative. As proposed by the Maricopa Association of Governments, the South Mountain Freeway would be part of the Regional Freeway and Highway System. Other transportation improvements such as mass transit and local roads are specified in the Regional Transportation Plan and were considered during the evaluation of this proposed new freeway. As noted in the Final Environmental Impact Statement (see page 3-60), the proposed freeway would provide opportunities to enhance operation of future mass transit improvements.

The Arizona Department of Transportation and Federal Highway Administration identified several issues and concerns that were frequently noted by commenters. Responses to these issues can be found in the Responses to Frequently Submitted Public Comments beginning on page B733 of this appendix.

Unplanned growth is often termed “urban sprawl.” Generally, this term is used in the context of rapid and uncontrolled urban growth onto previously undeveloped land—usually on the outskirts of an existing urban area. Projects like the proposed freeway are often identified as contributors to urban sprawl. Freeway projects are often cited as making land at the urban fringe more accessible and, therefore, more attractive for development. However, examination of data comparing population and land use between 1975 and 2000 suggests major transportation projects like the proposed freeway do not induce growth in the region (see Final Environmental Impact Statement pages 4-170 through 4-174). The proposed freeway would be implemented in a historically quickly urbanizing area (most noticeably in the Western Section of the Study Area, although the nationwide recession which began in 2007 slowed growth). In the Eastern Section of the Study Area, the proposed freeway would abut public parkland, Native American land, and a near-fully developed area—therefore, any contribution to accelerated or induced growth would be constrained. The proposed freeway would be built in an area planned for urban growth as established in local jurisdictions’ land use plans for at least the last 25 years.
Unplanned growth is often termed “urban sprawl.” Generally, this term is used in the context of rapid and uncontrolled urban growth onto previously undeveloped land—usually on the outskirts of an existing urban area. Projects like the proposed freeway are often identified as contributors to urban sprawl. Freeway projects are often cited as making land at the urban fringe more accessible and, therefore, more attractive for development. However, examination of data comparing population and land use between 1975 and 2000 suggests major transportation projects like the proposed freeway do not induce growth in the region (see Final Environmental Impact Statement pages 4-170 through 4-174). The proposed freeway would be implemented in a historically quickly urbanizing area (most noticeably in the Western Section of the Study Area, although the nationwide recession which began in 2007 slowed growth). In the Eastern Section of the Study Area, the proposed freeway would abut public parkland, Native American land, and a near-fully developed area—therefore, any contribution to accelerated or induced growth would be constrained. The proposed freeway would be built in an area planned for urban growth as established in local jurisdictions’ land use plans for at least the last 25 years.
The Arizona Department of Transportation and Federal Highway Administration identified several issues and concerns that were frequently noted by commenters. Responses to these issues can be found in the Responses to Frequently Submitted Public Comments beginning on page B733 of this appendix.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Purpose and Need, Old Plan or Use of Old Data</td>
<td>The Arizona Department of Transportation and Federal Highway Administration identified several issues and concerns that were frequently noted by commenters. Responses to these issues can be found in the Responses to Frequently Submitted Public Comments beginning on page B733 of this appendix.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Phoenix must look to inward development. [J.D.]

In a time of recession, much is being said about great forces of change—population and demographics, environmental concerns—that will fundamentally reshape communities for the rest of the century. In this time of change, it is critical to understand the impact of urban design and development, which will meet expectations of Valley residents for livability, amenity, accessibility, and place, which we know is clear. Where we’ve been is not where we are headed.

How much of the anticipated population growth for the U.S. will be happening in Greater Phoenix? Is Phoenix appealing to talented workers? Do Phoenix have an adequate supply of housing that is both affordable and close to jobs? And, how can future development help position Phoenix as being progressive and innovative for the 21st century? Research from the Center for Neighborhood Technology tells us that in the Phoenix metropolitan area, residents in outer communities (where the majority of Valley residents live) spend more than 65 percent of their income on housing and transportation—about five times what residents in the downtown area spend, and must have seen their annual costs double, even quadruple, since 2000. This is simply not a sustainable growth model.

Building the Phoenix metropolitan region in a way that conserves energy and land, enhances the natural environment, and de-emphasizes auto dependency is critical to our region’s success. Limited new construction is a greater emphasis on reusing and adapting existing space in our future. We need to do a better job of developing inward, utilizing parcels already benefiting from municipal services and infrastructure.

Nearly five years ago, the Urban Land Institute was founded to research, analyze, and encourage responsible patterns for long-term urban growth, and explore what constitutes sound real-estate development projects and practices. For the Urban Land Institute (ULI), on December 14, 2009, it is a new starting point—a date to think about what’s to be accomplished for the next 75 years. As ULI Founder J.C. Nichols once wrote, “the intelligent city plan... does not forget the greater needs of tomorrow in the present of today. It is simply good, practical sense.”

Whether our jury is summarily from the past will be measured by how much of what we build remains relevant, appealing and worth preserving in 75 more years.

Steven A. Bette is chairman of the Urban Land Institute’s Arizona District Council.
MAG Transportation Director Eric Anderson’s press release of October 8, 2011 spoke nothing of MAG joining in a plan that replaces the objectives and funding of Prop 400. The Metropolitan Business Plan means more sprawl less funding for clean air. More funding committed all sources. Now MAG TTPC is using that to hand Toll Roads, high development and doubling 1-10. And extending Loop 202. Funds for Light Rail committed areas but are personal piggy banks for some. Clean Air and Sunshine was what made Phoenix, not pie in the sky developments sweats. Dirty air and dirty politics may destroy it.

Anderson on MAG on not funding what was promised:

MAG Transportation Director Eric Anderson’s press release of October 8, 2011 spoke nothing of MAG joining in a plan that replaces the objectives and funding of Prop 400. The Metropolitan Business Plan, means more sprawl less funding for clean air.

MAG Director Eric Anderson: “Some Valley freeways, re-routing will be delayed up to 5-years by a sharp downturn in newness promised by the recession, regional transportation officials say.

Proposition 400, approved by Maricopa County voters in 2004, imposed a countywide half-cent sales tax for 20 years to fund regional transit projects - freeways, trains, bus and light rail. The tax expires in 2025. However, revenue is now expected to be $1.3 billion, or 34 percent, lower than projected for the remaining 17 years of the program, according to the Maricopa Association of Governments, a coalition of local governments that serve as a planning agency for the Greater Phoenix area. The regional transit plan is overseen by MAG.

When Prop 400 was implemented, MAG projected $14.6 billion in revenues through the life of the program. The new projections: $8.7 billion.

While the effect on transit projects is still being reviewed, MAG has determined that at least 11 Valley freeway projects will be delayed. It is too early to say whether they will be eliminated entirely from the current 20-year plan.

Completion of these projects would require an extension of the program for at least five years and a ½ cent sales tax extension.”


Proposition 400

If approved by the voters of Maricopa County, Proposition 400 would continue the one-half cent sales tax for 20 years, through December 31, 2035. This sales tax would be used for construction of new freeways, widening of existing freeways and highways, improvements to the arterial street system, regional bus services and other special transportation services, and high capacity transit services such as light rail, bus rapid transit and express buses. All projects to be funded from the proposed sales tax are specified in the Maricopa Association of Governments (MAG) Regional Transportation Plan.

Regional Transportation Plan

Utilizing input from the community, the MAG Transportation Policy Committee developed the Regional Transportation Plan (the Plan). The 22-member committee included elected officials and representatives from cities and towns across the region, the business community, the Arizona Department of Transportation, Maricopa County, the freight industry, transit, and the Citizens Transportation Oversight Committee.

The Regional Transportation Plan includes $15.8 billion in proposed projects, taking into account all regional funding sources. About half of the funding, $9 billion (based on 2002 dollars and including $520 million a year for interest expenses) would come from the passage of Proposition 400.

Mesa Republic - 12/19/11

A campaign to give Phoenix Mesa Gateway Airport an internationally identifiable name I made efforts to get as plan for the Light Rail at Sycamore and Main Street to go south to the Airport or Sun Tech. I spoke to the Gateway Board made up mostly of the Mayors of the surrounding cities that are involved. The Chairman that day was Mesa Mayor Scott Smith. He did not seem receptive at all. I then went to the Board of the Maricopa Association of Governments and guess what Mayor Smith was the Chairman and no more receptive. The same was true at the Mesa City Council meeting.

You and I at completion of Loop 101 the sleeping downtowns Mesa business and property owners awake.The highway no longer runs through their Main Street, there was no business, it was in the newly developed Phoenix and Valley areas. That same effort and publicity to attract the public downtown, keep the Light Rail going real fast could where there had been a population explosion over the past ten years.

Richard T. Tracy, Sr. Mesa 480-439-1153
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Comment Document</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Update on the Southeast Corridor Major Investment Study**

The TPC has an update on the Southeast Corridor Major Investment Study. The purpose of the study is to examine the existing transportation investments proposed for the Southeast Corridor, which primarily encompasses the Interstate 10 corridor from Central Phoenix to the East Valley. These investments include widening of Interstate 10; coordination of the highway interchange connecting I-10, State Route 143 and 48th Street; construction improvements to the US-60 (Superstition Freeway) and the Interstate 17 (Black Canyon Freeway) traffic interchanges; construction of an additional HOV lane on I-10 between I-17 and US-60; and implementation of a local express lane system to provide additional capacity along I-10. The Arizona Department of Transportation is currently completing an Environmental Impact Statement for the I-10 corridor within the study area.

Along with reviewing these investments and other parallel facilities, the Southeast Corridor Major Investment Study will study the travel demand between the East Valley and Central Phoenix to identify the potential for alternative transportation mode strategies to accommodate demand, along with freeway widening scenarios.

Staff reported that the consultant conducting the study has developed and analyzed three “bundles” of more than 25 different transportation alternatives. The bundles include a basic mobility bundle ($350 million investment), peer competitive bundle (systems common in peer regions, a $2.8 billion investment), and transit focus bundle ($5.1 billion investment).

**Sustainable Transportation – Land Use Integration Study**

Staff provided an update on the Sustainable Transportation – Land Use Integration Study. The study was launched in 2010 and includes a market analysis and research of best practices for sustainable transportation. Staff noted that one issue is that many people interpret the words “sustainable transportation” differently, with definitions ranging from traffic demand reduction to mode choice to the environment. Eight factors typically found when measuring sustainable transportation performance include a neighborhood street network, housing and employment density, auto-use neighborhoods, regional accessibility (especially job centrality and concentration), frequent/convenient transit service, demand management/excesses, transit-oriented development (including mixed-income housing), and demographics.

Staff noted that a focus group found the existence of obstacles that make infill development a higher risk than fringe development in the Valley. These include parking availability and zoning laws, as well as difficulty for developers in assembling various land parcels. The focus group expressed interest in bus options, and suggested the region take a hard look at “rubber tire” transit options. Additional observations based on stakeholder input were that mobility solutions are needed throughout the region, but that limited parts of the region can support transit oriented development and high capacity transit in the near term. Next steps will include identifying mobility priorities, modeling various scenarios, and developing policies, with an eventual outcome of recommended policies, investments, and pathways.
MARICOPA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS
INFORMATION SUMMARY... for your review

DATE: November 9, 2011

SUBJECT: Update on the Southeast Major Investment Study

SUMMARY: The fiscal year (FY) 2010 MAG Unified Planning Work Program and Annual budget, approved by the MAG Regional Council in May 2009, was amended in March 2010 to include $300,000 to conduct the Southeast Corridor Major Investment Study. On May 17, 2010, the MAG Regional Council Executive Committee selected HDR, Inc. to conduct the study.

The Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) is in the process of completing an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the widening of Interstate 10, the Maricopa Freeway, between SR-51/SR-202L/Red Mountain “Mini-Stack” and SR-202L/Santan-South Mountain “Pecos Stack” traffic interchanges. The subject of this EIS is an environmental clearance that would allow the reconstruction of the Interstate 10/SR-143/48th Street traffic interchange, connection improvements to the US-60 Superstition Freeway and the Interstate 17/Black Canyon Freeway traffic interchanges, construction of an additional high occupancy vehicle (HOV) lane between Interstate 17 and US-60, and implementation of a local-express lane system to provide additional capacity along Interstate 10 that could accommodate more than 400,000 vehicles per day. ADOT is in the process of wrapping up this EIS and proposes obtaining a Record of Decision (ROD), the final action in the EIS process, in early 2012.

Presently, the Regional Freeway and Highway Program of the MAG Regional Transportation Plan provides approximately $850 million for an initial phase of the project between 32nd Street and SR-202L/Santan-South Mountain Freeways. The remaining sections of the project, from 32nd Street to SR-81/SR-202L/Red Mountain Freeway, is estimated to cost $550 million and is presently identified for implementation in the fifth phase of the Regional Transportation Plan.

During the course of the EIS, questions have been raised by MAG member agencies about the investment being made in this corridor and the need for alternate transportation options, in addition to widening Interstate 10 and improving the system traffic interchanges, to accommodate the growing travel demand between the East Valley and Central Phoenix. In response, MAG began developing the Southeast Corridor Major Investment Study for these purposes. The work program for this Study has the following tasks:
- Review of all transportation investments proposed for the Southeast Corridor, including those proposed along other parallel facilities, such as SR-101/LPrice Freeway and SR-202L/Red Mountain Freeway;
- Study of the travel demand shed between the East Valley and Central Phoenix to identify the potential for alternative transportation mode strategies to accommodate demand in addition to freeway widening scenarios;
- Consultation with project stakeholders on the project’s findings and recommendations; and
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**MAG Launches Metropolitan Business Plan**

With the Valley just beginning to climb out of one of the most significant economic downturns in U.S. history, the Maricopa Association of Governments (MAG) and economic development leaders from across the region have launched a Metropolitan Business Planning process that will move the Valley toward a more secure economic future.

"We have experienced tens of thousands of layoffs in the Valley, and the pain isn’t over yet," said Litchfield Park Mayor Thomas Schiavone, who chairs the MAG Economic Development Committee (EDC). "The region’s recovery will not be driven by a single sector, agency, or individual. A collaborative approach is needed to make dramatic changes in our economy."

Mayor Schiavone said MAG is coordinating with a range of stakeholders to develop a business plan that will help put the region back on the path to prosperity. In Arizona, MAG was selected by the Brookings Institution in one of only a handful of plans cities can participate in a collaborative partnership to develop a Metropolitan Business Plan. Other partners in the project include the Greater Phoenix Economic Council (GPEDC), Arizona State University, the Thunderbird School of Global Management, Maricopa Community Colleges, and the Arizona Commerce Authority.

"Not only are we tapping into some of the brightest minds in our region, the value of working with Brookings is that they can help us identify new opportunities through their connections with best practices around the country," said MAG Chair and Tempe Mayor Hugh Hallman. "This will help us leverage key assets to better compete in a global economy," he said.

Mayor Hallman pointed out that the effort will build upon the hard work that has already taken place in the region, including incorporating economic development plans across agencies.

"We are relying on the expertise of our partners in economic development and on our regional leaders to identify the actions necessary for revitalizing our economy," said Hallman. "The great advantage of this project is that it gives us a chance to work together instead of in silos, which is a key to creating a unified economic development strategy."

GPEDC President and CEO Barry Roscoe said he is excited about the partnership, agreeing that it is time to change the way we think about economic development.

"We want to transform Greater Phoenix into a world-class region of excellence, we need a shift in mindset."

---

Continued on page 10
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Comment Document</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mr. Robert Forrest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Metro Light Rail, Suite 1300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>101 North 1st Ave.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Phoenix, AZ 85003</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2238 S Cottonwood St  
Mesa, AZ  85202

Dear Mr. Forrest:

May 27, May 26, count back to December 19 before you can find a good air day in Maricopa County. Once known for its clean air, a respiratory cure center and laid back lifestyle, is now a place compared to Los Angeles. Urban sprawl. Traffic delays, smog-obscuring view...

The EPA and Federal Departments of Transportation, free of local influences are guilty of betraying their obligation to the residents. They give lip service to anti pollution measures but support federally funded projects that contribute to poor planning of a community, waste, traffic jams, accidents and increased pollution.

The Light Rail is badly needed where there are young families, working middle class and college students. Light Rail's goal to reduce traffic instead is being diverted to a retirement area. First stop Mesa Dr. along mostly abandoned Main Street to the Cemetery, large park across from the LDS Temple, Historic single family home districts. They want it, because it's almost free. All local funds are going to redevelop east of Mesa Drive that is where the Mormon Community of Lehi is being rebuilt.

The future plan after 2016 is to extend to Gilbert Road a trailer park area on the north, mostly vacant six month a year. Growth and traffic jams are miles to the South. Help would come to finance a connection between the two major airports, but to go east to Power Rd, then south, would add nine miles and at least twenty minutes to the trip and maybe twenty years before completion.

