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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

GOALS OF REPORT
The goals of this report are to identify the baseline needs and requirements for landscape treatment along the Maricopa Association of Governments (MAG) freeway system and recommend the most cost effective approach to meet these needs and requirements.

THE GOVERNOR'S PLAN
In January of 1995, the Governor's Office issued the "Governor's Plan" which commits to the completion of the MAG Regional Freeway System. A primary aspect of the Plan was cost reductions on future freeway segments, to allow for the construction of additional miles of freeway. The Plan proposed cost savings that reduced lighting, landscape treatments and widths of structures (bridges), and eliminated lanes. This proposal raised significant aesthetic and environmental concerns for the surrounding communities.

The Plan -- approved by the MAG Regional Council in January 1995 -- called for elimination of all trees and shrubs from traditional landscape treatments, restricted all future efforts to a nominal layer of rock mulch (i.e., decomposed granite), and reduced construction budgets accordingly.

The elimination of landscape treatments was the most contested part of the Governor's Plan. Plantings greatly enhance the aesthetic appeal of urban freeways and are one of the reasons for widespread acceptance of freeways. The majority of the public and the local jurisdictions recognized that landscape was included when the initial corridor studies and design concepts were adopted and they did not support the elimination of this feature.

This Report analyzes the proposed reductions in landscape treatments, suggests alternatives and recommends a course of action.

THE COMMITTEE'S WORK
The landscape budget previous to the Governor's Plan was based on $750,000 per mile (1992), which included approximately $350,000 for decomposed granite and $400,000 for plants, irrigation and miscellaneous items (Actual costs on some freeway segments were approximately $900,000 per mile).

A Value Analysis Committee, including the Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) and representatives from the MAG cities and from the engineering and landscape industries, was formed with the initial charge to develop landscape design concepts that fit the Governor's Plan budget of $350,000 per mile. After initial study, however, the Committee determined that 1) the reduced budget only provides for minimum erosion control treatment and was not sufficient for even meager planting mitigation and 2) the actual cost savings represent only a very small percentage of the cost of completing the freeway system. Given this and the environ-
mental requirement that any roadway project adequately mitigate negative impacts of its development, the Committee created alternative concepts. The concepts were then applied to the design of an actual project. The Committee’s goal for the alternatives and applications is appropriate and cost effective landscape treatment along the MAG freeway system. Appropriate means taking advantage of the many quantitative and qualitative benefits of urban landscapes. Cost Effective means insuring real, measurable and long term value.

THE ANALYSIS:
- examines the comparative effectiveness of the Governor’s Plan, recently and not so recently designed landscape treatments for the MAG urban freeway system
- reviews the Landscape Design Guidelines for Urban Highways (1988)
- considers alternative landscape concepts
- discusses quantitative and qualitative costs and benefits of the Committee’s alternatives
- reviews federal NEPA and other environmental requirements (erosion control, air quality, etc.)
- reviews local development codes of the affected MAG jurisdictions for consistency
- includes a survey of potential sources of supplemental funding

THE ALTERNATIVE CONCEPTS:
- include minimum level of mitigation that development of the freeway system must provide
- meet environmental requirements
- vary the application of inert materials, grading, erosion control and water harvesting
- vary the use of trees, shrubs, ground covers, seed mixes and irrigation for them
- include short and long term maintenance and replacement (life cycle) cost considerations

APPLICATION OF THE CONCEPTS:
- recognizes that land use and design requirements change over the course of the system
- involves combining concepts in response to a visual prioritization process (see page 2-7 for a description)
- recognizes the need for additional research

CITIZENS TRANSPORTATION OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE (CTOC)
Approximately 90 percent through the Value Analysis and report writing effort, the CTOC decided to recommend re-funding landscape treatments along the MAG freeway system (December 1996). An average budget of $650,000 per mile was set. The final landscape concepts and budgets included in this report conform to this recommendation.

RECOMMENDATIONS AND CONCLUSION
The beneficial effects of plants are widely known. They filter pollutants, add oxygen to the atmosphere, help control erosion, increase the value of residential and commercial properties and provide psychological benefits. Freeway plantings provide a positive community image, attract visitors and businesses and encourage appropriate plantings by others. Arizona is a state which relies heavily on its tourism industry. Landscaped streets and freeways add to Arizona’s image as a scenic state with a high quality of life and a concern for the environment. Municipalities require private developments to include landscape plans, as one way to compensate the community for the increased noise, traffic, heat and stormwater runoff associated with urban development. Unplanted freeways would not be consistent with local or national standards.
There are a variety of beneficial landscape concepts appropriate to the MAG Freeway System that conform to current budgets. The effective application of these concepts can mitigate many of the negative impacts of freeway development. The Value Analysis Committee recommends the following:

1. Incorporate plant materials as a part of the construction of all segments of the MAG Urban Freeway System.
2. Adopt a landscape construction budget of $650,000 per mile, with appropriate percentages added for design, engineering administration, and contingencies. This reflects a 20% reduction from recent projects.
3. Develop future landscape budgets based on a per acre amount on a project to project basis.
4. Maintain a flexible approach to landscaping which would allow adjacent communities to fund higher levels of landscaping (such as increased plant size and density).
5. Apply a visual prioritization process to future MAG freeway segments, in relation to funding and expenditures.
6. Consider long term maintenance and life cycle costs in the design and budgeting process.
7. Select landscape design concepts that maximize environmental, economic and aesthetic benefits of plants, while meeting cost reduction goals.
8. Update the Landscape Design Guidelines for Urban Highways publication.
9. Maximize the effectiveness of landscape and mitigation funds (first) within each jurisdiction, and (second) on each project.
10. Continue to include topsoil and irrigation sleeving in the roadway construction budget.
11. Adopt an appropriate budget on a per mile, per year basis, for landscape maintenance.

Traditionally, adjacent neighborhoods have born the brunt of urban freeways, through higher noise and air pollution levels, intrusion of traffic and incompatible land uses, and severed connections with schools and other neighborhoods. In response to this, ADOT’s urban freeway investments of the past decade have included attractively designed noise walls, grade separated pedestrian and bicycle crossings, traffic intrusion controls and desert adapted plantings. These features help mitigate the impacts of the freeway on those who live nearby, as well as providing community-wide environmental, aesthetic and economic benefits.