The East Valley has the last chance to grow over a million people. Mainly in the Gilbert, San Tan, Queen Creek Chandler areas. Only a small percentage reside north of Route 60. Mesa Main Street, dead route 60 moved south and residents resisted change. Mesa has ten thousand homes empty or in foreclosure. The ADOT Citizens Overview Committee and MAG Chairman, the Mesa Mayor, are both stonewall. Governor sense the facts. And public interest. Suggest people can drive free to ten miles to Light Rail. EPA and Metro have a responsibility to get traffic off the road on to rail, but for five years only Mesa Central Main was considered.

The Maricopa Association of Governments is controlled by developers. It encourages only Urban Sprawl, not infill and we have thousands of empty new buildings, they and people are not developers concern, only buying BLM land, building and making a profit. ADOT is planning roads for the developers into 2024. Travel time, empty buildings pollution increase, as do non-burn days. The community already so spread out the two car families have grown to three or four with teen ages. Excessive travel demands, costs and plight not a concern of County Planners.

Light Rail should go south from Sunrmer to the Fiesta Mall area with its Hospital and College campus, dozens of empty buildings and locations for apartments. Actual, not just potential riders.

Then through Gilbert southeast ending near Mesa Gateway Airport and San Tan Village. ADOT’s plan a twenty four lane road west of Tempe that could become a Toll Road. More about that in the attached addition to go with the Exhibits and articles.

Very little has been done to get express buses between cities except for the West Valley to Downtown Phoenix and that did provide results. There is very little effort to get the single driver of the road. Proper placement of Light Rail and extending it, 60 just does not fit the powers to be plan for this large county that is run like a nick town by people who remember it as it was, do not know how it could be. It is clear to an impartial observer that there is not sufficient passenger prospects for Light Rail at Central Mesa and there is not enough room for proper traffic movement in Central Mesa, but then drivers will avoid going there, the public and private investment would it off when Freeways developed south then north. It’s common the grassy take from the needy around here.

Sincerely,

Richard T. Tracy, Sr.
Mesa wrangles with how to pay for light rail

"I would like to see some of those (questions) answered. And I’m not going to move forward on my vote until I’m sure the council is supportive." said Councilwoman McComb.

Kend Hawker, the manager of the Mesa Transportation Department, said the project is on schedule.

"The council has committed to building the project, and we’ll continue to work with them," he said.

Mesa is one of the few cities in the Valley that has a light rail project on the horizon.

The project is estimated to cost $1 billion, and Mesa is looking to the state for funding.

"We’re planning on doing a lot of the work ourselves," Hawker said.

Mesa is one of the few cities in the Valley that has a light rail project on the horizon.

The project is estimated to cost $1 billion, and Mesa is looking to the state for funding.

"We’re planning on doing a lot of the work ourselves," Hawker said.

Mesa is one of the few cities in the Valley that has a light rail project on the horizon.

The project is estimated to cost $1 billion, and Mesa is looking to the state for funding.

"We’re planning on doing a lot of the work ourselves," Hawker said.
Report of Bob Hazlett MAG Senior Engineer 10-19-11 on Managed Lanes (Toll Road) to MAG Transportation Committee

Laure Network Study will look at the concept of priced managed lanes or placing a toll on HOT lanes. He stated that there are four phases to the project, with the first phase underway.

Mr. Hazlett stated that the study will evaluate future HOV needs, the viability of managed lanes, and legislative and institutional requirements. He said that stakeholders include representatives of MAG member agencies, the Arizona Department of Transportation, and the Federal Highway Administration.

Mr. Hazlett stated that managed lanes are dedicated lanes for car or more users. He said that HOV lanes in this region are managed lanes. Mr. Hazlett stated that managed lanes can be high-occupancy toll (HOT) lanes, express lanes, express toll lanes, or value-priced lanes. He said that names and branding vary by region and reflect different strategies. Mr. Hazlett noted that there are more than 130 managed lanes facilities in the United States, and he added that once the HOV lanes on Loop 101 are completed, the MAG region will have the fourth largest managed lanes network in the country in terms of lane miles, behind Los Angeles, San Francisco, and Seattle. Mr. Hazlett remarked that the evolution of the region’s freeway system since 1985 is a remarkable achievement.

Mr. Hazlett stated that 12 projects in the country currently use price managed lanes, and the Managed Lanes Network Study consultant identified where they are being contemplated. He noted that some express toll lanes where you must stay in the lane and cannot weave in and out. Mr. Hazlett stated that one of the more ambitious projects is in the Dallas area, where Interstate 635 will be double decked. He explained that the top lanes will be existing lanes and the bottom lanes will be managed lanes. Mr. Hazlett stated that truck-only toll roads are being considered in Atlanta and New Jersey.

Mr. Hazlett then addressed the lessons learned from SR-91 in Orange County, California, considered the granddaddy of managed lanes, constructed in 1996. He said that it was the first managed lane facility to use value pricing and the first fully automated toll facility in the United States. Mr. Hazlett stated that SR-91 is in an area with few competing routes, and it introduced the concept of variable pricing for tolls. He said that toll setting is an ongoing process; they review the data monthly and set the tolls with a goal of keeping traffic moving. Mr. Hazlett stated that the toll amounts vary and the peak hour toll is about $10.

Mr. Hazlett stated that SR-91 was a public-private partnership, and as a result, a lot of odicicles were added that made it difficult for Orange County to do a lot of planning. He said that a buy-back by Orange County was necessary to overcome a restrictive non-compete clause contained in the lease, for example, CALTRANS could not add any lanes on nearby freeways that would compete with SR-91. Mr. Hazlett stated that SR-91 generates about $45 million in revenues annually.

Mr. Hazlett then addressed lessons learned from Interstate 55 in Miami-Dade County, Florida. He said that the project converted 21 miles of single HOV lanes to dual HOT lanes. Mr. Hazlett stated that drivers previously could enter or leave the lanes at anytime, but once the lanes were converted, drivers could enter or exit only through dedicated ports. From this it was learned that a good increased effort to create Congestion has been apparent. No real effort to promote car pools, use public transportation or stagger hours etc. In recent years, Congestion is good for Toll Road business, Light Rail and Express Bus or extending Route 60 over I-10 bad.
End of the rail line is ‘no-man’s land’

Mesa rail stop leaves bad impression
B3304
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Comment Response Appendix

Comment Document

Code

Issue

Response


1 Purpose and Need, Lack of Support

The Arizona Department of Transportation and Federal Highway Administration identified several issues and concerns that were frequently noted by commenters. Responses to these issues can be found in the Responses to Frequently Submitted Public Comments beginning on page B733 of this appendix.

2 Alternatives

Federal regulations stipulate that an environmental impact statement shall “rigorously explore and objectively evaluate all reasonable alternatives” (40 Code of Federal Regulations § 1502.14; see Final Environmental Impact Statement page 3-1). All alternatives were screened using a multidisciplinary set of criteria. Nonfreeway alternatives were considered (see Final Environmental Impact Statement pages 3-3 through 3-6). Among other things, the study took into account improving existing freeways, improving or expanding other travel modes, strategies to reduce travel demand, and various roadway configurations. This study examined not only the potential impacts from improvements, but also the consequences of building nothing, the No-Action Alternative. As proposed by the Maricopa Association of Governments, the South Mountain Freeway would be part of the Regional Freeway and Highway System. Other transportation improvements such as mass transit and local roads are specified in the Regional Transportation Plan and were considered during the evaluation of this proposed new freeway. As noted in the Final Environmental Impact Statement (see page 3-60), the proposed freeway would provide opportunities to enhance operation of future mass transit improvements.

3 Alternatives

The proposed project is part of the Regional Transportation Plan for the Maricopa Association of Governments region. In 2004, the voters of Maricopa County approved the Regional Transportation Plan and the extension of a half-cent sales tax to fund its projects. The funding for the right-of-way acquisition and construction of the proposed freeway would come from a combination of federal (National Highway Performance Program) and County (half-cent sales tax, also known as Regional Area Road Funds) sources. Use of these funds for construction of the proposed freeway would not affect available funds for statewide projects nor would not constructing this facility make available additional funds for other statewide projects.

4 Purpose and Need

Although the region’s freeways are now congested during the peak travel period, conditions in 2035 without the proposed freeway would be substantially worse with more congested areas and congested conditions for longer periods of time (see Final Environmental Impact Statement pages 1-21 and 1-22). By 2035, east- and westbound motorists on Interstate 10 between State Route 101L (Agua Fria Freeway) and State Route 202L (Santan Freeway) are expected to experience stop-and-go driving for over 3 hours every day. This is for a distance of nearly 30 miles. A new freeway in the Study Area would distribute commuters over an additional freeway facility. As a result, the duration of stop-and-go traffic on the region’s freeways would be reduced.

5 Alternatives, Gila River Indian Community Alignment

The Arizona Department of Transportation and Federal Highway Administration identified several issues and concerns that were frequently noted by commenters. Responses to these issues can be found in the Responses to Frequently Submitted Public Comments beginning on page B733 of this appendix.

6 Air Quality

RICHARD T. TRACY, Sr.
2236 S. COTTONWOOD ST,
MESA, AZ 85202

Mountain Study Team
ADOT MD 126F
1655W Jackson St.
Phoenix, Az 85007

July 21, 2013

Dear Study Team:

My big concern is the High way to nowhere 202 Extension will waste $2 billion, which could solve problems in the south east Valley of Phoenix.

Extending Rt. 60 over and west to 59th Ave, Light Rail to the Sunset Area via Fiesta Hbl and Alma School Road. Where people who will pay for the system live.

And most important the start of RT 1-11.

We will be left out if we get money for 202 and the try to get money for I-11 Tucson to Vegas. Other states will claim it is their turn after we get

What would be needed to satisfy the road builder. Rail is our futur other more freeways. Just like Solar but we have people fighting to look cool.

My enclosed items tell the truth about the proposed extention of 202 on or near Pecos Road. The editors are on the other hand has a lot of false information. The so call South Mountain Freeway will not help relieve traffic. The vote on Prop 400 was to help move people with mass transit. Those people did not keep their promise. the Indians do not want their land made like Rt. 101 for the benefit of the Los Vegas investors. Look at the sharks years later. Some investors have held options on the proposed area and for years. We have too many casinos already. They have damaged the Scottsdale economy.

The Light Rail did not progress for years because Maricopa Association of Governments is not moving traffic in the edges of cities. What MAG and East Valley movers and shakers want and what we need are set out in their Minutes of meetings. The Metropolitan Business Plan will create more highted areas like those referred to by the citizens in the inout question of the Feb. 16th Mesa Republic article. South Phoenix is the largest area in need of a-maker. Investors gladly accept Government tax credits but develop out side the cities. Areas north and west were to have light Rail by this time. Instead money was held back for projects they call Progress but leaves our main industry Tourism. Road and home building can not take its place for long. We have the sun but pollution hides it and people do not come back when its hard to breathe and every thing is twenty miles away. Not organized like Denver for example or San Diego.

Sincerely,

Richard T. Tracey Sr.
Secondary and Cumulative

Unplanned growth is often termed “urban sprawl.” Generally, this term is used in the context of rapid and uncontrolled urban growth onto previously undeveloped land—usually on the outskirts of an existing urban area. Projects like the proposed freeway are often identified as contributors to urban sprawl. Freeway projects are often cited as making land at the urban fringe more accessible and, therefore, more attractive for development. However, examination of data comparing population and land use between 1975 and 2000 suggests major transportation projects like the proposed freeway do not induce growth in the region (see Final Environmental Impact Statement pages 4-170 through 4-174). The proposed freeway would be implemented in a historically quickly urbanizing area (most noticeably in the Western Section of the Study Area, although the nationwide recession which began in 2007 slowed growth). In the Eastern Section of the Study Area, the proposed freeway would abut public parkland, Native American land, and a near-fully developed area—therefore, any contribution to accelerated or induced growth would be constrained. The proposed freeway would be built in an area planned for urban growth as established in local jurisdictions’ land use plans for at least the last 25 years.

Alternatives

The alternative proposed by the commenter is similar to the U.S. Route 60 Extension and Interstate 10 Spur alternatives evaluated for the proposed project. The reasons these alternatives were eliminated from further study are presented on page 3-12 of the Final Environmental Impact Statement.
Freeway

Continued from Page 81

The tribe's requirements to qualify the petition, tribal election of candidates, and the tribe's requirements for the petition to be submitted for public comment on its environmental statement on the 1,400-thousand square mile region in the West Valley. The tribe will conduct an economic analysis of the project and the estimated cost is $2 billion. The tribe's estimate is based on the project's estimated cost of $2 billion and the tribe's plan to sell the project to the state for $2 billion.

The tribe has not taken a formal position on the options to make the environmental statement more effective. In response to the tribe's request for more detail, the tribe has not yet made a decision. The tribe's request for more detail is based on the tribe's plan to sell the project to the state for $2 billion.

The report, titled "The Freeway and the Environment," was released by the tribe and the tribe's chairman, Michael Tafolla, on April 24, 2015. The report is available at the tribe's website.

The tribe has not yet made a decision on whether to sell the project to the state for $2 billion. The tribe's plan to sell the project to the state for $2 billion is based on the tribe's estimate of the project's estimated cost of $2 billion and the tribe's plan to sell the project to the state for $2 billion.

The tribe's plan to sell the project to the state for $2 billion is based on the tribe's estimate of the project's estimated cost of $2 billion and the tribe's plan to sell the project to the state for $2 billion.
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|      | Mr. Robert Forrest  
Mesa Light Rail, Suite 1300  
101 North 1st Ave.  
Phoenix, Az 85003  

2235 E Cottonwood St  
Mesa, Az 85202  

Dear Mr. Forrest:  

May 27, May 29, count back to December 19 before you can find a good air day in Maricopa County. Once known for its clear air, a respirable carbon center and bad breath, is now in place compared to Los Angeles. Urban sprawl, traffic delays, smog obscuring view.  

The EPA and Federal Departments of Transportation, flow of local influences are guilty of destroying their obligation to the residents. They give lip service to anti pollution measures but support federally funded projects that contribute to poor planning of a community, waste, traffic jams, accidents and increased pollution.  

The Light Rail is badly needed where there are young families, working middle class and college students. Light Rail’s goal to reduce traffic is being diverted to a retirement area. First stop Mesa Dr. along mostly abandoned main street to the Cemetery, large park across from the LDS Temple, Historic single family home districts. They went it, because it’s almost free.  

Local funds are going to revitalize east of Mesa Drive (the area where the Mormon Community of Lehi is being return).  

The future plan after 1980 is to extend to Gilbert Road, a trailer park area on the north, mostly vacant six months a year. Growth and traffic jams are miles to the South. Help come to finance a connection between the two major airports, but go east to Power Rd. Then south, add nine miles and at least twenty minutes in the trip and maybe twenty years before completion.  

The East Valley at the last census has grown to over a million people. Mostly in the Gilbert, San Tan, Queen Creek, Chandler areas. Only a small percentage resides north of Route 60. Mesa Main Street died when Route 60 moved south and residents installed change. Mesa has ten thousand homes empty or in foreclosure. The ADOT Citizen’s Oversight Committee and MAC Chairman, the Mesa Mayor, are both strong Mormon leaders ignoring the facts. And public interest.  

Suggest people can drive fire to ten miles to Light Rail. EPA and Metro have a responsibility to get traffic off the road on rail, but for five years only Mesa Central Mall was concluded.  

The Maricopa Association of Governments are controlled by Developers, it encourages only Urban Sprawl, not still and we have thousands of empty newer buildings, they are not a developer’s concern, only buying BLM land, building, and making a profit. ADOT is planning roads for the developers into 2004. Travel time, empty buildings pollution all increase, as do no-burn days.  

The community already so spoiled out the two car families have grown to three or four with two teen again. Excessive travel demand, costs and light are not a concern of County Planners.  

Light Rail should go south from Sycamore to the Fleece Mall area with its Hospital and College campuses, dozens of empty buildings and locations for apartments. Ask for not just potential riders. Then through Gilbert southwest ending near Mesa Gateway Airport and San Tan Village. ADOT’s plan a twenty four lane road west of Tampa that could become a Toll Road. More about that in the attached addition to go with the Exhibits and articles.  

Very little is done to get express buses between cities except for the West Valley to Downtown Phoenix and that did not result. There is very little effort to get the single driver of the road. Proper placement of Light Rail and extending Rt. 60 just does not fit the powers to be plan for the large county that is run like a hick town by people who remember it as if were, do not know how it could be. It is clear to an impartial observer that there is not sufficient passsenger prospect for Light Rail at Central Mesa and there is not enough room for proper traffic movement in Central Mesa, but then drivers will avoid going there, the public and private investment will it off when Freeways developed south than north. It’s common the greedy take from the newly around here.  

Richard T. Towns
End of the rail line is ‘no-man’s land’

2 team on MLK tribute
Mom, brother and daughter honor future generation with King’s messages.

Mesa rail stop leaves bad impression

Mesa residents express disappointment with new light rail station.
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Suburban population explodes in A.

Mesa, Chandler doing work necessary to land jobs
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## Downtown Mesa

### Church Leaders Active in Light-Rail Planning

**Free and in**

“Church leaders are at the forefront of the effort to bring light rail to the Valley. The church is playing a key role in shaping the future of the neighborhood near Temple Station.”

With a group of Mayor Smith, Mesa Mayor and President Obama, June 10, 2011, Smith returned to our city to discuss “Federal and State issues involving mass transit.” With Thunder Park in city centers, these developments are helping build the city’s future.

**Response**

*Further discussion on the role of church leaders in shaping the future of the neighborhood near Temple Station.*
March 8, 2011

Mr. Richard T. Tracy, Sr.
2298 S. Cottonwood
Mesa, AZ 85202

Dear Mr. Tracy:

Thank you for your inquiry on the LINK bus route. According to your recent correspondence, I have provided the information that you are seeking. The Mesa Main Street route travels between Superstition Springs Transit Center and the Sycamore Station on Main Street to meet the light rail service.

"Cost of operation including equipment purchase for the first year of operation of the double buses for the Main Street Route. I would also like to receive the cost of operation and riders for the period of August 2010 and January 2011."

Equipment purchase: Each bus costs $756,385 for a total of 10 buses and will operate for an average of 10 years each.

December 28, 2008 - June 30, 2009: 187,291 miles x $5.25* per mile = $983,277
July 1, 2009 – June 30, 2010: 362,187 miles x $5.13* per mile = $1,850,775
August 2010 - January 2011: 152,293 miles x $5.30** per mile = $807,153

*These figures are based on fiscal years as that is when costs change.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ridership 2010</th>
<th>Average Daily Passengers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>August</td>
<td>1,238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September</td>
<td>1,174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October</td>
<td>1,127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November</td>
<td>1,315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December</td>
<td>1,218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 2011</td>
<td>1,361</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We hope that you find this information helpful.

Sincerely,

Susan A. Terney
Public Information Officer
Mesa wrangles with how to pay for light rail

The Mesa segment's cost ranges from $200 million to $400 million.

I want to see this go to the people in the form of a referendum.

I'm not going to move forward until I'm sure the council is supportive.

John Johnson
Cold, dry weather contributing to bad air quality

DDBT AIR
Continued from R

doesn’t mix,” said Paul Deigne, a meteorologist with the National Weather Service in Phoenix.

“Long term, we are seeing the same pollution levels as the past months, which are very high,” said Deigne. “The forecast calls for more high-pressure systems to move in, with low humidity and high temperatures.”

The Arizona Department of Health Services reported that the air quality index for Maricopa County was in the “unhealthy” range as of 11 a.m. on Monday.

Although the air quality has improved slightly over the past few days, residents are still encouraged to take precautions such as reducing outdoor activities and staying indoors when possible.

For more information on air quality, visit the Arizona Department of Health Services website at aztoday.gov.

---
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Response
Gateway Aviation Day Sets Attendance Record

An estimated 10,000 people attended Gateway Aviation Day, presented by Wells Fargo Bank, on March 17 to see aircraft and meet with Airport managers and personnel. Previously known as the Airport Open House, the event now combines the past two events due to budgetary constraints. However, thanks to corporate sponsors, the event returned and plans are now underway to host the event next year on Saturday, April 19, 2014.

We had a good showing of aircraft on display," said Airport Community Relations Coordinator and event planner. "We're grateful for the support of the U.S. Military and local aircraft owners for sharing their aircraft and love of aviation with the community. I hope we see everyone out at Gateway again next year.

Thank you 2013 Gateway Aviation Day Sponsors:

Gateway Airport Brings $685 Million to Local Economy

The Phoenix-Mesa Gateway Airport helped generate $685 million in economic benefits last year, and supports more than 6,000 jobs in the region. That's according to a new study from the W. P. Carey School of Business at Arizona State University, which looks at how the airport contributes to the local economy.

In addition, the direct spending from both on- and off-property activity on the airport contributed $138.5 million, then added together with the indirect and induced spending that ensuing, the total came out to $685 million for the fiscal year.

I well-functioning airport serves as a portal that connects communities and cities into the region," says research Professor Lee McPherson, Ph.D., who headed the study on behalf of the L. William Maricopa County Community College.

The numbers are especially impressive when you consider all of the happened during one of the worst times recorded in Arizona's economic history.
Plenty of ideas for Fiesta District but no action

2nd light-rail extension studied

Even more serious is the fact that the light rail will end at Westmoreland, but there will be an old B&M line that can be used to extend the line to Southmore along the whole length of the area. This will make it easier for people to get around. The West End Shopping Center will also benefit from the extension. There will be more people in the area, which will bring in more business. The installation of a light-rail system will be part of the plan for the area's development. The current system, which serves as a feeder for the main line, will be replaced.
ADOT right to move ahead on freeway

Ties to land hound DiCiccio

Crises say councilman's advocacy on freeway extension represents a conflict
MAG Celebrates Native American Participation, Contributions to Region

MAG's membership includes three Native American Indian Communities, the Fort McDowell Yampai Nation, the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community, and the Gila River Indian Community. The leaders of these Tribal Nations serve on the MAG Regional Council and testify the voices of their communities to the regional level. To celebrate their continued contributions to our region, MAG is presenting the second in a line of special events, the 2020 Special Edition of the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community (SRS/MIC).

Two Tribes, Two Cultures, One Home
The history of our people, the Pima and Maricopa, is a story richly woven within legend and fact. Our traditions tell us that both tribes have always lived in the Southeast region of the Phoenix Valley of Arizona. Our presence here today is proof of the unbroken continuum that is now being continued in our ancestors, and is now lived by us.

With two distinct backgrounds and cultures, the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community comprises two Native American tribes: the Pima, "Ahkrar", or "father" (River People), and the Maricopa, "Kolychdok Piti-waht" (People Who Live Beyond the Water). Surrounded by the cities of Scottsdale, Tempe, Mesa, and Fountain Hills, the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community is a natural asset endowed by other growth.

Growth is also abundant in our community, our population now has reached 6,500 members, with half under the age of 25. Our diverse economic base is also growing many business opportunities for our members and for the region, with exciting programs taking shape in our Community.

Two Tribes: New Opportunities
Over the past century, our Community has been enveloped by urban sprawl. With this rate of growth, we have seen remarkable changes, cultural challenges and enriched opportunities for our people.

As communities grow, we are aware of the need to preserve our heritage and promote cultural awareness. We are committed to ensuring that our communities remain vibrant and alive.

As a reminder of growth, we have seen remarkable changes, cultural challenges, and enriched opportunities for our people.

At times, our ancestors built a diverse social and economic system in the Salt River Valley. Today, the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community has diversified its economy. Besides two successful gaming operations and a golf club, the Community operates a water utility, a real estate development company, and a tobacco company. It is a testament to the commitment that has united the Communities with Internet services.

Our newest venture: Talking Stick Resort, a 4th interface among Native American communities.

106,000 square feet of meeting space, a state-of-the-art spa, and a cultural arts center. The resort will open in spring 2020 adjacent to our new Center, Arizona's largest cultural center, featuring several upscale restaurants, conference areas, lounges, a showroom, and a wide variety of gaming options.

Our Community is also celebrating a new project, a $100 million seasonal facility for the Arizona Diamondbacks and Colorado Rockies major league baseball teams. The 11,000 seat facility, scheduled to open in early 2021, will be the first professional sports facility ever built on Indian land.

Two Tribes: Shared History
With this remarkable growth, we hold for our future. But our Communities is also dedicated to preserving our past.

The Pima consider their ancestors to be the "Hokogai", a people who inhabited an advanced society in central Arizona from about A.D. 300 to A.D. 1300. The word "Hokogai" translates as "those who have gone before." Archaeologists refer to this as the Hokogai or the Hohokam.

The ancestors of the Maricopa are the O'odham, who lived in what is now southwestern Arizona. The Maricopa were organized from the Pimeria Alta area on the sparse group of people. Over years...
Loop 202 could find a new path

Tribe’s offer may spare S. Mountain, Ahwatukee

Current plans for a Loop 202 extension call for a 12-mile route that cuts through the land and crosses through a ridge in South Mountain Park’s bright. The Little River Valley.

Parties have agreed to help in merging the preserved freeway onto tribal land instead.

South Mountain Freeway

A map replication, the City of Phoenix Community scale is open to a scale on its land.

Office Hours,

from 9am, and severe times

The proposed South Mountain Freeway could add area alien of current federal designations, and development.

The City of Phoenix Community, which long has opposed the freeway extension. Thru an open-mouthed echo by Kirtland Sherwood, who could be called to end things.

The freeway need of the present.
Our stand: City Council should tell Donald Trump to move it or lose it.

Comment Document

Issue

Response

Photo Resty turned as scum in several states and cities after investigations. Speed Readable and Readable can mean arbitrary standard. Location of red light photo radar altered when income drops. One second increase in yellow light reduces violations 50%. Company claims fail.

Open Court provision tactical in favor of mandatory, speedy and salient issues. Trend to distribute judges work load renewed by eliminating commissioner’s in a system which has judges doing criminal, mandatory sentences when disorder in the prosecution rather than impartial judge, Distraction and manipulation by some lawyers to maximize hourly bill ignored.

November 9, 2001 the national. The local news reported that Arizona was last. “ONE OF THE WORST PLACES TO LIVE IN THE COUNTRY.” The fact that the right is only part of the reason and does not include the lack of access to courts or reasonable legal fees. Business interests and the local media have worked to require almost all civil causes to be submitted to arbitration or mediation where the average citizen is not able to get fair treatment. To make it impossible to get just decisions they now want to keep layers and the law out of the Supreme Court and make justice available only in Superior Court, does taxes Ponderosa.

Although one of the most expensive legal systems it is not functioning to benefit the public. They are not represented. money is all that matters helped make the rules in the legislature and the courts.

In 1872 having practiced law in New York and Ohio and spending a year reviewing cases at the Supreme Court I pointed out that there were judges doing clerk’s jobs and no common cause to process most disputes quickly and economically. Since then the population has doubled, number of Superior Court judges, paid Arbitration and mediation and social proceedings almost exclusively in Maricopa County rather than simply with the Constitution. Washington based attorneys.Sellers and Milamson, in the Green Tree v. Randolph case that recognized that an arbitration agreement that would impose large costs or a party opposed to or who lacks power to bargain over terms may be unfair and/or unconstitutional. Denying following rights ordinarily available to citizens of other states.

The provision for a 30 day notice-seeking extended. The provision for a public forum in which to litigate a controversy.

The right to a public forum, thereby avoiding large expense to gain access to a forum. The provision for a written record of litigation. The right to have the proceedings reviewed on appeal. The right to discovery and to present relevant evidence. The right to brief the forum to the legal precedent providing.

ARIZONA’S RANKINGS
(All salaries from articles in the Arizona Republic story or the direct result of that paper’s newspaper)
3rd Worst State to Fiddle A Child CRIME
4th highest in overall crime highest in auto theft. highest in death by gun in (000), received a grade of D by Handley-Corbin in annual survey on how well states protect children from violence. One of 20 states that does not strict reporting laws. Due to low salaries, one of the highest turnover rates for correctional officers.

HEALTH
2nd worst to provide jobs with health insurance. Children without health coverage in one of highest in the nation. 1971 highest infant mortality rates. Tool with forces for highest in the nation for lease, suicide and drugs. Among seven states to provide the least adequate experience of insurance companies.

7th highest in nursing home residents who suffer unexplained pain. Lowest in funding mental health due the nation average in spending to treat effects of drug, alcohol and cigarette abuse. Very poor oversight for any cares centers because of 2,500 licensed facilities, there are only 26 inspectors.

EDUCATION
One of the lowest for per pupil funding in public education in an Arizona poll, nations gave schools a grade of C minus. On average, teacher salaries are $3,000 lower than national median. 3rd lowest in school curriculum. Student national median. One of seven states to try and remove education from school science.

Tool with Nevada for the lowest rate of high school graduation in the nation. Highest teen pregnancy rates in nation. 3rd highest teen pregnancy. Tops in nation for availability of teacher schools, ease of home schooling, access to voucher and level of payment for private school education.

ECONOMICS
2nd highest disparity in family income between most affluent and poorest. 4th worst poverty rates. 13th Arizona households in need of food assistance. Compared to 10% nationally 2 million Arizona residents pay over half of monthly income for housing. Arizona States among the lowest in the nation.

ENVIRONMENT
3rd highest in toxic industries into the atmosphere. For scores, among worst places in nation for summertime pollution, Four Arizona national parks are among the nation’s most dangerous. Organ Pipe Cactus, Superstition, Grand Canyon and Lake Tahoe.

AUTO INSURANCE SAFETY
Arizona crash rate 1% higher than national average. Only 33% higher. 30% uninsured insurance people to keep costs racking, reduces auto glass replacement costs, POLITICAL CONTRIBUTIONS AND ELECTING.

2nd lowest in contributions to Democratic candidates, frequent elections, contests rare, system has two viable candidates, 15 to 30 voter turnout come in local elections.
John Birch Society’s new battle

Group’s leader to discuss migrants’ invasion of U.S., during speech in Mesa

By Gary Hagen

The Arizona Republic

July 20, 2011

The John Birch Society, the East Valley Tea Party Patriots and others
will hold their annual meeting in Mesa to hear the society’s president, 73-year-old John McManus, respond on the perceived threat. His topic: ‘‘Understanding the American Dream: How Illegal Immigration Affects You.’’ The event is scheduled for 8:30 a.m. at the Hyatt Regency, 1111 N. Central Ave. in Mesa. Tickets are $25 at the door.

By Steve Bowers, a member of the Birch Society-based council, said his group is allied with the tea-party group, which

John Birch Society leader to speak

IMMIGRATION

Continued from Page 3

Mesa, Ariz.

The John Birch Society, the East Valley Tea Party Patriots and others will hold their annual meeting in Mesa to hear the society’s president, 73-year-old John McManus, respond on the perceived threat. His topic: ‘‘Understanding the American Dream: How Illegal Immigration Affects You.’’ The event is scheduled for 8:30 a.m. at the Hyatt Regency, 1111 N. Central Ave. in Mesa. Tickets are $25 at the door.

By Steve Bowers, a member of the Birch Society-based council, said his group is allied with the tea-party group, which...
Ariz. cities’ economies fare poorly in report

By Betty Board

The economy in the Phoenix and Tucson areas ranked in the bottom 10 of the 150 metro areas in the nation, based on a report released this week by the U.S. Department of Education. The performance was rated by the researchers, who cited factors such as job growth, earnings and the number of employers.

The researchers said that the area’s economy continued to be a disappointment, with job growth lagging behind the national average. The report also noted that the area’s economy was more dependent on the housing market than other areas, which could make it more vulnerable to downturns.

Experts offer varied housing outlooks

Real Estate

House prices have been on the rise in recent months, which could be good news for homebuyers. However, there are still concerns about the sustainability of the current market, as some experts worry that the recent gains are not sustainable.

Estate Contents

The current market is still inflating, according to some experts, but it is expected to slow down soon. Another concern is the lack of inventory, as many homes are being sold quickly, leaving few options for buyers.

Plan to ax clean-car program criticized

Activists to stage Keep strict rules on emissions

By Noreen Stencil

State officials have opposed a proposed plan to phase out all-electric vehicles by 2030, which would reduce greenhouse gas emissions. The activists argue that the plan is necessary to combat climate change.

The activists have planned a series of protests across the state to show support for the plan and call for stronger regulations. The events will highlight the dangers of climate change and the importance of taking action to address it.

The plan was met with resistance from some officials, who argued that it would hurt the economy and create jobs for the auto industry. However, the activists argue that the long-term benefits of the plan far outweigh the short-term costs.
Mesa Tribune
Letter To The Editor (480) 698-0362 January 21, 2007

Dear Editor:

At this time while others are paying the price for comfortable summers, contending with snow and ice, we should be planning how to reduce the price we pay to escape that frigid weather. Such as the ever increasing cost of fuel, high pollution, power shortages, threatening rolling black-outs, even isolation. Much of that can be reduced with something as simple as using the cooler daylight hours. Around 4 and 5 a.m. is our best time of the day, May to October. Arizona is the only place left on the U.S. mainland that fails to take into consideration the earth’s rotation. That is nothing to be proud of, it is a handicap. For example, most local sports events broadcast nationally end after midnight eastern time. That effects ratings and revenue.

A young Benjamin Franklin while in France measured the lamp oil saved when people arose and retired one hour earlier in the season. His experiment has been accepted in most of the industrial world as a method of conserving fuel. The concept has been adopted by out door workers, the construction industry. Home and travel energy use is reduced by many who voluntarily alter work hours. Any opportunity to avoid using the air conditioners saves fuel, reduces pollution. Ever notice when activated the auto air conditioner compressor acts as if a trailer was attached to the vehicle: Even stalled in traffic, common today, its off / on load on the motor is detectable. That is more fuel and residue exiting the tailpipe.