The Value Analysis Committee recognized that the metropolitan area would be best served by effective landscape treatments along all of its freeways, even if it meant delaying construction of a few miles of freeway. The community echoed these concerns, and in December 1996 the MAG Citizens Transportation Oversight Committee recommended restoring funding for freeway landscaping, with a budget of $650,000 per mile. This budget represents enough money to plant and irrigate a modest quantity of trees and shrubs (from small containers) and to cover 60 to 80 percent of the landscape area with decomposed granite. It also allows varied treatments to be applied within a given jurisdiction or project (based on a visual prioritization process) in order to respond to varying land uses, views and screening needs. Additional funds may be contributed by municipalities and/or private sources in order to increase plant densities, add specimen plants or otherwise upgrade what can be accomplished within the $650,000 budget.

In this way, landscape costs will be reduced from what has been spent in the past decade, while maintaining vegetative cover, cohesive design themes and meeting varying environmental, aesthetic and economic goals.
TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PART 1 REPORT GOALS AND BACKGROUND 1-1

A. GOALS 
B. BACKGROUND 
C. VALUE ANALYSIS COMMITTEE 
D. CITIZENS TRANSPORTATION OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE DECISION 
E. BASELINE LANDSCAPE COST
   Traditional Budgets
   The Governor's Plan
   Projected Savings 
F. COMMITTEE VALUE ANALYSIS PROCESS

PART 2 VALUE ANALYSIS FINDINGS 2-1

A. HISTORY OF MAG LANDSCAPE POLICIES
   1. Brief Summary of Landscape Design Guidelines for Urban Highways
      Plants
      Inert ground covers
      Irrigation
   2. MAG Freeway Budgets and Actual Costs 
   3. Landscape Practice Under the Governor's Plan 
B. BENEFITS OF PLANTS
   1. Quantitative Benefits
      Air quality
      Heat island reduction
      Reduction of stormwater runoff and increase in groundwater recharge
      Energy usage reduction
      Economic
   2. Qualitative Benefits
      Social
      Psychological Health
      Physical Health
      Recreational
      Aesthetic
3. Benefit-Cost Analysis
4. Community Recognition of Benefits

C. Landscape Design Variables, Requirements and Issues

1. Environmental Requirements
   - Impacts to minorities or economically disadvantaged groups
   - Park Land impacts
   - Public and Agency involvement
   - Aesthetic concerns and impacts
   - Air Quality conformance
   - Noise abatement
   - Erosion control requirements

2. Code Requirements of Adjacent Municipalities
3. Responsibilities of Adjacent Jurisdictions
4. Design Factors

PART 3  LANDSCAPE CONCEPTS

A. Landscape Elements
B. Landscape Concepts
   1. Traditional landscape - accent/color plantings (60% total planted area)
   2. Decomposed granite only used for erosion control (0% total planted area)
   3. Land graphics used for an accent (0% total planted area)
   4. Seed mix only used for revegetation (100% total planted area)
   5. Shrubs only used for revegetation (100% total planted area)
   6. Shrub and ground cover emphasis for wall mitigation (40% total planted area)
   7. Tree emphasis with shrubs and decomposed granite for screening (60% total planted area)
   8. Trees only with turf at detention basin (100% total planted area)

C. Summary

PART 4  APPLICATIONS

A. Sample 1 High Visual Priority Level
B. Sample 2 Medium Visual Priority Level
C. Sample 3 Low Visual Priority Level
D. Summary

PART 5  RECOMMENDATIONS
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>APPENDIX</th>
<th>NOTES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Appendix A</td>
<td>BIBLIOGRAPHY AND REFERENCES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix B</td>
<td>ADOT ROADSIDE DEVELOPMENT REPORT ON COSTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix C</td>
<td>TOPSOIL AND IRRIGATION SLEEVING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix D</td>
<td>WATER HARVESTING AND EROSION CONTROL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix E</td>
<td>BASIS FOR ACRES/MILE AND UNIT COSTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix F</td>
<td>BASIS FOR LANDSCAPE CONCEPTS - ESTIMATED COSTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix G</td>
<td>COMPARISON OF LANDSCAPE COSTS TO RESIDENTIAL COSTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix H</td>
<td>MAG LANDSCAPE CONSTRUCTION COSTS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PART 1
REPORT GOALS AND BACKGROUND

A. GOALS

The goals of this report are identification of baseline needs and requirements for landscape treatment along the Maricopa Association of Governments (MAG) freeway system and recommendation of the most cost effective approach to meet these needs and requirements.

B. BACKGROUND

MAG freeway system facilities are constructed and maintained by the Arizona Department Of Transportation (ADOT), with cooperation of the adjacent, local jurisdictions. On October 8, 1985, the voters in Maricopa County approved Proposition 300 to establish a one-half cent, transportation excise tax for construction of the MAG regional freeway system. This legislation was in effect through December 31, 1994. These funds were supplemented by State Highway User Revenue Funds (HURF) and federal funds on some segments of the system.

On November 8, 1994, the voters rejected Proposition 400 that proposed an extension of the Proposition 300 plus a half cent sales tax for an additional 10 years (through 2015). Proceeds of the extended tax would have been divided equally among freeways and alternate modes of public transportation.

On December 13, 1994, in response to the defeat of Proposition 400, Governor Symington presented a plan to complete more of the MAG regional freeway system. The Governors' Plan (referred to as the 'Plan') in-
cluded additional funding from higher sales tax forecasts, a greater allocation of MAG federal funds earmarked for freeways, reductions in lighting, landscape treatment and structure (bridge) widths, and a reduction in the number of miles.

In January 1995, the State Transportation Board and the MAG Regional Council approved the Plan for public review and comment, and it was incorporated into the Adopted Life Cycle Program.

Project locations and the budget for each segment are shown on the Plan (see Governor's Regional Freeway Plan). Each project is evaluated for funding by MAG as part of the Transportation Improvement Program. The 1990 Federal Clean Air Act requires that all transportation plans and projects be in conformance with applicable air quality plans. To comply with this requirement, MAG conducts a conformity analysis on proposed transportation projects. Projects are partially selected based on their potential impact to air quality in the MAG area.