Arising an hour earlier most people could drive to work with car windows open, reduce home power demands. It would accommodate the construction worker as well as those communicating with offices that close three hours earlier in the east. Most important, as I pointed out, we waste the most pleasant time, before 6:00 a.m. Most Arizonans are asleep, they watched late news and went to bed an hour later than the rest of the country.

Its nice in the earlier morning, to get up and take a walk around the block, say Hi to your neighbor. There are benefits to adjusting to nature, and there are clocks that adjust to daylight savings time automatically for those challenged by the task. Richard T. Tracy, Sr. (480)-839-1153
Environmental study touts freeway

By Susan Pollock

The report's developers said the project would ease traffic congestion, improve air quality, and bring economic benefits to the city. funding for the project was provided by a state transportation department. The report stated that the proposed freeway would reduce traffic by 20 percent, increase the air quality index by 10 percent, and generate $1 billion in economic benefits.

The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) reviewed the report and issued a permit for the project, with conditions that included monitoring and reporting on the project's impact on the environment. The project was completed in 2014.
**OPINIONS**

**MESA REPUBLIC**

**Transit specifics needed**

**Our View**

That's far more letters than we have received during that time on any other subject. Granted, 14 letters hardly is a representative sample of the population. But Friedman's proposal clearly has touched a nerve with readers who feel that commuter rail is long overdue.

Whether you agree with Friedman's idea or not, at least his proposal is specific, not just lip service. We challenge other elected leaders to either join Friedman on his idea or express their own plans to speed transit improvements.

Given how little cash there is, and how great the need is to improve traffic flow without spewing more pollution, residents should have several creative ideas to debate.

**What do you think?**

Want more elected leaders to get smart about transit? Tell them. E-mail March in pare at marcm@azcentral.com. Find your legislators at azleg.state.az.us. And copy us on your messages, tmselover@azcentral.com.

---

**Ties to land DiCiccio on freeway extension represents conflict**

**Our View**

That's far more letters than we have received during that time on any other subject. Granted, 14 letters hardly is a representative sample of the population. But Friedman's proposal clearly has touched a nerve with readers who feel that commuter rail is long overdue.

Whether you agree with Friedman's idea or not, at least his proposal is specific, not just lip service. We challenge other elected leaders to either join Friedman on his idea or express their own plans to speed transit improvements.

Given how little cash there is, and how great the need is to improve traffic flow without spewing more pollution, residents should have several creative ideas to debate.

**What do you think?**

Want more elected leaders to get smart about transit? Tell them. E-mail March in pare at marcm@azcentral.com. Find your legislators at azleg.state.az.us. And copy us on your messages, tmselover@azcentral.com.

---

**Curve’s design is problem**

**Our View**

"We had into the problem just as much it was ever were. Now the Broadway Curve, you have the entire line of traffic from Arizona I-10 onto the freeway, followed immediately by Broadway Road on ramp traffic and then by the Superstition Freeway off-ramp. Do we really need a lane of traffic, or can we just add a way to funnel those cars onto the I-10 and Broadway Road to get onto I-10 after the Superstition interchange?"

"It’s a mess right now, and though I have commuter rail, I don’t know if that will have much impact on reducing the traffic as it currently stands."

— Paul Nicholson, Tempe

**Roll system must be extensive**

I agree with Tempe Mayor Hugh Hallman that a rail system should be built before widening the Broadway Curve. The inset traffic gridlock is to take more ears a road.

Building more freeways will not cut costs and pollution. The train world is the acceptable method, though it is a small part of the Valley in order to function.

— Peter Betsch, Tempe
There has been considerable effort by the state to improve the reputation of the Justice of the Peace court, which are the primary court where cases involving local government are handled. This is important given the large number of cases that are heard in these courts and the potential impact on the community. The power of the court has been expanded since 1986. These judges are attorneys who are accountable to the local government body and comply with the Constitution, which requires a judicial officer in good standing to have a law license and to be appointed by the governor. The salaries of these judges have increased, and the court now has a more professional appearance.

RICHARD T. TRACY, Esq.
202 S. COTTONWOOD ST.
MESA AZ 85202
TELEPHONE CONVERSATION RECORD
SOUTH MOUNTAIN FREEWAY INFORMATION LINE

INCOMING CALL
DATE: 6/14/13
TIME: 1:50 PM
CALLER: NANCY TRAINER
CALLER ADDRESS: P.O. BOX 5575, GOODYEAR, ARIZONA 85338
PHONE: 623-399-6218
EMAIL:

CALLER REMARKS/QUESTIONS:
Yes, I do support the freeway. The South Mountain freeway, but you need to stop playing politics with it and build it. But you need to build it where you will disrupt the least amount of people. Also, I take exception with having to listen to this message in Spanish. If you are a voter you need to be able to read and write in English. Thank you.

The Arizona Department of Transportation and Federal Highway Administration identified several issues and concerns that were frequently noted by commenters. Responses to these issues can be found in the Responses to Frequently Submitted Public Comments beginning on page B733 of this appendix.
I live in Avondale and commute to work every day on the 10E to Tempe, AZ. Traffic in the morning is typically really bad once I approach around 43rd Ave. In the past 8 years, I've noticed that accidents tend to occur before, in or after the downtown tunnel. One of the factors that I believe contributes to these increases in accidents in this area is the short amount of distance after you exit the tunnel to either enter the 202 or the 51. I believe that with the proposed loop 202 in the west side will definitely decongest traffic going into the tunnel and hence, reduce accidents.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Comment Document</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1    | **TELEPHONE CONVERSATION RECORD**  
   **SOUTH MOUNTAIN FREEWAY INFORMATION LINE**  
   **DATE:** 7/23/13  
   **TIME:** 1:57 PM  
   **CALLER:** THE TRAVILLIONS  
   **CALLER ADDRESS:** 2608 SOUTH WETSTONE PLACE, CHANDLER, ARIZONA 85286  
   **PHONE:**  
   **EMAIL:**  
   **CALLER REMARKS/QUESTIONS:**  
   Hi we're in favor of the South Mountain and the 202 freeway. Thank you.  
   |  
| 1    | **Comment noted.** |
1. MS. TRAVIS: Janet Travis and my address is 44177 West Palmen Drive in Maricopa and 85138. I think the first comment I have is in this report there is absolutely no information on the tonnage. And this is a point that we repeatedly asked, I'm sure it was ADOT, MAG, all these representatives that were there, the bigwigs here, decisionmakers on this. Repeatedly asked them for that information, and they did tell us, "Yes, yes, we will have that information." That's very, very basic information regarding freeway and employees.

   And not just a public meeting, you know, something like this, but departmental meetings, air quality program with decisionmakers at Gila River, transportation meetings, a number of meetings over the years. We were told we would have that information. It's not in there. And that it's a basic, basic piece of information that is included in normal environmental impact statements.

   As an example, the amount of vehicle miles traveled, or the amount of cars per day on that 18-mile stretch on the community, Interstate 10, there's 17,000 tons of carbon monoxide emitted annually. This needs to have tonnage and it's just not there.

The Arizona Department of Transportation and Federal Highway Administration identified several issues and concerns that were frequently noted by commenters. Responses to these issues can be found in the Responses to Frequently Submitted Public Comments beginning on page B733 of this appendix.

The total tonnage of emissions by pollutant is not presented because the regulations require that the analysis be compared to the National Ambient Air Quality Standards, which are not based on tonnage. However, tonnage (total emissions) was reported for mobile source air toxics because there are no standards.
1. Okay. Another point is, there is absolutely nothing about health impacts on this. And I know not all environmental impact statements have that included, but many do. And in this case, it should be included because this freeway, unlike all the others in the Valley, is located between two mountain ranges during periods of inversion layers, stagnant air. That's going to sit right there between the mountains.

   And the level of health problems out here, especially with kids with asthma, it's going to skyrocket. And right now, there's kids playing football outside. And pollutants have been proven to have a strong impact on the population within a mile and a half of a freeway. So there's schools, of course, residents and they're going to be sitting in that smog.

   We need numbers, tonnage on carbon monoxide, ozone, volatile organic compounds. Just all of the things, particulate matter. And one thing they did not address, they did mention particulate matter and 10 -- PM 10, but they do not address PM 2.5, smaller particulates, and those are especially the problem with diesel trucks, PM 2.5.

   And the community has an air quality

---

### Code Comment Document

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Comment Document</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Okay. Another point is, there is absolutely nothing about health impacts on this. And I know not all environmental impact statements have that included, but many do. And in this case, it should be included because this freeway, unlike all the others in the Valley, is located between two mountain ranges during periods of inversion layers, stagnant air. That's going to sit right there between the mountains. And the level of health problems out here, especially with kids with asthma, it's going to skyrocket. And right now, there's kids playing football outside. And pollutants have been proven to have a strong impact on the population within a mile and a half of a freeway. So there's schools, of course, residents and they're going to be sitting in that smog. We need numbers, tonnage on carbon monoxide, ozone, volatile organic compounds. Just all of the things, particulate matter. And one thing they did not address, they did mention particulate matter and PM 10, but they do not address PM 2.5, smaller particulates, and those are especially the problem with diesel trucks, PM 2.5. And the community has an air quality</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

### Code Issue Response

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Health Effects</td>
<td>The Arizona Department of Transportation and Federal Highway Administration identified several issues and concerns that were frequently noted by commenters. Responses to these issues can be found in the Responses to Frequently Submitted Public Comments beginning on page B733 of this appendix.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Air Quality</td>
<td>According to the Arizona Department of Transportation, 2013, Air Quality Assessment South Mountain Freeway 202L Draft Report, review of wind data from the Gila River Indian Community monitoring site at St. Johns suggests that during the morning hours and associated with mountain-drainage air flows and stable atmospheric conditions, wind flows are from the southeast and follow the Gila River channel to the north. Locations to the east of St. Johns tend to flow from the east to the lower elevations along the Gila River. During the warmer hours' improved mixing, flows typically follow the river channel and come from the north and northwest. Likewise, during a 1-month-long meteorological monitoring period (November 20, 2006, through December 21, 2006) at Pecos Road and 40th Street and a second 1-month-long monitoring period at Pecos Road and 24th and 40th streets (April 19, 2007, through May 21, 2007), winds during the morning hours typically were from the northeast. During the warmer hours, and with improved mixing, winds typically were from the west.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Air Quality</td>
<td>A particulate matter (PM$<em>{2.5}$) analysis is not required since the area is in attainment for the particulate matter (PM$</em>{2.5}$) National Ambient Air Quality Standard.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
monitoring site. You could almost see it it's so close. And we have baseline levels and it will be interesting to see what those levels increase to once the freeway is put in. And we did our 2.5 measurements, PM 2.5. We did what is called speciation on that particular type of pollutant, and that picks up the hazardous air pollutants. So this does not address that. It does not really address air toxins.

From what I can understand, this is pretty complex. They did two, have monitoring criteria from the point in Chandler where the freeway -- where 202 will meet I-10 and around on the other side. Those end points, they have carbon monoxide monitoring numbers. Although it is not in tons, it is just saying they meet the standard and that's not enough information. And then they have no monitoring or estimated numbers for all along the community, and that information is actually easy to gather.

All you have to do, if you estimate vehicle miles traveled and put these particulate types of pollutants into a modeling program and it comes up with tonnage. So I know they have the information. They just did not express it in the way that they should have. This is very, very basic
1 information because it affects public health on a
2 level that is unimaginable.
3             I know Maricopa County, City of Phoenix,
4 they have met a number of EPA standards. They have
5 made some progress, but there's a few that they
6 haven't met, and I do need to gather more information
7 on that. But it seems like Phoenix pretty much does
8 the minimal amount to meet those standards. They
9 could do more. It's not easy, but it's based on
10 health standards, federal health standards, and it
11 seems like they never go beyond the minimum.
12             And I know they've been threatened with
13 sanctions, and it seems like that's the only time
14 they move forward. And to me that indicates more of
15 an economic concern rather than a health concern, so.
16             And as far as where they discussed
17 benefits, impacts, social economic environmental
18 impacts, that was all done for the other side, not
19 for the Gila River side. Especially what really
20 upsets me is no mention of health impacts. I mean,
21 in a way, they are addressed because those standards
22 of pollutants are based on federal numbers,
23 measurements, and anything beyond certain levels has
24 these impacts spelled out.
25             Well, we don't know the tonnage, so we
1 can't estimate what those health impacts might be.
2 And that's kind of a simplified way to say it, but
3 I've been out of the loop for a while, but there are
4 some basics that I do know. And after being told
5 they would be addressed and to not have it in there I
6 think is really disrespectful and a slap in the face
7 to Gila River, and this is why one reason this is so
8 controversial.
9 And I know this is going to be built.
10 I've known from the beginning, but I just thought it
11 would be done in a way where the information would be
12 out there for residents of Phoenix, but the residents
13 of Gila River, I just don't understand why we are not
14 allowed the same information that is provided to all
15 the other freeway environmental impact studies that
16 have been done in the past.
17 So I know a lot of people view the City
18 of Phoenix as the 2,000 pound gorilla, you know, when
19 it comes to economic development and a lot of things.
20 And this kind of supports that, as much as I hate to
21 say it, but...
22 And then as far as cultural, I will let a
23 lot of these other people address that because I
24 think they are more knowledgeable than I am, so I
25 don't need to go into that. And as far as direct
1 impact on water quality, on wildlife, that is also
2 information that will be addressed more in-depth from
3 one of the departments in Gila River.
4 So our comments as a whole different
5 environmental program have been submitted, and they
6 will be reviewed by the higher-ups before they are
7 released as official statements. In the meantime, I
8 think it would have been good to have a lot of this
9 information out so people would know the right
10 questions to ask so that they would insist upon
11 answers.
12 And my familiarity with public hearings
13 where you actually have to do the legal requirements,
14 which you guys are doing right here, and the fact
15 that there's no question-and-answer, you know, I
16 realized that's how it was going to be. I was kind
17 of hoping they might tweak that a little bit, but, I
18 mean, I'm kind of at a loss for words just because I
19 was so surprised at what I read -- or I should say
20 what I didn't read, what should have been there.
21 Actually, when I did park here and I saw
22 those kids out there, I was just thinking in the
23 future how they will be impacted by this. I know one
24 of the benefits for the freeway is like
25 transportation of emergency vehicles and stuff like

---

At the public hearing, in addition to the public hearing room (Ballroom 3), and the project video (Ballroom 1), information, resources, and staff were set up in an open house style format in Ballroom 2. Several copies of the Draft Environmental Impact Statement document were available for review; 63 banners explaining the participation process, the Draft Environmental Impact Statement, and the next steps were displayed; approximately 25 staff members were available to answer questions; computer stations were set up to accommodate online comments; comment cards were provided at tables for written comments; and court reporters were available to record verbal comments.
that. I know they're going to have, oh, what do you call that, the roads on either side of the freeway?
Service roads. And that will, you know, be part of the benefit, but then it also came to mind that, okay, you're making it easier for emergency vehicles, which is a good thing because you're probably going to be out here a lot picking up little kids that have asthma attacks in reality.

The rate of diabetes, which pollution does affect, the rate of asthma of course is extremely high out here. A lot of people know that. So they kind of get lost in the big picture when it comes to that. And that's -- they should have the priority, the little kids, of impacts to them.

And I think another issue is, there's a lot of people around right now, community members that remember when Interstate 10 was built. And I've always heard that they weren't paid fair market value for some of the land. I don't know if that's true. At one particular meeting, ADOT was asked to provide numbers of how much were they paid back in the early '60s, and they had a number, but then you hear different people say, no, we only got this or that.

So that's really not something I can make a comment on because I just don't know. But one
1 thing is the people that do have the memory of that,  
and I was surprised to hear this, we were promised  
frontage roads. We were promised more exits when  
that was built. We're still waiting for the frontage  
rails. People remember that because they've been  
here for generations. And that information, you  
know, it's passed down and it pisses people off.  
They remember because the people here live here for  
years and their children and their children.  
And a lot of these people here, they  
didn't grow up here. Their parents still live here.  
Their grandparents live here and great, great  
grandparents live here, and that's why it's become so  
personal, and I think that's something that a lot of  
people don't realize and they don't see it this way.  
Well, maybe five, ten years, you know,  
maybe you'll move to wherever. Maybe I will too, but  
most of the people here don't. They stay and they  
remember. I'm going to make some silly sarcastic  
comments, but I better not. This is official.  
But anyway, I think those are my main  
points, just to include the basic information. And I  
really would like to ask directly the people that,  
the engineers monitoring, overseers, whatever, are  
they going to have that in the final draft? I know
they're not. I just know they're not. But I just want them to know we were told they were, and that is one reason that people are weary of things, one of many reasons.

And then it does go into how this will benefit the Phoenix area. Sure it's going to relieve congestion, it's going to reduce air pollution. Well that's great if you're on the other side of the mountain, that's really great, but here we're not.

And whenever you talk about this kind of thing, casinos always come up into the mix, so I don't know. It seems like, well, you guys have those casinos. Like we're not allowed to complain about anything because we have casinos. That gets kind of old.

There's a number of people out here, whether you want to call them activists or just concerned people. I consider myself a concerned resident, not really an activist because I'm kind of too lazy, but they're getting a lot of the kids involved. And I think I would like to see more of the other side, you know, not just the emotional so those kids can actually have scientific background to back up what they're so passionate about. So maybe in the future we'll have more of that, but right now

The Arizona Department of Transportation and Federal Highway Administration identified several issues and concerns that were frequently noted by commenters. Responses to these issues can be found in the Responses to Frequently Submitted Public Comments beginning on page B733 of this appendix.
just to see the kids expressing themselves, having a voice, that's really great.

I think something that's kind of scary about all of this and the controversy that comes with it for a lot of tribal members out here, this is like the last straw. So I don't know how that's going to affect things in the future, but just wanted to get that out there. I'm not saying it's the last straw.

You're not going to see me laying in the freeway or laying in front of a bulldozer that's trying to, you know, but no promises there won't be other people doing it.

And actually, the model that they used, this Mobile 6 model where they figure out no pollutants, you know, measurements like that and vehicle miles traveled, blah, blah, blah, we used that same model to do our emissions inventory for the Interstate 10. And specifically I didn't do it, but it's been done. And it wasn't contracted out, air quality personnel did it themselves, and they happen to have a lot of experience with other jurisdictions outside, so they pretty much know what they're doing as far as technical and policy issues because they go hand-in-hand, you know.

Don't even get me started on Arizona's
politics. I won't mention Jan Brewer's name, but you
know what I mean. So air quality here does have
familiarity with the type of technology used when
figuring emissions. And I do know that these
calculations are also done on projected situations
like better quality gas, better mileage for vehicles,
you know, that kind of thing. And that is
technically, yeah, you do want to include that
information, but the way it is right now, I think
that's all people see. They're not going to sit
back, well, 35 years from now, things will be better,
you know. You can't do that. Nobody really wants to
do that.

I mean, it just in many ways, it doesn't
make sense, but I do know that is information you
have to include when you're figuring these things
out. So I do understand that's part of it, but the
assessment does make those assumptions, but they are
assumptions and not based on the way things are now.

And people are also curious, I am too,
about what classification on air quality that this
Gila River -- okay, I know I'm rambling here, but we
currently have what's considered clean air based on
three years of monitoring data which is a federal
requirement. How is that going to impact it? Are we
1. now going to be considered nonattainment dirty air area? How will that affect economic development? 
2. There is a direct relationship that really affects that, and Phoenix has had the upper hand on that for years. Finally got that changed. I could go into a lot of other things, but it gives me a headache, so...

   And currently we don't do emissions testing based on the fact that the air is considered clean out here, and I do believe all that will change. Even where Phoenix might have monitors for different pollutants that do meet the standard, once that air is trapped between the mountains, that's going to change. I don't care what anyone says, that is going to change. So that is another thing that residents of the community, I'm sure they will be required to do emissions testing because right now they don't.

   One thing I would like to mention is that Gila River Environmental Department, we've always had a good relationship with the state and the county and federal PA people. We've had a good relationship, and that has helped a lot because many, many tribes do not have a good relationship with the state, where we actually did play well together and we have worked
1 together on different projects. So it is not
2 something personal, you know. It is all about policy
3 and my opinion of what is fair.
4 Another thing I want to mention, as far
5 as environmental issues or conditions that were out
6 here at one time, a lot of the elders remember when
7 the rivers were around, Gila River and Salt River.
8 They remember the wildlife. They remember all of the
9 fields that were growing. They remember all of that.
10 And in a very short period of time, it's gone. And,
11 you know, I understand that Phoenix is a city. It's
12 growing, but to be honest, I had no idea this would
13 happen because I always thought it's so hot there.
14 Who would want to move to Phoenix? And what am I
15 doing, I'm back in the Valley.
16 But I guess my main point is, even myself
17 just in talking to my mother, she lives in District 7
18 right near where the Salt River once was, and she
19 tells stories about swimming there every single day
20 and hauling watermelons on the horse so they'd have
21 something to eat. I mean, just these amazing
22 scenarios that I can't even imagine.
23 And the elders, there's less and less of
24 them. So many of us have no clue of what it was like
25 on a personal level. We see old pictures, we hear
stories, but it's gone and that's in a very short period of time. And a lot of natural resources that are now gone were directly tied to cultural elements. And I think that's another thing that people don't understand is how many ceremonial cultural things still take place here. I think many of them don't believe it because to be honest, people more or less remember the negative, the native people that they see wherever in the city. It's not always pretty. That's what they know. And they have no idea that so many ceremonial cultural events still happen and they're still important. People just have no clue. And I would go into some of those, but I really don't think this is the place to do that as far as public comments, but I just want people to realize it's there. They're probably never going to see it, but they need to know these are there. After this is over and you have all of these comments, and you're going to have a lot of them, not just here but from Ahwatukee, Phoenix, environmental clubs, industry, whatever, the process I think people know they are aware they may feel that what I'm saying right now isn't going to make a damn bit of difference. That state environmental impact statement is not going to be realized based on what
one person is saying, and that's a little bit
upsetting because you feel you have all of this
passion about something, but deep down you realize
nothing's going to change and that's upsetting, so...
Subject: Against the South Mountain Freeway

To: Projects

Sent: Friday, May 17, 2013 5:04 PM

From: Mike Treacy [mailto:treacy@asu.edu]

-----Original Message-----

I do not support the proposed South Mountain Freeway.

(1) That valley is beautiful and scenic at present. I like it unspoiled.

(2) Making it even easier to access Phoenix by car can only worsen the traffic density downtown.

(3) Smog in winter in the valley is already unhealthy. There are certain days when the kids in my daughter's school (Awakening See in South Phoenix) were not allowed to play outside because of poor air quality.

(4) I would prefer you to focus more on ways to reduce the number of single-passenger cars. I like the new downtown tram system. I would prefer you to put your resources into that project, which potentially serves more people.

You do a great job designing and maintaining the roads in the valley. I am impressed. I am not persuaded that another artery into Phoenix is needed. I sense that this movement is driven by residents of West Ahwatukee who do not like having to travel East to the I10 in order to get around South Mountain. The freeway will reduce their commute time, but the rest of the Valley will not be served so well.

Sincerely

Mike Treacy
Resident of South Tempe.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Comment Document</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

From: Projects  
To: ADOT  
Subject: FW: Build the South Mountain Freeway  
Date: Tuesday, May 14, 2013 9:46:48 AM

-----Original Message-----  
From: aptrejo_2@juno.com [mailto:aptrejo_2@juno.com]  
Sent: Friday, May 10, 2013 4:24 PM  
To: Projects  
Subject: Build the South Mountain Freeway

We support the South Mtn Frwy project.  
Al & Pat Trejo  
4726 E. Florian Circle  
Mesa, Az. 85206

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/professional 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.
From: Projects
To: ADOT
Subject: FW: Let us to the 202!

Date: Wednesday, May 15, 2013 3:41:50 PM

-----Original Message-----
From: Leo Trinidad [mailto:ltrini@aol.com]
Sent: Wednesday, May 15, 2013 3:34 PM
To: Projects
Subject: Let us to the 202!

BUILD THE 202 FREEWAY NOW...
After moving and making the Phoenix area as my family's permanent residence since 1987 we have witnessed the transformation of Phoenix from a small city to a major city that requires big city infrastructure facilities.

The smoothly functioning I-17 is a product of proper transportation planning and execution of long term transportation planning. MAG and ADOT have proven it in the past, the 202 freeway will be another good news from ADOT in the future.

Therefore let us build the 202 freeway NOW!

I-17 freeway was slowly

Confidentiality and Nondisclosure Notice: This email transmission and any attachments are intended for use by the person(s)/entity(s) 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.
TELEPHONE CONVERSATION RECORD
SOUTH MOUNTAIN FREEWAY INFORMATION LINE

INCOMING CALL
DATE: 5/16/13
TIME: 12:14 PM
CALLER: LEE TURNER
CALLER ADDRESS: 838 EAST DAVA DRIVE, TEMPE, AZ 85283
PHONE: EMAIL:

CALLER REMARKS/QUESTIONS:
I am calling in support of the South Mountain Freeway construction. Thank you.

Comment noted.
From: Projects
To: ADOT
Subject: FW: Comment on the proposed Loop 202 extension
Date: Tuesday, June 18, 2013 11:42:29 AM

Thank you,
Felicia Beltran
Senior Community Relations Officer
1655 W Jackson St. MD 126F
Phoenix, AZ 85007
602-319-7709
azdot.gov

From: Tuszynski, Ron S [mailto:ron.s.tuszynski@intel.com]
Sent: Tuesday, June 18, 2013 10:59 AM
To: Projects
Subject: Comment on the proposed Loop 202 extension

AZ DOT,

I live in the Ahwatukee Foothills and am one of many that oppose the build out of the Loop 202. I do not believe the environmental impact study is complete and I do not think this benefits the residents of Ahwatukee at all. I am very concerned about the air pollution, noise pollution and the drop in property values that this extension will produce. There are multiple schools that will be impacted by the noise/air pollution. I urge you to reconsider building out the extension at all when it will only benefit truckers who will detour out of the city to connect to I-10 on the east side. We do not need it and cannot afford it!

Respectfully,
Ron Tuszynski

Confidentiality and Nondisclosure Notice: This email transmission and any attachments are intended for use by the persons/organization named above and may contain confidential/confidential information. Any unauthorized use, disclosure or distribution or opening of this email or any contents or attachments is strictly prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient, please contact the sender by email, and delete or destroy all copies plus attachments.

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Purpose and Need, Lack of Support</td>
<td>The Arizona Department of Transportation and Federal Highway Administration identified several issues and concerns that were frequently noted by commenters. Responses to these issues can be found in the Responses to Frequently Submitted Public Comments beginning on page B733 of this appendix.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Air Quality</td>
<td>A review of the literature reveals few detailed and comprehensive analyses of the relationship between the transportation infrastructure and residential property values (Transportation Research Record: Journal of the Transportation Research Board, No. 2174, Transportation Research Board of the National Academies, Washington, D.C., 2010, pp. 138–47, “Impact of Highways on Property Values: Case Study of the Superstition Freeway Corridor”). A recent study by the California Department of Transportation concluded that freeway facilities did not substantially affect sales prices in residential areas adjacent to the facility. The study concluded that it is the visibility of the freeway that may influence selling price and not distance or noise. As a result, the researchers generally concluded that the more the visibility of a new freeway is reduced, the less it would determine the sales price of homes sold in the area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Noise</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Economics, Socioeconomics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Health Effects</td>
<td>The Arizona Department of Transportation and Federal Highway Administration identified several issues and concerns that were frequently noted by commenters. Responses to these issues can be found in the Responses to Frequently Submitted Public Comments beginning on page B733 of this appendix.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Purpose and Need, Truck Bypass</td>
<td>The proposed project is part of the Regional Transportation Plan for the Maricopa Association of Governments region. In 2004, the voters of Maricopa County approved the Regional Transportation Plan and the extension of a half-cent sales tax to fund its projects. The funding for the right-of-way acquisition and construction of the proposed project would come from a combination of federal (National Highway Performance Program) and County (half-cent sales tax, also known as Regional Area Road Funds) sources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Issue</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Comment noted.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TELEPHONE CONVERSATION RECORD**
**SOUTH MOUNTAIN FREEWAY INFORMATION LINE**

**INCOMING CALL DATE:** 5/20/13  
**INCOMING CALL TIME:** 3:52 PM  
**CALLER:** WILLIAM ULLOA  
**CALLER ADDRESS:** 3323 E. MALAPAI DRIVE, PHOENIX, ARIZONA 85028  
**PHONE:** EMAIL:  

**CALLER REMARKS/QUESTIONS:**
Hi, I do support the new freeway along Pecos Boulevard. I happen to be in the transit area of the 51 going north. And even though I am close, I think it’s for the betterment of entire city and county that the freeway goes through as soon as possible. It has been on the drawing board for a long time. I feel bad for those people but no one felt bad for me up here at 32nd and Shay and it hasn’t really hurt that much. Thank you. Goodbye.
I would like to see the bridge at 32nd Street eliminated. Without a Traffic Interchange there and no access to the freeway, I would prefer to see 32nd street just dead end. I have experienced enough crime that can enter our neighborhoods from the reservation (from other connections and personal experience into the City). I don't want future access to the reservation from my neighborhood. Having future access from 40th street and 24th street is enough.

The bridge at 32nd Street is included to allow potential access to land south of the freeway.
From: Projects
To: ADOT
Subject: FW: Build the South Mountain Freeway
Date: Tuesday, May 14, 2013 9:46:48 AM

-----Original Message-----
From: Frank [mailto:frankcarol2001@cox.net]
Sent: Friday, May 10, 2013 1:19 PM
To: Projects
Cc: info@buildthe202.com
Subject: Build the South Mountain Freeway

I am a retired Maricopa County public works street maint. Superintendent and agree this freeway is way overdue in being built and should get started right away. I would enjoy being part of a discussion or focus group to start discussions with Indian tribe and its leaders to start this project and get the ball rolling. Thank You. Frank Urquiza

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.
I feel this 202 freeway is long overdue, and should be built. I was born and raised in the west valley and have seen the growth throughout the valley with most of it on the north and east side of the valley and very little done on the west side of Maricopa County. As we go into the future traffic will continually get worse on the freeway and this 202 freeway will allow traffic to continuous flow eliminating traffic problems, accidents, pollution, etc. thanks you.

Frank Urquiza
From: Gary Usinger  
To: Projects  
Subject: 202 extension  
Date: Thursday, June 20, 2013 9:18:05 PM  

I am for the extension...it will help with the current flow of traffic and give people alternate routes to get out of this funnel called ahwatukee  

Gary Usinger  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Comment noted.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**TELEPHONE CONVERSATION RECORD**

**SOUTH MOUNTAIN FREEWAY INFORMATION LINE**

- **DATE:** 5/17/13
- **TIME:** 3:35 PM
- **CALLER:** KEMP USRY
- **CALLER ADDRESS:** 5503 CAYA DE SANTO RIOS, PHOENIX, AZ 85018
- **PHONE:**
- **EMAIL:**

**CALLER REMARKS/QUESTIONS:**
I am in support of the new freeway.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Comment noted.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. **Alternatives, No-Action (No-Build) Alternative**
   - The Arizona Department of Transportation and Federal Highway Administration identified several issues and concerns that were frequently noted by commenters. Responses to these issues can be found in the Responses to Frequently Submitted Public Comments beginning on page B733 of this appendix.

2. **Purpose and Need, Old Plan or Use of Old Data**
   - The proposed freeway is part of the Regional Transportation Plan for the Maricopa Association of Governments region. The Regional Transportation Plan, as described on pages 1-5 and 1-10 of the Draft Environmental Impact Statement, addresses freeways, streets, transit, airports, bicycle and pedestrian facilities, freight, demand management, system management, and safety. The proposed freeway is only one part of the overall multimodal transportation system planned to meet the travel demand needs of the Maricopa Association of Governments region.

3. **Alternatives, Nonfreeway Alternatives**
   - The Arizona Department of Transportation and Federal Highway Administration identified several issues and concerns that were frequently noted by commenters. Responses to these issues can be found in the Responses to Frequently Submitted Public Comments beginning on page B733 of this appendix.

4. **Section 4(f) and Section 6(f)**

---

1. **THE FACILITATOR**: Thank you. Jim Vaaler.
2. **MR. VAALER**: Yeah, thank you for the opportunity to speak, just got basically two words for you, no-build. I think the purpose and need for this freeway is outdated. I think you could improve existing infrastructure and use mass transit in place of this freeway.
3. My other concern is the intrusion this potential freeway would have on South Mountain Park. I think you set a very bad precedent by proposing to build it in the park. Any deletion from the park, I mean, 30 acres is unacceptable. Those are the two points I'd like to make.
4. **THE FACILITATOR**: Thank you.
5. **MR. WEEKS**: Good afternoon, my name is Larry Weeks. I'm in the 85048 zip code, specifically in the Lakewood and Ahwatukee area. And my concerns are the increase in noise and increase in pollutants.

---

**Driver and Nix Court Reporters - (602) 266-6525**
**www.drivernix.com**
From: Projects
To: ADOT
Subject: FW: Build the 202 South Mountain Freeway.
Date: Monday, May 20, 2013 10:51:25 AM

Please build this freeway. The metropolitan area need it desperately.