The current Life Cycle Program and Long Range Plan for the MAG freeway system contains a total of 155 miles of freeway, with approximately 4,650 acres of potential planting area. As of December 1996, forty (40) miles of freeway had been completed, and twelve (12) miles were under construction. Approximately 56 additional miles were funded and 47 more planned. The plan includes approximately 3,240 acres of budgeted landscape areas and an additional 1,410 acres planned. For purposes of this Analysis, the total number of miles and acres budgeted were considered to be 108 miles and 3,240 acres, respectively.
C. VALUE ANALYSIS COMMITTEE

The relatively extreme nature of the reductions proposed in the Plan implied significant aesthetic and environmental impacts to the surrounding communities and raised legal questions. This Value Analysis study was requested by ADOT's Roadside Development Section, to evaluate the portion of the Plan which addressed the reduction in landscape treatments along the MAG system. A Committee was formed in the Spring of 1995 that included representatives from each of the MAG jurisdictions; ADOT representatives from highway design, maintenance, and roadside development; and private sector landscape architecture and engineering firms.

The Plan called for elimination of all trees and shrubs from traditional landscape treatments, restricting all future efforts to a nominal layer of rock mulch (i.e., decomposed granite) on freeway segments that do not have committed funds for full landscaping. The initial charge of the Committee was to develop landscape design concepts that fit the proposed budget. Committee members expressed concern that the granite mulch only alternative would not be acceptable both to local jurisdictions and the traveling public. After initial study, the Committee determined 1) the reduced budget only provides for the minimum erosion control treatment and was not sufficient for even meager planting mitigation and 2) the actual cost savings represent only a very small
percentage of the cost of completing the system (see figure showing Cost Comparisons). Accordingly, the Committee agreed to identify and analyze alternatives that would provide higher value and greater aesthetic benefit, and address the need for cost reduction.

Following the kickoff meeting, held on May 17, 1995, the Committee met monthly to discuss the potential effects of the new policy and to brainstorm alternative cost reduction ideas. There was much discussion about the many and various functions of roadway landscape: controlling erosion, increasing motorist safety, providing a buffer for the residents living adjacent to the roadway, and improving the environment. The Committee also addressed the concept of the landscape as an investment in the economic success of the community, and the role of freeway landscapes in the tourism industry.

These discussions set the stage for the generation of diverse ideas during the brainstorming sessions. Refinement and development were performed by several subcommittees.

Operating under environmental requirements that any roadway project adequately mitigate negative impacts of its development, the Committee created alternative concepts. The concepts were then applied to the design of an actual project. The Committee's goal for the alternatives and applications is appropriate cost effective landscape treatment along the MAG freeway system. Appropriate means taking advantage of the many quantitative and qualitative benefits of urban landscapes. Cost effective means insuring real, measurable and long term value. These ideas are evaluated and documented in this report.
D. CITIZENS TRANSPORTATION OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE DECISION (CTOC)

Based on growing public and political demand and a recognition of the value associated with plant materials, the MAG Citizens Transportation Oversight Committee (CTOC) decided to recommend re-funding landscape treatments along the MAG system (December 1996) at an average budget of $650,000 per mile. This decision was made when this study was approximately 90 percent complete. The final landscape concepts and budgets included in this report confom to this decision.

E. BASELINE LANDSCAPE COST

Traditional Budgets. Construction budgets for traditional landscape treatments, which conform to ADOT’s Landscape Design Guidelines, were approximately $600,000 per mile of freeway in 1985. Each mile of freeway typically includes approximately 30 acres of landscape area. These figures allow for typical traffic interchanges and above, below or at grade freeway designs. The traditional 1985 landscape budget calculated on a ‘per acre’ basis is approximately $20,000 per acre. Adjustments for inflation indicate that the traditional landscape budget in 1996 dollars would be $851,521 per mile, or $28,384 per acre.

The Governor’s Plan called for 1) a reduction of landscape budgets to $350,000 per mile or approximately $11,700 per acre and 2) the installation of granite mulch only; no trees, shrubs, ground covers or irrigation systems. The baseline cost of $350,000 per mile (or $11,700 per acre) was taken from a 1991 cost analysis prepared by ADOT Roadside Development (see Appendix C). The baseline cost included a two inch deep layer of decomposed granite mulch (at a cost of approximately $8,800 per acre) plus allowances for mobilization, traffic control and construction administration. Recent bid tabs indicate that today’s cost for the baseline treatment of decomposed granite mulch only would be in the range of $410,000 per mile, based on 100 percent coverage and 30 acres per mile. The $350,000 budget allows for approximately 80 percent coverage. Other areas would be left as raked earth.

Projected savings with the Governor’s Plan was the difference between the previous budget amount of $750,000 per mile and the Governor’s budget amount of $350,000 per mile, a projected savings of $400,000 per mile. This would amount to a total savings of over $43 million dollars if projected for the remaining 108 miles of the funded MAG system. While this sounds like a significant amount of money, it amounts to only four percent of the total freeway construction cost. The 43 million dollar savings would fund the construction of approximately 4.4 miles of freeway.

The Governor’s Plan budget and projected savings were calculated without adjustments for inflation. It is likely that $350,000 per mile will not provide adequate erosion control on some projects today.
F. COMMITTEE VALUE ANALYSIS PROCESS

With the background of the discussions of landscape function and the budget parameters proposed in the Plan, the Committee weighed costs and benefits of the Plan, the projected savings, and the alternatives. Following review of actual construction bids for a host of recent roadway projects, the Committee acknowledged that actual costs will vary depending on a multitude of factors unique to each project.

The Committee, during the Value Analysis process, reviewed the current practice, traditional and nontraditional landscape concepts, and explored new ideas and approaches for increased cost effectiveness. Specifically, the Committee:

- reviewed the traditional and current MAG landscape policy
- identified landscape elements
- considered construction, maintenance and replacement (life cycle) costs
- reviewed environmental requirements (erosion control, air quality, etc.)
- considered codes, policies and responsibilities of adjacent jurisdictions
- reviewed the application of a visual analysis as a cost effective approach
- considered design, land use, roadway configuration and other variables

The Committee selected eight, distinct landscape concepts for analysis purposes. Application of some cost effective concepts are demonstrated on a new freeway in the metropolitan area, the Sky Harbor Expressway.