Patricia Vachon
Honeywell International
HPS Technical Assistance Center Manager
Desk: 602-293-1720
Cell: 602-300-5451
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From: Projects
To: ADOT
Subject: FW: Loop 202
Date: Thursday, May 16, 2013 8:14:12 AM

From: Mary Ann [mailto:maryannvail@aol.com]
Sent: Thursday, May 16, 2013 7:26 AM
To: Projects
Subject: Loop 202

I feel very strongly that the South Mountain Freeway needs to be built.
Thank you for your consideration.

Mary Ann Vail
8934 East Calle Buena Vista
Scottsdale, AZ 85255
Antonio Valdovinos

I support the 202 because we need a hospital in our area, lets save lives in the long run

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Comment noted.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Draft Environmental Impact Statement describes a decade-long consultation and coordination effort led by the Arizona Department of Transportation and the Federal Highway Administration with the Gila River Indian Community and other Native American tribes. As a result of the consultation, the cultural importance of the South Mountains is acknowledged in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement in several locations, notably page 5-26. The proposed project would accommodate and preserve (to the fullest extent possible from the available alternatives) access to the South Mountains for religious practices.

Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act requires a government-to-government relationship between the Federal Government and Indian tribes as described beginning on page 4-140 of the Final Environmental Impact Statement. Section 106 requires federal agencies take into account the effects of their undertakings on historic properties and requires consultation with tribal authorities. Consultation has occurred with Gila River Indian Community government officials, the Tribal Historic Preservation Officer, the Cultural Resource Management Program, other tribes, and the State Historic Preservation Office and has led to concurrence from the Gila River Indian Community Tribal Historic Preservation Office and the State Historic Preservation Office on National Register of Historic Places eligibility recommendations (including traditional cultural properties like the South Mountains), project effects, and proposed mitigation and measures to minimize harm. This consultation has been ongoing and will continue until any commitments in a record of decision are completed.

The section entitled Title VI and Environmental Justice, beginning on page 4-29 in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement, presents acceptable methods, data, and assumptions to assess the potential for disproportionately high and adverse effects from the proposed action on environmental justice populations and disproportionate impacts to populations protected under Title VI. Based on the content of the section, no such effects would result from the action alternatives.

In light of comments received on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement, the above-referenced conclusions were confirmed in the preparation of the Final Environmental Impact Statement. To provide further clarity, the discussions of environmental justice and Title VI were separated and additional text explaining the relationship of environmental justice and Title VI to various environmental elements was added throughout Chapter 4, Affected Environment, Environmental Consequences, and Mitigation, as exemplified by the inserted text on page 4-29 of the Final Environmental Impact Statement.

The Arizona Department of Transportation and Federal Highway Administration identified several issues and concerns that were frequently noted by commenters. Responses to these issues can be found in the Responses to Frequently Submitted Public Comments beginning on page B733 of this appendix.
had a meeting for the, you know, Loop 202 in Phoenix.
And there was a lot of people that I know from the
reservation who went and attended that, who were opposing
against it, outside with signs and banners.
And, in the article that I read, it had nothing to
do with Gila River and how it will affect the people who were
there protesting against it. And it had no -- Like, it sort of
makes it sound like it's something good, like it's a positive
thing.
And there's nothing -- There's nothing in the --
you know, in the visual aid and in the research, that they
haven't put who -- like, the air quality, like, what scientists
and, like, who proved that. And, like, it just doesn't really
seen like reliable information that they would put out. So I
don't know.
But, again, I would just like to say that this
freeway would violate my civil rights as a person. And that's
it.
### Environmental Justice/Lifestyle

The Draft Environmental Impact Statement describes a decade-long consultation and coordination effort led by the Arizona Department of Transportation and the Federal Highway Administration with the Gila River Indian Community and other Native American tribes. As a result of the consultation, the cultural importance of the South Mountains is acknowledged in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement in several locations, notably page 5-26. The proposed project would accommodate and preserve (to the fullest extent possible from the available alternatives) access to the South Mountains for religious practices.

Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act requires a government-to-government relationship between the Federal Government and Indian tribes as described beginning on page 4-140 of the Final Environmental Impact Statement. Section 106 requires federal agencies take into account the effects of their undertakings on historic properties and requires consultation with tribal authorities. Consultation has occurred with Gila River Indian Community government officials, the Tribal Historic Preservation Officer, the Cultural Resource Management Program, other tribes, and the State Historic Preservation Office and has led to concurrence from the Gila River Indian Community Tribal Historic Preservation Office and the State Historic Preservation Office on National Register of Historic Places eligibility recommendations (including traditional cultural properties like the South Mountains), project effects, and proposed mitigation and measures to minimize harm. This consultation has been ongoing and will continue until any commitments in a record of decision are completed.

The section entitled **Title VI and Environmental Justice**, beginning on page 4-29 in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement, presents acceptable methods, data, and assumptions to assess the potential for disproportionately high and adverse effects from the proposed action on environmental justice populations and disparate impacts to populations protected under Title VI. Based on the content of the section, no such effects would result from the action alternatives.

In light of comments received on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement, the above-referenced conclusions were confirmed in the preparation of the Final Environmental Impact Statement. To provide further clarity, the discussions of environmental justice and Title VI were separated and additional text explaining the relationship of environmental justice and Title VI to various environmental elements was added throughout Chapter 4, **Affected Environment, Environmental Consequences, and Mitigation**, as exemplified by the inserted text on page 4-29 of the Final Environmental Impact Statement.

### Cultural Resources

The Arizona Department of Transportation and Federal Highway Administration identified several issues and concerns that were frequently noted by commenters. Responses to these issues can be found in the Responses to Frequently Submitted Public Comments beginning on page B733 of this appendix.
The Loop 202 (South Mountain Freeway) project will create 30,000 jobs during the five to six year construction period and result in a $2 billion investment in the Phoenix-area economy. Not only will the project create numerous jobs and become investment to the Phoenix area, the money to build the freeway is in the budget.

I believe it is time to build the Loop 202 (South Mountain Freeway). Valley commuters have waited long enough.

Tiffany Van Cleave

Code Comment Document

Code Issue Response

1

Comment noted.
Thank you,

Salina Tovar
Community Relations Officer
1655 W. Jackson St.
MD 126F, Room 170
Phoenix, AZ 85007
602.712.4629
azdot.gov

From: joelvandesande@gmail.com [mailto:joelvandesande@gmail.com]
On Behalf Of Joel van de Sande
Sent: Wednesday, July 24, 2013 11:15 AM
To: Projects
Subject: NO LOOP 202

In Arizona, we have an urban-sprawl problem and we are also in an economic depression. Yet you along with MAG, the Federal Highway Administration, corporate & developmental interests want to build an unneeded, polluting, and destructive freeway extension through the sacred mountain: Muhadag Do’ag (South Mountain).

There are many issues with the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS), which has taken too long to produce in the first place. Plus, this project is an incredible waste of money.

Joel van de Sande
It is time to build the South Mountain Freeway. Valley commuters have waited in traffic jams long enough. Based on the traffic studies in the Draft EIS, this will greatly help commute times in a busy area of roads.

The freeway will cut traffic congestion across the metro area, reduce air pollution, and save drivers time and money.

64.3% of likely voters in Maricopa County support construction of the freeway according to the results of a new poll commissioned by We Build Arizona. Just 19.6 percent said they were either opposed or likely to oppose the project.

In a separate survey, also commissioned by We Build Arizona, 59 percent of likely voters living in Ahwatukee and Laveen support the freeway as well.

If we don’t build the South Mountain freeway, traffic in the region will get much worse over the next two decades. According to ADOT’s own study:

- Traffic on I-10 between Ahwatukee and Goodyear will grow 28%
- Another 103,000 cars will use the Broadway Curve each day
- Another 38,000 cars will jam the Tunnel every day
- Morning and evening commute times will increase 39% to 82%
- Traffic congestion on city streets will increase 46%

The same report indicates the project also will reduce air pollution by reducing the time vehicles spend stuck in traffic.

The project will create 30,000 jobs during the five to six year construction period and result in a $2 billion investment in the Phoenix-area economy.

The money to build the freeway is in the budget. It was approved by voters twice, first in 1985 and again in 2004.

There is no more important project to the area’s commuters and workers than the South Mountain Freeway project. We must build it now.
From: Rory.VanDenBerg@kiewit.com [mailto:Rory.VanDenBerg@kiewit.com]  
Sent: Monday, May 20, 2013 5:34 AM  
To: Projects  
Subject: Loop 202 South Mountain Freeway Draft EIS.

Dear Sir or Madame,

The proposed completion of Loop 202 South Mountain Freeway has been part of the planned freeway system in Phoenix for over 30 years, and there is no better time to build it than now, so we can take care of traffic issues before they become bigger problems. I have read through the Draft EIS, and seeing the numerical data further reinforces my thoughts on completing Loop 202. Below are some key points to consider.

• It is time to build the South Mountain Freeway. Valley commuters have waited in traffic jams long enough.

• The freeway will cut traffic congestion across the metro area, reduce air pollution, and save drivers time and money.

• 64.3% of likely voters in Maricopa County support construction of the freeway according to the results of a new poll commissioned by We Build Arizona. Just 19.6 percent said they were either opposed or likely to oppose the project.

• In a separate survey, also commissioned by We Build Arizona, 59 percent of likely voters living in Ahwatukee and Laveen support the freeway as well.

• If we don’t build the South Mountain freeway, traffic in the region will get much worse over the next two decades. According to ADOT’s own study:
  • Traffic on I-10 between Ahwatukee and Goodyear will grow 28%
  • Another 103,000 cars will use the Broadway Curve each day
  • Another 38,000 cars will jam the Tunnel every day
  • Morning and evening commute times will increase 39% to 82%
  • Traffic congestion on city streets will increase 46%

• The same report indicates the project also will reduce air pollution by reducing the time vehicles spend stuck in traffic.

• The project will create 30,000 jobs during the five to six year construction period and result in a $2 billion investment in the Phoenix-area economy.
The money to build the freeway is in the budget. It was approved by voters twice, first in 1985 and again in 2004.

There is no more important project to the area’s commuters and workers than the South Mountain Freeway project. We must build it now.

Thank you for your attention to this vital project to the Phoenix area,

Rory van den Berg
Citizen and construction employee in Phoenix

Comment noted.
Thank you,

Salina Tovar
Community Relations Officer
1555 W. Jackson St.
MD 126F, Room 170
Phoenix, AZ 85007
602.712.4629
azdot.gov

From: Jill Van Dierendonck [mailto:jill.vandierendonck@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, July 23, 2013 10:10 AM
To: Projects
Subject: Proposed South Mountain Freeway Routes

I am completely opposed to the E1 Alternative route for the proposed South Mountain Freeway. I have lived in Ahwatukee for more than 12 years, and have listened and watched the debate over this freeway extension project the entire time. This road path may have made sense when planners looked at an aerial map of the Valley in the early 1980s...but it certainly is a bad idea today. It is inconceivable to me that responsible area leaders hope to displace homeowners, schools, churches, an efficient local travel road...and destroy a beautiful and sacred mountain range...to enable interstate truck traffic to bypass downtown Phoenix. I know...the "pro" arguments also say this freeway is needed so people can travel from the far East Valley to the West Valley and vice versa. Really? Both the U.S. 60 and the existing 202/I-10 routes seem to work pretty well for this. Transportation planners really need to STOP negatively impacting our air quality and natural resources with highway/freeway designs like this.

NO on the 202.
NO on the Pecos Road alignment.
NO on ANY destruction of South Mountain.
NO to increased interstate truck traffic in my neighborhood.
NO to destroying homes, churches, and schools.
NO to harming and destroying wildlife habitat.

Jill Van Dierendonck
16821 S. 11th Way
From: psn0ball@aol.com [mailto:psn0ball@aol.com]
Sent: Sunday, May 12, 2013 7:34 AM
To: Projects; "<projects"@azdot.gov
Subject: 202 loop

I feel that the proposed route to I 10 and 59th Ave hook up is a bad idea as it will add to traffic jams on I 10 at that point.
I advise that the loop take the W101 alternative and be a straight shot north. I realize that pressure is attached to the 59th as people want to be closer to downtown in their commute, however, that can be obtained by adding a expressway up 59th Ave to I 10 with limited access at every mile. A mini freeway.
But until all this stuff is dealt with maybe make a deal with the Reservation about a toll road connecting the casino and 51st. going past the casino. A 2 lane short cut other than the long round about one travels now to the South.

Phoil Van Dyke

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.
MR. VAN DYKE: I'm all for a loop. I'm all for a loop, okay? But as long as it is -- that it is a loop. And -- and the 51st and fifty -- I mean the 59th and the 71st alternatives are not a loop. They -- they desecrate the idea of having a loop by -- by cutting it short, which will make -- make for congestion on I-10 considerable at those points.

Where traffic is going to come in and then it's going to go east or west on I-10, they're not going to widen I-10, so you're going to have a mess. And anybody that lives out west and uses the 10 to come into town is going to be very upset, you know, because they're going to have to wait a lot more time in traffic, you know, and burn a lot more gas.

Whereas, I hear now that the reason why they don't want to use the 101 -- I guess it's the 101 alternative, whatever the wide one is, the wide one here, yeah, the W-101 -- is that it would cut Tolleson in half and then they'd have to take out 1300 homes, versus 59th Avenue, which is only, like, 53 homes, 53 houses or something like that, which would save them a lot of money.

But it's -- But it's going to increase congestion on I-10 considerably. If you've been to California, you know that any time two freeways meet, what the congestion is like, you know, any time of day. Okay? The -- So I say that, you know, they have to somehow keep the -- keep the Loop 202 being a loop. That's why we designed a loop, is to keep the traffic...
from getting inside of town and congesting the town.

Any traffic going east or west, in other words, if
you have a semi truck or something like that going east and
west, you don't want to go through town because it's going to
slow you down. And if you go -- If you use the 59th -- If
you're going to use the 59th Corridor that they have planned,
you're going to have to get back on the I-10 in the middle of
town again, you know. And it's going to be -- There's going to
be even more congestion there than if it was down at the 101,
where a lot of traffic could either go north and then -- and
also west.

And all I know is that the 59th Avenue and
71st Avenue are -- are bad plans because it's not part of the
loop.

And I do say that we need to make 59th Avenue an
expressway, where, like, if you live north of town here, you go
up 51st Avenue, it gets to three lanes. But you have every --
every street comes in on it. Well, you need to not do that on
an expressway. You -- Only like on Dobbins and Elliott and the
major roads, you know, that are one mile apart would be the
access to the expressway, so there wouldn't be congestion
slowing down traffic between the lights.

And, that way, the Ahwatukee people, that want to
go around the mountain that way, can get downtown faster. But
we still need to keep the loop a loop.
I even made a comment, over there with the reservation people, is that the reservation needs to continue their four-lane road that goes past their casino there, the Vee Quiva or whatever it is, and take it down to Pecos Road, for now, because this is going to take years and years to build, and make it a toll road. That way, you know, a person can pay $2 to shortcut, to get from 51st Avenue to Pecos and get into Tempe for $2, versus having to go all the way through their town, which is 35 miles an hour, go all the way down to the -- go all the way down to the road that goes to Maricopa, and then come back into town that way, which would save a lot of gas and time.

The reservation would make a lot of money and -- and drive right past their casino, for a refreshment break. I don't know.

It's -- it's -- I think there's a lot of money that needs to be spent on this, and it needs to be spent wisely, not just -- The cheapest route is not the best route, you know?

And in fifty years from now, it -- it'll remain the same. Gas will be a lot more expensive, and we'll have the same problems. And people are not going to want to spend money and gas, sitting in a car waiting for traffic, because we did it wrong now. So that's all.

MR. HAYES: Robert Hayes. I have my little notes,

Alternatives

The proposed freeway is part of a transportation system developed to improve mobility in the region by increasing capacity and providing alternatives to allow traffic—including truck traffic—to bypass already congested routes (see Final Environmental Impact Statement pages 1-21, 1-22, 3-1, and 3-3). Like other "loop" freeways in the Phoenix metropolitan area, the proposed South Mountain Freeway would be a commuter corridor, helping to move local traffic between the eastern and western portions of Maricopa County. The alternative proposed by the commenter is similar to the Riggs Road Alternative evaluated for the proposed project. The reasons this alternative was eliminated from further study are presented on page 3-9 of the Final Environmental Impact Statement. Further, the Gila River Indian Community opposes any concept that doesn't limit truck and commuter traffic through its land (see page 2-8 of the Final Environmental Impact Statement).
From: craig.vanengen
To: Projects
Subject: Support for the 202 loop project
Date: Sunday, May 26, 2013 1:06:06 PM

I live in Laveen and I would like to show my support for the loop 202 project. It will help our city and our state.