The Committee concluded its work with final recommendations for future MAG freeway system landscape efforts, summarized in Section IV.
PART 2
VALUE ANALYSIS
FINDINGS

A. HISTORY OF MAG
LANDSCAPE POLICY

The landscape portion of the freeway system includes treatment of residual right-of-way adjacent to road shoulder and medians through grading and the installation of plants, irrigation and inert rock materials. Guidelines for the design of these areas in urban settings were published in 1988. Budgets for implementing the landscape guidelines have been based on a per mile cost. Considering the Governor’s proposal and the findings in this report, guidelines and budgeting procedures will require updating.


The 1988 Guidelines include design features, regional context and design objectives for landscape treatments along Arizona’s urban highway system. The purpose of these guidelines is “to ensure a comprehensive and unified approach to landscape design throughout the urban highway system.” Highway development in residential areas often requires noise abatement walls and frontage roads. In cross-section, highways may be at grade (level), elevated, depressed or a combination.

The approach labeled as “traditional” in this report is actually an innovative approach developed by the Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) in the mid 1980’s. This approach sets efficient standards for landscape design along urban highways. For example, the guidelines call for the use of widely spaced, desert trees planted from small containers (five gallon and one gallon). Plantings are concentrated where they are most needed.

Plants. Plant material (trees, shrubs and ground covers) has many uses along highways. Design considerations include responses to: physiographic landmarks and topography, surrounding land use, roadway profile and on-site functional requirements. Design objectives include:

- minimizing need for supplemental irrigation
- controlling stormwater runoff — using it for irrigation where possible — and protecting banks against erosion
- mitigating negative impacts to surrounding communities
- minimizing headlight glare
- helping keep drivers alert and promote motorist safety
- minimizing maintenance requirements including provision of good maintenance access
- preserving desirable views and screen undesirable views to and from the roadway
- reducing perceived scale of roadway and structures
- salvaging and/or reusing existing vegetation, when possible
- reinforcing community identity and regional character
- reduction of heat island effect

The guidelines include details for: spacing and massing — along roadsides, in medians and at interchanges—
erosion control, drainage channels, detention basins, and other site specific features.

Planting design concepts include:
- graduated height of plant materials: shorter trees closer to the roadway and taller trees at the edge of the right-of-way
- palm trees or other vertical accents at interchange bridges
- coarse textured plants used as “sculptural elements” at key decision points
- concentrating colorful shrubs and ground covers at interchanges
- plants used to define highway space and screen views of the highway
- a unique identity for the highway from community to community, or land use to land use
- grade changes to reduce the height of noise walls, direct stormwater runoff and create aesthetically pleasing land forms

Inert ground covers. The guidelines instruct that inert ground covers—decomposed granite and other rock material—be used for visual enhancement, erosion control and to complement planting, grading and drainage concepts. For example, roadsides with slopes of 1:4 and steeper should be treated with inert ground cover where not planted continuously with shrubs or ground cover plants, for erosion control purposes. The guidelines state that decomposed granite shall not be used in medians or on roadside areas along at-grade sections of roadway.

Irrigation. The guidelines state that irrigation should be an automatic, low-pressure drip system. Irrigation water is designed to stay within each jurisdiction, as the local jurisdiction provides water, at no cost to the State.

2. MAG Freeway Landscape Budgets and Actual Costs

As previously mentioned, prior to the enactment of the Governor's Plan, traditional MAG freeway landscape funds were based on budgets of $600,000 per mile (1985-91) and $750,000 per mile (1992-94). Based on the Committee's analysis of eleven constructed segments of the MAG freeway system, actual costs have ranged from approximately $525,000 per mile to $865,000 per mile. Costs have averaged $675,000 per mile, and $21,800 per acre, over the past ten years.

Actual costs vary depending on site specific conditions along each segment. It is important to note that a low cost per mile does not imply a low cost per acre. The actual cost data shows a range of 19.8 to 48.5 acres per mile with an average of 30 acres per mile. Costs per acre range from $13,468 to $28,686. Further, the project with the lowest cost per acre had a higher relative cost per mile of $653,000. The variation in figures and their relationships mean that establishing accurate landscape construction budgets requires a cost per acre basis and careful review of the project for site specific requirements.
3. Landscape Practice Under the Life Cycle Program and Long Range Plan

In an effort to be responsive to the wishes of ADOT's MAG customers and still operate within the guidelines of the Governor's Plan, the Department adopted the position that landscaping can be added to the system if the local jurisdiction is willing to fund the added cost of the irrigation, plants, construction engineering and contingencies and to assume the maintenance of the landscaping (estimated to cost approximately $35,000 per mile per year). Two cities, Glendale and Phoenix, entered into Inter-Governmental Agreements (IGAs) to landscape three miles of the Agua Fria, and two miles of the Squaw Peak, respectively. As part of the IGAs, the department agreed to fund the landscaping design and to contribute $10,000 per mile annually toward the landscape maintenance.

There are several problems with the above practice. While it has resulted in plans to landscape an additional five miles of the Regional Freeway System, the two IGAs will result in a $50,000 annual maintenance commitment that cannot be met by the Phoenix Maintenance District budget. Under this scenario, it is likely that many miles of the system would remain unlandscaped, which would continue to be an issue with the public. At the same time, approximately nine miles of the Pima Freeway on the Salt River Pima Maricopa Indian Community will be landscaped as one of the conditions of their Grant of Easement for the freeway. In addition, it now appears that ADOT will be required to provide some level of landscaping of the Federal Aid eligible corridors of the system since landscaping was addressed in the environmental document approval. It would be difficult to justify why these freeways will be landscaped while many others will not. Finally, several jurisdictions have suggested that the savings from any design changes agreed to by the local jurisdiction should be used to fund the local share of the landscaping. This and other "creative contribution" proposals have resulted in on-going conflict and lack of a consistent approach to the issue of landscaping the MAG urban freeway system.
B. BENEFITS OF PLANTS

The benefits of plants are generally grouped into two separate categories - Qualitative and Quantitative. Qualitative benefits, while as important, are intangible and have significant, but no monetary value. Quantitative benefits can be assigned a tangible, monetary value.

Qualitative benefits generally include social, psychological, recreational, and aesthetic values. These beneficial aspects of plants in the urban environment are well documented. Quantitative benefits include reduction of heat island temperatures, air pollution, stormwater runoff, and energy usage. This translates to an increase in the economic value of the property.

1. Quantitative Benefits.

Air quality. Trees and plants improve air quality in a number of ways. These are primarily grouped into two categories: air pollution removal, and atmospheric carbon dioxide reduction. Trees and urban vegetation:
- alter air flows and lower air temperatures through transpiration, which can reduce the formation of ozone.
- trap carbon compounds and particulates, such that the removal of local pollutants is increased.
- absorb Carbon Dioxide and other gaseous pollutants, including Carbon Monoxide, Ozone, Sulphur Dioxide and Nitrogen Dioxide.
- release Oxygen, as a product of photosynthesis.
- reduces wind speed so that heavy particles can settle out.

Incidentally, urban trees need to be carefully selected to avoid problems associated with allergenic pollen and volatile organic compounds.

Heat island reduction. The temperature in metropolitan Phoenix has increased four degrees in the past 20 years.\(^8\) Trees planted throughout the urban area can reduce and break up heat islands, by providing shade and by increasing air flows through transpiration and localized reductions in air temperatures.\(^9\)

Reduction of stormwater runoff and increase in ground-water recharge. Trees and other vegetation can reduce stormwater runoff and the associated costs by retaining precipitation in the canopies and increasing absorption into the ground surface. Multiuse recreation/stormwater detention basins are an example of utilizing urban vegetation to maximize these benefits.

Energy usage reduction. Significant energy and water savings can be realized from using trees and shrubs to shade buildings, as well as from evapotranspirational cooling generated by increased vegetation densities.\(^10\)

Economic. Trees and vegetation have economic value and have been shown to increase real estate values and decrease the time needed to sell property. The current collective value of community street trees in Mesa, AZ is approximately $21,120,000. Other economic impacts of trees have been shown as increases in tourism and increased shopping in commercial areas.\(^11\)
2. Qualitative Benefits.

Social. Plant materials in the urban area fulfill three main social roles: 1) as natural elements in a human made landscape, 2) as aesthetic objects in design compositions and 3) as a social object expressing power, status or prestige. Trees and other plants can symbolize and evoke religious, spiritual, political, memorial and commemorative events and experiences. As aesthetically pleasing elements in the city scape, plants play an important role in the social fabric and enhance the social quality of the community. Having access to yards, parks and natural areas is often an indication of economic status in the urban environment.

Health. Plant materials in the urban area can result in a restorative experience, where people are refreshed, reflection is encouraged, and pressures of the outside world are reduced. “Restorative experiences produce large benefits for a relatively small investment...” Plant materials have also been shown to improve physical health.

Recreation. Detention basins and excess rights of way associated with freeway projects provide opportunities for a full spectrum of active and passive recreational activities. Providing cover and forage can attract birds and butterflies to an adjacent neighborhood.

Aesthetic. As an art form, plant materials in the urban area can bring artistic design and scenic beauty into people’s everyday lives. Moreover, scenic values in the urban landscape involve people’s ability to make sense of the landscape and function in it. Plant materials are a common visual mitigation tool, reducing harsh, negative visual impacts of new roadways and other elements of the built environment.
3. Benefit - Cost Analysis

It is possible to project actual cost/benefit values on urban highway plantings. A comprehensive benefit-cost study was conducted on the Chicago, Illinois urban forest, utilizing a computer model (C-BAT) developed to quantify various management costs and environmental benefits of urban tree planting. A portion of the study analyzed the benefit-cost ratio of multiple plantings of a single species of tree along selected highway sites. The study took into account the following benefits and costs:

Benefits
- Heating/cooling energy savings
- Absorption of air pollution
- Reduction in stormwater runoff

Costs
- Cost of tree
- Planting
- Maintenance - pruning, removal
- Irrigation
- Infrastructure repair
- Waste disposal
- Liability

The resulting benefit-cost ratio was 2.3:1 for trees planted along urban highway sites.\(^2\)

While conditions on the MAG urban freeway system differ from highways in Chicago, Illinois, many circumstances are similar. A positive benefit-cost analysis is anticipated for trees and plants along the MAG system as well.

4. Community Recognition of Benefits

The landscape ordinances developed and enforced by the various jurisdictions in the Maricopa Association of Governments (and summarized on page 2-9) are evidence of local recognition of the value of fostering the urban landscape. Developers often exceed the minimum standards in the ordinances in an effort to increase the value of their developments. Some cities and developers have expressed interest in supplementing the landscapes planted along MAG freeways. The City of Glendale and Arizona Mills in Tempe are examples of public and private entities which have contributed additional funds for landscape along the MAG freeway system; at SR 101, 75th to 51st and the US 60/I-10 Interchange, respectively.
C. Landscape Design Variables, Requirements and Issues

MAG Urban Freeway segments vary in their requirements and opportunities for landscape treatments. The primary variables include:

- environmental mitigation requirements and funding source(s)
- code requirements (local municipal)
- cooperation of the adjacent jurisdiction
- multi-use opportunities
- design factors:
  - desired character of the new freeway segment
  - the freeway configuration
  - land uses of adjacent properties
  - visibility and impacts of the freeway on adjacent properties and vice versa
  - life cycle costs

The MAG urban freeway designer will need to assess the above variables and issues to develop a landscape design which is responsive to the needs of the project.

1. Environmental Requirements

Vegetation plays an important role in meeting many of the environmental requirements along urban freeway projects. MAG freeway system funds come from both State and Federal sources. The environmental analysis requirements for proposed projects vary depending on the funding source.

On projects with Federal Funds, or approval, compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) is required. Unless a project is excluded from NEPA, an Environmental Assessment (EA) is prepared to determine if the project has the potential to create significant adverse impacts. If it is determined to create such impacts (that cannot be fully mitigated), an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) must be prepared. The highest level of environmental study under NEPA is an EIS.