Thank you
Craig Van Engen
Laveen resident

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Comment noted.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
From: John Van Leuken [mailto:javanleuken@yahoo.com]  
Sent: Tuesday, May 21, 2013 12:50 PM  
To: Projects  
Subject: 202 support  

This e-mail is to express my feelings that either the Gila River tribe or ADOT get off the pot and build the freeway  

John & Audrey
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Comment Document</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
|      | **TELEPHONE CONVERSATION RECORD**  
**SOUTH MOUNTAIN FREEWAY INFORMATION LINE** |
|      | **INCOMING CALL**  
DATE: 05/15/13  
TIME: 9:09 AM  
CALLER: DENISE VANCE  
ADDRESS: 1101 E. WARNER ROAD, #134, TEMPE, AZ 85284  
PHONE: EMAIL: |
|      | **CALLER REMARKS/QUESTIONS:**  
I support the freeway. |
| 1    | **Code**  
**Issue**  
**Response** |
| 1    | Comment noted. |
TELEPHONE CONVERSATION RECORD
SOUTH MOUNTAIN FREEWAY INFORMATION LINE

INCOMING CALL
DATE: 7/23/13
TIME: 12:36 PM
CALLER: JAN VANDER ARC
CALLER ADDRESS: 2303 NORTH BULLMOOSE DRIVE, CHANDLER, ARIZONA
PHONE:
EMAIL:

CALLER REMARKS/QUESTIONS:
I approve of the proposed routing of the freeway.

1

Code Issue Response
1 Comment noted.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Comment Document</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Greg Vannoni</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I love the layout for the loop 202 expansion to support the greater Laveen area. It is obvious that, over the past decade, much work has been done to align the freeway to satisfy the communities that will gain the most benefit from this expansion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I know that a 202 expansion would help all commuters get between both east and west valley with less fuel and time consumption.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PLEASE BUILD THE FREEWAY!</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Comment noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Issue</td>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Comment noted.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From: Melinda Vasquez [mailto:MeVasquez@cenpatico.com]  
Sent: Friday, May 17, 2013 4:00 PM  
Subject: Support the 202 South Mountain Freeway

Please push this project through! We are bottle necking from Chandler and Ahwatukee to get in through the I-10 and with the 202, we could bypass that piece and cut down the traffic for both directions!

Melinda Vasquez  
Chief Officer  
Cultural & Community Affairs  
Cenpatico  
1501 W Fountainhead Parkway, Suite 360  
Tempe, AZ 85282  
866-495-6738 x26105 office | mevasquez@cenpatico.com  
480-317-6505 direct line  

WARNING: This is a Privileged and Confidential communication that is intended only for the listed recipient(s) of this message. Any unauthorized review, use, disclosure or distribution of any protected personal health information contained herein is prohibited by Arizona Revised Statutes §8-542, §36-441, and §41-1959 as well as by the Federal “HIPAA Security Rule” located at 45 CFR Part 160 and Subparts A and C of Part 164. If you believe you have received this message in error, please inform me immediately via e-mail at the address set forth above; destroy all printed copies; and permanently delete the communication from your system. Thank you.

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This communication contains information intended for the use of the individuals to whom it is addressed and may contain information that is privileged, confidential or exempt from other disclosure under applicable law. If you are not the intended recipient, you are notified that any disclosure, printing, copying, distribution or use of the contents is prohibited. If you have received this in error, please notify the sender immediately by telephone or by returning it by return mail and then permanently delete the communication from your system. Thank you.
how to protect their land, so I will stand on the side of protecting in any way that we can.

I'm with codepink.org. It's a national group. Okay. No build is the only option to conclude.

MR. VASQUEZ: My name is Roy Vasquez. I've been a resident of the Phoenix metropolitan area since 1978. I've experienced the massive infrastructure improvement of the highways during that period of time up until today and really see a need for -- for this project to go forward. More currently, I'm a resident of Laveen and will really feel the impact of this project to my family life and to the community that I live in.

One of the things that I'm in favor of is what it will do for the arterial roads improvement, the projected business improvement environment, also a much needed hospital project. That impacted me because several years ago, I had an appendix attack and I had to go way to Avondale to get that taken care of. So it will be more of a -- that was a personal viewpoint.

I think the routing from Pecos west through the South Mountain area is important. It will give a nice viewpoint for travelers. It will
make -- relieve all the traffic congestion that goes
through Interstate 10 through downtown. Having
experienced that traffic jam, this will really be an
improvement. Thank you very much.

MRS. HUGHES: Ray and Karen Hughes.
Well, we were just curious because of the wall is
probably going to be in our -- I mean, right -- we're
going to be right up against the wall, so we were
just curious how high it would be and, you know, is
it going to take the place of our -- our property
wall that's in the back or what the -- you know, how
loud is it going to be with it being right there, you
know.

MR. HUGHES: So right now, we see that
the alignment is -- they have the right-of-way line
is literally on our back property wall. And so we
were talking to the noise folks down here, and they
explained to us what they -- the study that they've
run and that it can be anywhere from 6 to 20 feet
tall. And we're just curious when those designs will
be finalized and how tall the wall will be and then
also how close it would be to a property wall.
That's all.

And then the other thing that we're very
interested in knowing is when will the decision be
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Comment Document</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>TELEPHONE CONVERSATION RECORD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SOUTH MOUNTAIN FREEWAY INFORMATION LINE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DATE</td>
<td>05/15/13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TIME</td>
<td>9:30 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CALLER</td>
<td>LINDA VEGA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADDRESS</td>
<td>1729 W. LARSON DRIVE, CHANDLER, AZ 85226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHONE</td>
<td>602-899-8363</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMAIL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CALLER REMARKS/QUESTIONS:**

I would like to inform you that I approve of the South Mountain Freeway. God bless you. Have a beautiful day. Bye.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Comment noted.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**TELEPHONE CONVERSATION RECORD**  
**SOUTH MOUNTAIN FREEWAY INFORMATION LINE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Incoming Call Date</th>
<th>Incoming Call Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>05/10/13</td>
<td>9:54 AM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Caller:** LILAH VEGA  
**Caller Address:** 1136 W. LYNNE LANE, PHOENIX, AZ 85041

**Caller Remarks/Questions:**  
I am a registered voter who supports the plans for the Loop 202 South Mountain Freeway.

**Response:**  
Comment noted.
and car ownership by young adults. Why, then, assume that patterns that held prior to 2005 will inevitably be repeated over the next few decades? Why not reinforce this positive trend toward diminished driving by enhancing transit, rather than building a freeway that may counteract the positive trend with an inducement to drive more?

Please don't destroy part of South Mountain on the basis of insufficient justification. I urge you to rethink this report and the freeway it recommends.

THE FACILITATOR: Thank you, Mr. Bickford.

Shana Velasquez.

MS. VELASQUIZ: Hi, thank you. I may not be as eloquent of a speaker as my speakers before me, but I'm here today as a mother that lives in Laveen. And we moved there originally four years ago because we were told there's going to be a lot more things that were going to be built, and so far that has not happened because we do not have the access to the 202. We can't have a hospital, we don't have a rec center, I have to drive my children 30 minutes just to, you know, take them to dance classes.

I personally work in Tempe, I used to work in North Scottsdale when I originally moved to Laveen and that takes me the same amount of time to get to Tempe as...
it took me to get all the way up to the Desert Ridge area, so I know that we need this 202. We need a hospital. When I gave birth to my son, it took me 40 minutes to get to the hospital just to be able to give birth. I mean, I understand about South Mountain, I love hiking, I'm a biker. I mean, when you do build the 202, we definitely want the bike route along it so we can have that access. We want sound-proof barriers, we want it to be pretty, we don't necessarily want to destroy South Mountain, but we also need to make some sacrifices in order to, you know, take into account all of the extra building that's going to be happening in Laveen shortly. We can't overlook the fact that all the growth is still going to be continuing within the next ten years, and now is our opportunity to be able to handle all the extra traffic, especially with the casino that will be opening in July. Thank you.

THE FACILITATOR: Thank you.

David Gironda. Did I pronounce that properly?

MR. GIRONDA: Gironda. I do have a written statement which I can give to the court reporter.

THE FACILITATOR: Thank you, Mr. Gironda.

Prem Goyal. Did I pronounce that name correctly? Is Prem Goyal in the auditorium?
The effort to keep traffic moving has another option. Begin farther south away from the City connect to the 1-10 west of the town Buckeye. We live in a valley, all the air pollution stays down in the valley. View this from Sunset Point coming south. People and commercial traffic needing to the I-10 only can avoid city traffic by beginning farther south and ending farther west. Cutting thru South Mountain is just ridiculous. Education and common sense HAS to meet somewhere is this project. Do you want a freeway next to your house? Or tear down a neighborhood unnecessary? Put the business and travel loop away from the city. Manifold the freeways away from residential areas and reduce the downtown traffic and air pollution. People who have a money interest will fight you all the way. Remember who bought property along the CAP canal before it was built he advised his family to purchase land there. This Senator is now retired. You and I wont make the decision, its the people higher up who’s strings are being pulled by special interest/investors. Air and traffic pollution don't mean a thing to them, they don't live here. All it takes is one hazardous cargo truck rolling over close to town to create a panic. A problem that could be avoided by directing that traffic away from town. Its called PREVENTION thinking and planning. Thank You.

The Arizona Department of Transportation, 2013, The Proposed freeway is not a business or travel loop. The proposed freeway is Alternatives

The study considered an alternative that would run along Interstate 8 in Casa Grande to State Route 85 from Gila Bend to Interstate 10 (see text on page 3-9 of the Draft Environmental Impact Statement). State Route 85 is currently being reconstructed as a four-lane, divided highway with limited-access control, and Interstate 8 is a four-lane, divided Interstate freeway with full access control. Existing signs at each terminus designate the route as a truck bypass of the metropolitan Phoenix area. This route would continue to be available for interstate and interregional travel, but it would not meet the proposed action purpose and need as part of a regional transportation network and, therefore, was eliminated from further consideration.

The Arizona Department of Transportation and Federal Highway Administration identified several issues and concerns that were frequently noted by commenters. Responses to these issues can be found in the Responses to Frequently Submitted Public Comments beginning on page B733 of this appendix.

According to the Arizona Department of Transportation, 2013, Air Quality Assessment South Mountain Freeway 202L Draft Report, review of wind data from the Gila River Indian Community monitoring site at St. Johns suggests that during the morning hours and associated with mountain-drainage air flows and stable atmospheric conditions, wind flows are from the southeast and follow the Gila River channel to the north. Locations to the east of St. Johns tend to flow from the east to the lower elevations along the Gila River. During the warmer hours’ improved mixing, flows typically follow the river channel and come from the north and northwest. Likewise, during a 1-month-long meteorological monitoring period (November 20, 2006, through December 21, 2006) at Pecos Road and 40th Street and a second 1-month-long monitoring period at Pecos Road and 24th and 40th streets (April 19, 2007, through May 21, 2007), winds during the morning hours typically were from the northeast. During the warmer hours, and with improved mixing, winds typically were from the west.

The Arizona Department of Transportation and Federal Highway Administration identified several issues and concerns that were frequently noted by commenters. Responses to these issues can be found in the Responses to Frequently Submitted Public Comments beginning on page B733 of this appendix.

Prospective home buyers and members of the church built after the freeway was conceived, according to State law, should have been informed of the proposed facility. (Sellers are obligated by Arizona common law to disclose all known material facts about a property to the buyer.)

The Proposed freeway is not a business or travel loop. The proposed freeway is needed to serve projected growth in population and accompanying transportation demand and to correct existing and projected transportation system deficiencies. See Chapter 1, Purpose and Need, in the Final Environmental Impact Statement.

The Arizona Department of Transportation and Federal Highway Administration identified several issues and concerns that were frequently noted by commenters. Responses to these issues can be found in the Responses to Frequently Submitted Public Comments beginning on page B733 of this appendix.
The Arizona Department of Transportation and Federal Highway Administration identified several issues and concerns that were frequently noted by commenters. Responses to these issues can be found in the Responses to Frequently Submitted Public Comments beginning on page B733 of this appendix.

1. Alternatives, E1 Alternative

2. Biology, Plants, and Wildlife

3. Neighborhoods/Communities

4. Air Quality

5. Noise

6. Alternatives, W59 Alternative Versus W101 Alternative

7. Purpose and Need, Truck Bypass

8. Hazardous Materials
9 Alternatives
The study considered an alternative that would run along Interstate 8 in Casa Grande to State Route 85 from Gila Bend to Interstate 10 (see text on page 3-9 of the Draft Environmental Impact Statement). State Route 85 is currently being reconstructed as a four-lane, divided highway with limited-access control, and Interstate 8 is a four-lane, divided Interstate freeway with full access control. Existing signs at each terminus designate the route as a truck bypass of the metropolitan Phoenix area. This route would continue to be available for interstate and interregional travel, but it would not meet the proposed action purpose and need as part of a regional transportation network and, therefore, was eliminated from further consideration.

10 Alternatives
The study includes an evaluation of the alternatives noted in “a,” “b,” and “c.” The assessment and outcome are described on page 3-9 of the Draft Environmental Impact Statement. The study also considered an alignment on Gila River Indian Community land (see page 3-24 of the Draft Environmental Impact Statement), but ultimately, the Gila River Indian Community voted against the alignment and it was not carried forward for further study.

11 Alternatives
A Riggs Road Alternative was considered. It would replace 51st Avenue south of its connection to Interstate 10 (Papago Freeway) for approximately 21 miles. It would then replace approximately 4 miles of Beltline Road in an easterly direction. At the Riggs Road/State Route 347 intersection, the alternative would replace approximately 3 miles of Riggs Road before connecting to Interstate 10 (Maricopa Freeway) (see Final Environmental Impact Statement page 3-9). Nearly two-thirds of any alternative using Riggs Road would be on Gila River Indian Community land. While the Riggs Road Alternative would serve regional mobility needs, particularly of those living in the Maricopa area, meeting this travel demand would not address specific planning goals for an integrated regional transportation network. The Regional Transportation Plan identifies the proposed South Mountain Freeway as a critical link in the Regional Freeway and Highway System. The Riggs Road Alternative would not complete the Phoenix metropolitan area’s loop system as part of State Route 202L, thereby causing substantial out-of-direction travel for motorists. Therefore, the Riggs Road Alternative would not meet the project’s purpose and need criteria and was eliminated from further study.

12 Alternatives, Gila River Indian Community Alignment
The Arizona Department of Transportation and Federal Highway Administration identified several issues and concerns that were frequently noted by commenters. Responses to these issues can be found in the Responses to Frequently Submitted Public Comments beginning on page B733 of this appendix.

(Responses continue on next page)
Public comments are a vital component in the decision-making process. Public comments have been solicited from project inception and through key milestones in the environmental impact statement process. The interests and needs of the public, along with all other social, economic, and environmental issues and impacts, must be fully analyzed and included in the Draft and Final Environmental Impact Statements. Comments made during development of the Draft Environmental Impact Statement have been used to adjust plans, explore new questions, or make changes—all within the scope of the National Environmental Policy Act. Public comments received on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement was reviewed and addressed in the Final Environmental Impact Statement. Public comments received on the Final Environmental Impact Statement will also be considered and addressed as appropriate. More information about the entire public involvement process up to publication of the Draft Environmental Impact Statement is available in Chapter 6, Comments and Coordination, of the Draft Environmental Impact Statement.
From: bethver@aol.com
To: Projects
Subject: 202 South Mountain Freeway
Date: Wednesday, June 12, 2013 5:31:52 PM

I am adamantly opposed to building the freeway on the Pecos Road route in Ahwatukee. It will substantially increase the air pollution and noise throughout the Ahwatukee area. You should do everything within your power to have the freeway relocated further south on the Gila Indian reservation.

Thank you.

Wanda Vermeer
Resident of Ahwatukee

The Arizona Department of Transportation and Federal Highway Administration identified several issues and concerns that were frequently noted by commenters. Responses to these issues can be found in the Responses to Frequently Submitted Public Comments beginning on page B733 of this appendix.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Alternatives, E1 Alternative</td>
<td>The Arizona Department of Transportation and Federal Highway Administration identified several issues and concerns that were frequently noted by commenters. Responses to these issues can be found in the Responses to Frequently Submitted Public Comments beginning on page B733 of this appendix.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Air Quality</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Noise</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Alternatives, Gila River Indian Community Alignment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
From: Dawn M. Vetter
To: Projects
Subject: I am opposed to the South Mountain Freeway
Date: Wednesday, July 24, 2013 1:08:37 PM

The South Mountain Freeway would cut through a portion of South Mountain Park, exacerbate air quality problems, destroy wildlife habitat and cut off wildlife movement corridors, endanger public health, and more. It would also continue the Arizona Department of Transportation’s (ADOT) short-sighted focus rather than looking toward long-term transportation solutions such as better mass transit.

I kindly ask that you please select the No Build Alternative in order to protect our environment and our communities.

Sincerely,
Dawn Vetter

The Arizona Department of Transportation and Federal Highway Administration identified several issues and concerns that were frequently noted by commenters. Responses to these issues can be found in the Responses to Frequently Submitted Public Comments beginning on page B733 of this appendix.