On projects with State Funds only (no Federal funds), the highest level of environmental study typically required is an Environmental Assessment (EA). A mitigated EA requires that the design of the project include measures to mitigate negative impacts such that the impacts are no longer significant.

Both an EA and an EIS disclose the project's impacts, and identify measures to mitigate (lessen) the negative impacts. With an EIS, the impacts do not have to be fully mitigated to a level that is below "significant" (as with an EA), but the expected results are fully disclosed, with public review and comment periods.13

Federally funded projects may be required to meet environmental criteria in excess of state funded projects. These requirements may include, but are not limited to the following:

Impacts on Minorities or Economically Disadvantaged Groups. An Environmental Justice analysis is required for Federal Aid projects. This analysis considers disproportionate impacts to minorities or economically disadvantaged groups.

Park Land Impacts. A Section 4(f) analysis, regarding impacts on park or recreation land is required for Federal Aid transportation projects.

Public and Agency Involvement. A public hearing is required for Federally funded projects in the EIS process. The review requirements are more extensive for Federally funded projects. For example, an EIS requires review by the Environmental Protection Agency and the Department of Interior. An EA also includes less extensive public
Aesthetic Concerns and Impacts regarding visual quality are brought forward through the public involvement process. In urban areas, there are no environmental regulations regarding impacts on visual resources. Mitigation measures are generally developed as a result of public review of visual impacts and comments regarding desired levels of mitigation. On the MAG freeway system, particularly on Federally funded projects where an EIS is conducted, it is more likely that aesthetic concerns will be identified by constituent groups, due to the longer and more formal review process required. In that case, the use of plant materials along the freeway system could be a determination or outcome of the required mitigation measures. In that situation, adjustments to the budget would have to be made to incorporate the required environmental study. Some projects, such as the Price Freeway, are committed to full landscape through the draft EIS, because of public input and mitigation of visual impacts.

Other differences include procedure, level of detail and significance of impacts and mitigation. Procedural requirements are more extensive for Federal Aid projects, that include specific Federal Register requirements. In the EIS process, a full range of alternatives must be analyzed to the same level of detail (historically, two to three action alternatives are analyzed). All impacts must be fully disclosed. In the EA process, a single alternative can be carried forward. An EA can result in a ‘finding of no significant impact’ (FONSI), as a result of the effectiveness of the designated mitigation measures, or as a result of not anticipating any significant impacts. If an EA determines that impacts are going to be significant, and Federal Funds or approvals are involved, the study should be reclassified as an EIS.

Several environmental requirements are the same for both Federal and State funded projects:

Air Quality Conformance processes and requirements. Air quality requirements for the MAG area are governed by the (federal) Clean Air Act.

Major air pollutants in urban areas are carbon monoxide (CO), predominantly from automobiles; nitrogen oxides (NOx), mainly from automobiles and stationary combustion sources; ozone (O3), formed through chemical reactions involving the principal precursors of NOx and volatile organic compounds; sulfur dioxide (SO2), emissions mostly from stationary combustion sources; and particulate matter (PM10 - small particulate matter such as dust and chemical reactions involving gaseous pollutants).

The entire Phoenix metropolitan area is in nonattainment (an extreme condition) for CO, PM10, and ozone.

MAG freeway projects are currently prioritized and funded, in part, according to their impacts on air quality because of the extreme condition in the Phoenix area. Projects with a landscape component may be ranked higher than those without plants, in recognition of the function of plants in improving air quality by filtering particulates and sequestering carbon compounds. (See Part 2B, Benefits of Plants)

A project can result in adverse impacts on the environment by exceeding National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS). The air pollutant index compound has typically been CO. If a violation does occur, federal level measures need to be incorporated into the design to reduce the violation to a “non-violation”. MAG has a list of
major projects for the five-year program for which macro scale violations have been modeled. If violations occur at this scale, then projects need to be reorganized to prevent predicted future violations.

If MAG funds a project which results in the worsening of air quality to a level which exceeds allowable Valley limits, federal funding assistance could be jeopardized.

Noise Abatement Requirements: The State of Arizona has adopted Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) noise requirements. If a proposed project approaches or exceeds 67 decibels in residential areas, it will require noise mitigation. Walls are typically required to mitigate urban freeway noise.

Erosion Control Requirements: The National Pollutants Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) component of the Clean Water Act regulates the point discharge of pollutants into surface waters. Granite mulch has been accepted to meet erosion control requirements for slopes up to a maximum of 3:1. Vegetation and established seeded areas with grasses and forbs also meet erosion control requirements.

2. CODE REQUIREMENTS OF ADJACENT MUNICIPALITIES

The various jurisdictions in the Maricopa Association of Governments (MAG) have developed landscape ordinances that provide standards and requirements for the installation of landscape materials for all new and expanded development. The purpose of these ordinances is to:

- promote the general welfare of the public
- encourage attractive and logical development
- aid in the enhancement of property values
- create aesthetically pleasing city streets
- provide appropriate buffers between incompatible land uses and protection from intense activities
- aid in conserving water by encouraging the use of a variety of plants, trees and shrubs indigenous to arid regions and characterized by low-water consumption
- reduce heat island effect

Typical requirements of the jurisdictions include prescriptions for densities of plant material, irrigation systems and treatment of impervious surfaces as well as an accepted plant list of drought tolerant species. Comprehensive landscape ordinances have been adopted by the jurisdictions of Scottsdale, Mesa, Tempe, Chandler, Glendale, Phoenix and the Salt River Pima Maricopa Community. These exemplify visions of community, street character and development held by contemporary urban designers and planners. The communities in the MAG area have seen how urban areas around the country have deteriorated due to poor planning and the lack of restrictions concerning urban development. They have also taken a stand on making their communities more sensitive to the environment around it, by promoting plant materials that exemplify low-water use characteristics and are indigenous to the desert Southwest.
Although ADOT is not legally required to meet the code requirements of the separate jurisdictions, the level of landscape design and construction of MAG freeways to date has been compatible with the intent of the adjacent jurisdiction ordinances. ADOT has made an effort to foster a cooperative working relationship with the other jurisdictions. Several projects have moved forward with special cooperative agreements in place, resulting in a shared responsibility and use of landscape areas within the ADOT right-of-way.

3. Responsibilities of Adjacent Jurisdictions

Adjacent jurisdictions have traditionally been responsible for providing irrigation water for construction and continued maintenance of new landscapes along freeways within their boundaries. In addition, local jurisdictions provide maintenance on sections of cross streets that pass over or under ADOT freeways and along frontage roads and areas outside the control of access that parallel the freeway. There are also a few special agreements with local jurisdictions where multiuse retention basins, located within the ADOT right-of-way, are maintained by that jurisdiction.

4. Design Factors

a. Character of the Corridor

The designer also considers the desired character of the new freeway corridor, considering the experience of the freeway traveler, as well as how it fits into the adjacent neighborhood and community. For example, scenic views of the surrounding mountains from the freeway are protected or enhanced to add to the overall character of the corridor.

b. Land Use

Land use varies significantly along the MAG freeway system routes. Land use categories impacted by the proposed freeway system include:
- residential
- retail
- business
- recreational/open space/public parks
- industrial
- agricultural

The designer must consider the future impacts on adjacent land as part of the design process. For example, views to and from the freeway will require visual screening along residential areas and other situations.

c. Freeway Configuration

The configuration of the freeway, whether it is elevated, depressed, at grade or a combination is an additional design consideration. For example, in residential locations where the freeway is depressed below grade, screening may not be required to the extent of at grade or above grade freeway construction (although, air quality and traveler considerations may require the use of plants in any case).

d. Visibility

Visibility and visual mitigation are important considerations for the freeway landscape design. A cost effective visual analysis and mitigation process, the Visual Prioritization Process\textsuperscript{15}, is described for application on the MAG system.

Visual Prioritization Process (VPP)

Past efforts to mitigate the negative impacts of freeway construction have tended to involve the consistent application of mitigation measures along entire corridors. The VPP recognizes that there are variations in the visual conditions, visibility and the significance of visual elements along a corridor. Available funding can be more wisely used and environmental concerns better met by varying the
amount of mitigation in various sections along the corridor according to the visibility of proposed impacts. The VPP uses numerical values, based on visual criteria, which help analyze the impacts and design appropriate mitigation measures. The VPP is also an effective communication tool for use among the planners, engineers, owners and constituent groups.

The VPP identifies visual units and elements along a corridor, quantifies impacts from alternative designs under consideration and evaluates costs and effectiveness of alternative mitigation measures. The process can be used in preliminary planning phases to analyze alternatives, construction document preparation, and has also been used during construction and maintenance. The VPP is most accurate when it is based on actual roadway plans or alternatives. It is recommended that the initial VPP be conducted for each project between the 30% and 60% roadway plan development stage.

Visibility Criteria of the VPP and Results The VPP analysis takes the following criteria into account:
- number of viewpoints from which the project is visible
- magnitude or scale of the area
- distance (or distances) from which the area is viewed
- slope or aspect
- angle of view
- time of day
- duration of view
- silhouette condition

Schematic of VPP Applied to Typical MAG Freeway Section
Based on an inventory of these criteria, the final VPP results indicate three levels of visibility known as Visual Priority Levels (VPL):

- High, areas with the highest level of mitigation needs
- Medium, areas with average level of mitigation needs
- Low, areas with the lowest, or no, level of mitigation needs

Typical Examples of Visual Priority Levels along MAG Freeway System. The following areas would typically result in a High VPL, with a high Landscape Mitigation Budget per acre due to visibility within and adjacent to the right-of-way:

- interchanges
- beginning of curve
- large fill slopes facing residential areas and parks

Conditions which may be factors in the designation of a High VPL area are:

- high degree of change
- loss of significant existing vegetation
- new visual elements within the right-of-way that need mitigation
- low quality views from right-of-way to adjacent parcels
- high constituency concern

The following areas would typically result in a Medium VPL, with an average Landscape Mitigation Budget per acre due to average visibility within right-of-way, and average visibility and impact adjacent to right-of-way:

- straight sections of roadway
- medium sized fill slopes that are not highly visible
- transition from high to low area

- other visual mitigation requirements are being met with other budget items (walls, freeway alignment, etc.)
- medium constituency concern

The following areas would typically result in a Low VPL, with the lowest Landscape Mitigation Budget per acre due to low visibility within right-of-way, low visibility and nominal impacts adjacent to the right-of-way:

- straight sections of peripheral roadway that are not highly visible
- small fill slopes that are not highly visible, or that face away from the viewer

Typical freeway locations with a Low VPL are areas with:

- low levels of change and loss
- good adjacent views from right-of-way
- low constituency concern

e. LIFE CYCLE (MAINTENANCE AND REPLACEMENT) COSTS

The Committee discussed maintenance costs associated with the “decomposed granite only” concept in the Governor’s Plan. A summary of an analysis — by ADOT staff — used as background for these discussions is attached to this report. Primary landscape maintenance activities are weed control, pruning, irrigation equipment repair and litter pick-up. ADOT staff reported the average annual overall cost at $40,000 per mile, of which $12,200 is the base cost associated with decomposed granite (litter pick-up, weed control, and erosion repair), with an additional $27,800 associated with planted areas (landscape and irrigation).

It can be anticipated that both weed control and litter
pick-up costs may increase from existing costs with the Governor's Plan, because planted areas “hide” weeds and litter to some extent. Public awareness of weeds and trash may actually increase, leading to lower tolerance for these unsightly elements.

Life Cycle costs are long term expenses, analogous to preventive maintenance for utility systems. These include replacement of dead or declining plant materials and worn out or damaged irrigation equipment.

Budgeting for Life Cycle costs implies either 1) setting aside current funds for the future, 2) hoping or expecting that funds will be made available when the time comes or 3) obligating future budgets. Regarding the first of these, ADOT already has a budget set-aside type program for asphalt pavement and it may be appropriate to follow suit for landscape replacement. Secondly, it may be operationally effective to include replacement costs as an allocation of or supplement to routine maintenance budgets. As for the third implication, budgeting is an annual process and it is not legal to commit future legislatures to any expenditures.