1 Section 4(f) and Section 6(f)

2 Air Quality

3 Biology, Plants, and Wildlife

4 Health Effects

5 Alternatives, Nonfreeway Alternatives

6 Alternatives, No-Action (No-Build) Alternative

“Until one has loved an animal, part of their soul remains unawakened.”
I think the Loop 202 will help in improving the traffic of the east valley, mainly in the I-10 westbound and 101 north portions. This will certainly contribute to improve quality of life of people in the great Phoenix area. I am looking forward to seeing the loop 202 constructed.

Comment noted.
Nathan Vigneau

I am in favor of building the South Mountain Freeway. As a resident of Laveen I am excited about the prospect of getting new business to move into the area and create a better way of life for Laveen residents. I also see a great benefit of a bypass for those who would not like to sit idle in traffic through Phoenix to head south on I10. I see a great economic impact as well as environmental impact that we can not get wrong. Please move forward with this project!

1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Comment noted.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
From: Genny Villa [mailto:genny.villa29@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, May 21, 2013 3:02 PM
To: Projects
Subject: The 202

To Whom It May Concern,

Although my husband and I will not be able to attend the public hearing today we want to let you know that as residents of Laveen for almost eight years, we are very much in favor of this freeway being built. We have heard about it since we moved here and hopefully it will become a reality before too much longer.

Respectfully Submitted,
Genny and Vincent Villa
(602) 237-7478
genny.villa29@gmail.com
1. **Alternatives**

The proposed freeway is part of a transportation system developed to improve mobility in the region by increasing capacity and providing alternatives to allow traffic to bypass already congested routes (see Final Environmental Impact Statement pages 1-21, 1-22, 3-1, and 3-3). Like other "loop" freeways in the Phoenix metropolitan area, the proposed South Mountain Freeway would be a commuter corridor, helping to move local traffic between the eastern and western portions of Maricopa County.

The study considered an alternative that would run along Interstate 8 in Casa Grande to State Route 85 from Gila Bend to Interstate 10 (see text on page 3-9 of the Final Environmental Impact Statement). State Route 85 is currently being reconstructed as a four-lane, divided highway with limited-access control, and Interstate 8 is a four-lane, divided Interstate freeway with full access control. Existing signs at each terminus designate the route as a truck bypass of the metropolitan Phoenix area. This route would continue to be available for interstate and interregional travel, but it would not meet the proposed action purpose and need as part of a regional transportation network and, therefore, was eliminated from further consideration.

2. **Purpose and Need, Lack of Support**

The Arizona Department of Transportation and Federal Highway Administration identified several issues and concerns that were frequently noted by commenters. Responses to these issues can be found in the *Responses to Frequently Submitted Public Comments* beginning on page B733 of this appendix.

3. **Alternatives, W59 Alternative Versus W101 Alternative**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1    | Alternatives | The proposed freeway is part of a transportation system developed to improve mobility in the region by increasing capacity and providing alternatives to allow traffic to bypass already congested routes (see Final Environmental Impact Statement pages 1-21, 1-22, 3-1, and 3-3). Like other "loop" freeways in the Phoenix metropolitan area, the proposed South Mountain Freeway would be a commuter corridor, helping to move local traffic between the eastern and western portions of Maricopa County.

The study considered an alternative that would run along Interstate 8 in Casa Grande to State Route 85 from Gila Bend to Interstate 10 (see text on page 3-9 of the Final Environmental Impact Statement). State Route 85 is currently being reconstructed as a four-lane, divided highway with limited-access control, and Interstate 8 is a four-lane, divided Interstate freeway with full access control. Existing signs at each terminus designate the route as a truck bypass of the metropolitan Phoenix area. This route would continue to be available for interstate and interregional travel, but it would not meet the proposed action purpose and need as part of a regional transportation network and, therefore, was eliminated from further consideration. |
<p>| 2    | Purpose and Need, Lack of Support | The Arizona Department of Transportation and Federal Highway Administration identified several issues and concerns that were frequently noted by commenters. Responses to these issues can be found in the <em>Responses to Frequently Submitted Public Comments</em> beginning on page B733 of this appendix. |
| 3    | Alternatives, W59 Alternative Versus W101 Alternative | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Comment Document</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>ESTIMATED COST</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>SKETCH</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>CONSTRUCTION</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>SUMMARY</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>SUBTOTAL</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Estimates**

- **Cost**
- **Construction**
- **Summary**
- **Subtotal**
- **Total**
The proposed freeway is part of a transportation system developed to improve mobility in the region by increasing capacity and providing alternatives to allow traffic to bypass already congested routes. Like other "loop" freeways in the Phoenix metropolitan area, the proposed South Mountain Freeway would be a commuter corridor, helping to move local traffic between the eastern and western portions of Maricopa County.

The study considered an alternative that would run along Interstate 8 in Casa Grande to State Route 85 from Gila Bend to Interstate 10. This route would continue to be available for interstate and interregional travel, but it would not meet the proposed action purpose and need as part of a regional transportation network and, therefore, was eliminated from further consideration.

The proposed freeway is part of the multimodal Regional Transportation Plan. The Maricopa Association of Governments, as the region's metropolitan planning organization, has the responsibility to perform regional multimodal planning. The Arizona Department of Transportation is charged with implementation of the freeway program (of which the proposed freeway is a part) within the Regional Transportation Plan. Similarly, Valley Metro is charged with implementing the transit program within the Regional Transportation Plan.

The Arizona Department of Transportation and Federal Highway Administration identified several issues and concerns that were frequently noted by commenters. Responses to these issues can be found in the Responses to Frequently Submitted Public Comments beginning on page B733 of this appendix.
The locations of the planned interchanges were determined in coordination with the City of Phoenix. The current plan balances the need to minimize impacts on the adjacent community with the need to provide acceptable access to the region’s transportation system.
The Arizona Department of Transportation and Federal Highway Administration identified several issues and concerns that were frequently noted by commenters. Responses to these issues can be found in the Responses to Frequently Submitted Public Comments beginning on page B733 of this appendix.

**ENCLOSURE B**

**COMMUTER DESTINATION PLANNING**

**Zip Codes Are a Useful Tool for Planning Commuter Traffic Patterns**

The Social Security Act provides needed data for planning:

1. **Employees’ Zip Code**
   - Example: 85000
2. **Number of Employees**
   - Example: 100
3. **Number of Employees Sharing the Same Zip Code**
   - Example: 85010

**Then**

4. **In Each Zip Code Total All Employees and All Employees Sharing the Same Zip Code**

5. **List the total amounts in descending order.**

6. **The top of the list is where traffic problems may occur.**

If the Social Security Administration did the work, then the time-honored (more correctly stated, person-honored) can be passed to the Federal DOT who in turn can deputize the amount from the State’s DOT allotment. Now there exists a foundfit tool that anybody can access showing high volume traffic areas. For planning, this beats the current process of “Here a freeway, there a freeway, everywhere a freeway.”

The planning process will be enhanced in municipalities, would coordinate and agree on areas for future large employee development.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Comment Document</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NOTES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. Phoenix River Station - the area between S. Stanfield and Central Union, make an old land fill site between Water St. and the Salt River Colle as an ideal location.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. The miniature station should be located on the Gila River, near the city because it makes the businesses, old houses, etc. more accessible via public transportation and be a terminal point interconnecting Light Rail &amp; bus systems.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Research the ownership of abandoned marina to transfer to Phoenix railroad for other projects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Route 2, Sun City-McKale, light rail construction should utilize where a long and over pass, where can protect the aquaduct and from snowing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Route 10 &amp; 11, site to transfer light rail construction should be based upon the flood rates and water levels that occurred during back-to-back 100 year flood levels in the 1970s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6. All future freeways should be designed to include light rail construction in the median or on edge of right-of-way.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7. All future freeways should have space for future communications needs instead of design of existing streets.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8. With a Phoenix-McKale light rail in service, would a double-tier rail service such as proposed in the Arizona Republic article on 7-1-12, 'A Gold Rail, Diesel Car' (see Wikipedia article or something similar) could accomplish the same result at much less cost.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Comment Document</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Code Comment Document

![Map of Railroads of Arizona](image)

**RAILROADS OF ARIZONA**

- **Las Vegas**
- **Flagstaff**
- **Prescott**
- **Phoenix**
- **Globe**
- **Tucson**

**Cities and Towns**:
- Yuma
- Mesa
- Apache Junction
- Chandler
- Casa Grande
- Florence
- Benson
- Bisbee
- Sonoita

**Railways and Mileage**:
- Southern Pacific
- Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe
- Union Pacific
- Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community (SRP)

**Trails and Roads**:
- Apache Trail
- Sonora Trail
- Butterfield Overland Stage Route

**Important Points**:
- Phoenix to Tuscon
- Yuma to Tucson
- Flagstaff to Prescott

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

---

© 1993 by Marine North Co.
According to the Arizona Department of Transportation, 2013, Air Quality Assessment South Mountain Freeway 202L Draft Report, review of wind data from the Gila River Indian Community monitoring site at St. Johns suggests that during the morning hours and associated with mountain-drainage air flows and stable atmospheric conditions, wind flows are from the southeast and follow the Gila River channel to the north. Locations to the east of St. Johns tend to flow from the east to the lower elevations along the Gila River. During the warmer hours’ improved mixing, flows typically follow the river channel and come from the north and northwest. Likewise, during a 1-month-long meteorological monitoring period (November 20, 2006, through December 21, 2006) at Pecos Road and 40th Street and a second 1-month-long monitoring period at Pecos Road and 24th and 40th streets (April 19, 2007, through May 21, 2007), winds during the morning hours typically were from the northeast. During the warmer hours, and with improved mixing, winds typically were from the west.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Comment Document</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Comment Response Appendix

B3409

Comment Document

Code

Issue

Response

South Mountain Destruction

ADOT's spin is that just a “little bit” of South Mountain would have to be “sacriﬁced” for the SMI. The truth is that 3 ridges would be leveled, with a resulting cut 10 lanes wide and 20 stories high. 4 million cubic yards of dirt would be removed. Imagine that this were Camelback Mountain. The camel would not just get a short haircut — the camel’s head would be cut in half?

South Mountain is a signiﬁcant part of the Phoenix Mountain Preserve, containing the world’s largest metropolitan wilderness park, South Mountain Park. The proposed cut would destroy the integrity of both the Preserve and the Park.

South Mountain is sacred to the Gila River Indian Community and precious to all who enjoy its natural beauty. Once this treasure is defiled, it can never be “made whole” again. The mountain, its desert vegetation, unique wildlife, and water would all be disﬁgured or disrupted. All to further ADOT’s political agenda — to beneﬁt the trucking industry!

Incredible Waste of Tax Dollars

Long before the economic crisis, the 22 mile long SMI was going to be a waste of money. Now, ADOT estimates it would cost nearly $2 billion to build a “bare bones” version of the SMI today and this ﬁgure will continue to increase until the SMI is built.

PARC’s conservative estimate is that this 22 mile stretch of freeway would eventually cost $32 – 35 billion. Compare this staggering ﬁgure to the cost of the controversial light rail which is just $1.1 billion or the budget for the entire state of Arizona which is less than $20 billion.

ADOT would save the taxpayers billions of dollars by building a freeway along the path of existing US 85. In the process, ADOT would revitalize the Valley of the Sun if it followed the lead of states like Ohio, Oklahoma, New York, New Jersey, and Oregon, to name a few. Some of their cities are now planning to re-route main freeways around their downtowns instead of through them.

Imagine I-10 going around Phoenix on the new freeway along the existing US 85 keeping all but local trafﬁc out of downtown. That would really make a difference in relieving trafﬁc congestion and reducing pollution!
From: Greg Vogel  
To: Projects  
Subject: BUILD NOW - Loop 202 - South Mountain Freeway  
Date: Wednesday, July 24, 2013 6:06:29 AM

To Whom it May Concern

I am writing this letter in support of getting the Loop 202 South Mountain Freeway moving forward. We represent land and business owners that will benefit from building this stalled freeway. While they will directly benefit, I cannot overstate the importance of building this freeway now and its importance to all citizens of our State.

- relief of existing and coming massive congestion along Interstate 10 at I-17  
- Jobs that will be created by the construction of the freeway  
- tax base in property, income, sales all increasing and benefiting the entire State  
- environmental benefits of relief of congestion

This freeway has been on the books for almost 30 years. It is time for the State, City and local governing bodies to step up and lead and build this massive missing link to our transportation network.

We look forward to seeing this Freeway completed this decade.

Greg J. Vogel  
Chief Executive Officer, Land Advisors Organization  
4900 North Scottsdale Road, Suite 3000, Scottsdale, Arizona 85251  
480.483.8100 fax | 480.483.8000 web | www.landadvisors.com

Please consider the environment before printing this e-mail.
From: Dave Von Tersch [mailto:djvontersch@q.com]
Sent: Sunday, May 19, 2013 9:40 AM
To: Projects
Subject: Loop 202 South Mountain Freeway

Dear Sir / Madam,

Several months ago, I suggested that Loop 202 South Mountain Freeway consider (if feasible) a “double deck” design, similar to I-70 Colorado’s double decker through Glenwood Canyon. At that time, the answer I received was NOT adequate.

Please provide detailed information as to why this “double deck” suggestion is not a viable solution.

Dave & Jeannie Von Tersch
12007 S. Crow Ct.
Phoenix, AZ. 85044
480-753-4166
djvontersch@q.com

Please consider your environmental responsibility before printing this e-mail

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.
I came here primarily because I understood that the freeway was going to make a loop and enter our reservation at Pecos Road, and my niece just told me that I was mistaken, that it's not going to, that it is going to stay on Pecos Road, so my presentation is really ineffective and has no balance as to -- like I said, my whole thought is to not put anything on the reservation, because we cannot lose any more land, and I congratulate you on the wise decision not to put it on the Ahwatukee side, and I think that'll be best for everybody and speed up the process of the freeway and so forth. And I thank you very much, and that's all I have to say. Thank you.

THE FACILITATOR: Thank you.

Do we have another name up there? There it is. Dave Von Tersch. Did I pronounce that right?

Dave Von Tersch.

As a reminder, anyone in the auditorium, if you would like to speak just register at the front desk, your name will appear on the screen, and we will call you up.

Ken Lapierre.

Dave Von Tersch, is that you, sir?

MR. VON TERSCH: Hi, my name is Dave Von Tersch.

I live in Ahwatukee. I'd like to suggest, as long as there's no ordinance against it or law against it, that the committee 202 project team might consider a
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Comment Document</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>The double-deck option suggested in the comment would have similar benefits and impacts as the Bridge Alternatives evaluated in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (see pages 3-13 and 5-20). Options to build a bridge through or over the South Mountains were eliminated from further study because of incident management, constructibility and maintenance issues, future expansion limitations, substantially higher estimated construction costs, and undesirable intrusion-related impacts.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The double-deck option suggested in the comment would have similar benefits and impacts as the Bridge Alternatives evaluated in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (see pages 3-13 and 5-20). Options to build a bridge through or over the South Mountains were eliminated from further study because of incident management, constructibility and maintenance issues, future expansion limitations, substantially higher estimated construction costs, and undesirable intrusion-related impacts.
TELEPHONE CONVERSATION RECORD
SOUTH MOUNTAIN FREEWAY INFORMATION LINE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>TIME</th>
<th>CALLER</th>
<th>CALLER ADDRESS</th>
<th>PHONE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>05/13/13</td>
<td>4:56 PM</td>
<td>DONNA VOTE-BRACY</td>
<td>107 W. GENEVA CIRCLE, TEMPE, AZ 85282</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CALLER REMARKS/QUESTIONS:
We are in support of the new Loop 202 Freeway, south of the South Mountain for better traffic control and easing of the congestion on the existing freeways running north of South Mountain.

Comment noted.
Hello and thanks for possibly taking my input! My name's Alex Votichenko, born and raised here in the valley and I just want to urge you to please consider a No Build Option for the the 202 extension through part of the South Mountain preserve—it’s really a cherished landmark and point of pride here in the valley, all of the preserve really. I bring out of town visitors to the park frequently and it's important to so so many valley residents.

Thank You!

Alex Votichenko

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Comment Document</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>From: DJENTRIFICATION.AVE</td>
<td>To: Projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject: Phoenix Native against a 202 Freeway South Mountain Option</td>
<td>Date: Wednesday, July 24, 2013 3:52:45 PM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Arizona Department of Transportation and Federal Highway Administration identified several issues and concerns that were frequently noted by commenters. Responses to these issues can be found in the Responses to Frequently Submitted Public Comments beginning on page B733 of this appendix.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Alternatives, No-Action (No-Build) Alternative</td>
<td>The Arizona Department of Transportation and Federal Highway Administration identified several issues and concerns that were frequently noted by commenters. Responses to these issues can be found in the Responses to Frequently Submitted Public Comments beginning on page B733 of this appendix.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Section 4(f) and Section 6(f)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>