The extent of the Life Cycle effort can range from simply removing and replanting a dead tree or shrub with a container-grown replacement, to wholesale removal and replacement of entire landscapes including irrigation.

Professional maintenance personnel confirm that drip-type irrigation systems on the whole will last ten to fifteen years. However, one should expect to replace the moving parts of control valves annually. In ADOT's experience, drip emitters may last only six months to three years, depending on other activity in the area. An accidental break in a line can contaminate and clog small orifices. Low-flow bubblers or other systems may have greater longevity though their use may be restricted to level conditions. It is generally agreed that disturbance is the greatest factor in the failure of irriga-

Plant life expectancies have been shown to be significantly shortened by the stresses associated with urban environments (e.g., excessive wind, heat build up and reradiation preventing nighttime low temperatures). Maintenance costs need to include regular replacement of dead or declining plant materials in urban settings.
f. Additional Funding Sources

The Committee identified and discussed several potential funding sources to supplement the funds available through ADOT for the MAG freeway landscape construction. These include:

- **ISTEA Transportation Enhancement Funds.** These funds have been used for components of several projects on the MAG system where landscape treatments were over and above the 'normal' treatment, e.g., land graphics, provision of multiuse areas and tree salvage.

- **Community assistance.** The adjacent communities may participate in a form of landscape funding partnership. Cities already contribute to the projects by providing irrigation water and maintaining those sections of the freeway outside the Control of Access, normally including cross streets and frontage roads.

- **Developer assistance.** Arizona Mills in Tempe, contributed funds to increase plant sizes at the US60/I-10 interchange.

- Generating landscape funds by leasing space to outdoor advertising companies on bridge abutments, retaining walls and noise walls. This would require legislation, design guidelines and negotiations with the Outdoor Advertising Industry.

- Involve volunteer groups in the planting and maintaining of freeway sections, similar to the Adopt-a-Highway program.

- Develop an infrastructure bank. Municipalities could borrow from the bank for landscape construction, and pay the fund back at a later time, when additional funds are available.

These ideas, generated by the Committee, may be explored as potential sources of funds to supplement the funding available from Federal and State sources.
PART 3
LANDSCAPE CONCEPTS

Landscape concepts are designed to meet the multitude of functional, environmental and aesthetic requirements generated by the development of the freeway system. The Value Analysis committee produced a number of landscape concepts for future application and study.

The concepts presented are intended to compare different approaches, and show the different effects and corresponding costs for possible cost reduction strategies.

The $650,000 budget approved by the Citizens Transportation Oversight Committee represents enough money to plant and irrigate a moderate quantity of small trees and shrubs and to cover most of the landscape area with decomposed granite. Landscape Concepts 6 and 7 (pages 3-14 to 3-17) are examples of treatments which conform to this budget. The other Concepts are included for comparison. They range in cost from $7,000 to $34,000 per acre or approximately $210,000 to $1,020,000 per mile. Part 4 explains how a combination of these Concepts might be applied within a given jurisdiction or project in order to respond to varying land uses, views and screening needs.

It is important to state that the landscape concepts do not address design decisions such as: corresponding time frame for effective mitigation, water uses over time, density and massing, visual variety, character of area (informal vs. formal), adjacent jurisdiction requirements (re: overlapping right of way line with tree canopy, etc.), visual transition from one concept/application to another, sculptural statements, selection of plants for texture, color, seasonal bloom, etc. These factors are addressed in the Landscape Design Guidelines for Urban Highways.
A. LANDSCAPE ELEMENTS

The Committee identified a number of landscape elements, which are typically combined for various landscape concepts. Landscape concepts typically describe the use of one or more materials or elements. Following is the full list of landscape elements and concepts identified by the Committee:

- decomposed granite only (the proposed landscape treatment of the Governor’s Plan)
- “land graphics” (two-dimensional designs using a variety of inert materials)
- planting a seed mix, resulting in a mix of plants over time
- using only native plants, (e.g. a combination of salvaged cacti and succulents, seedlings (such as mesquite, acacia and creosote) and a seed mix. This concept includes an irrigation system for plant establishment, to be turned off except during plant establishment and periods of drought.
- accent/color plantings
- walls for retaining slopes and mitigating noise (not included in landscape budget)
- use of plants for screening (typically trees and shrubs, closely spaced)
- turf in detention basins where water would collect, usually in combination with trees
- trees in combination with various ground covers — inert and living — including: decomposed granite, soil stabilizer, river rock, trailing plants, raked earth and seed mix. This concept includes the idea of a mesquite bosque.
- use of plants to enhance and frame views
- staggered ledges and other specialized grading for water harvesting and visual variety
- ground cover plants only
- shrubs only
- cactus only
- farming/gardening in right-of-way
- inert ground cover materials (other than decomposed granite)
- seedlings only (e.g. mesquite bosque, creosote stand) - to be irrigated by hand until established
B. LANDSCAPE CONCEPTS

Several of the above elements have been combined into a sampling of eight landscape concepts for further discussion and analysis. While not a prescription for all of the MAG freeway system, the landscape concepts that follow will be applicable in various locations within the system, either alone or in combination with others. The concepts must be applied in ways that meet the site, safety, environmental and design requirements of specific projects.

The first concept is an example of a traditional MAG freeway project. This concept is included as a baseline against which all other concepts are measured. Each subsequent concept has been evaluated as to its effectiveness in mitigating impacts, as compared to Concept 1. The following ranking system was used:

- Less (less effective than traditional)
- Same (same effectiveness as traditional)
- More (more effective than traditional)

The per acre estimates of the eight landscape concepts do not include topsoil plating, rough grading, noise abatement walls, irrigation sleeves, or drainage facilities; these items are assumed to be included in the roadway costs. The estimates also do not include removal and/or salvage of existing vegetation, design, engineering administration, contingencies, or landscape maintenance. Most concepts include decomposed granite in bare areas in order to control erosion and dust. (see Appendix G)
**Concept 1**
**Traditional Landscape**

This concept includes a mixture of native and drought tolerant trees, shrubs, ground covers, and accent plants. Decomposed granite is used throughout to control erosion. This concept would typically be used in graded (nonnatural) areas and is consistent with area landscape ordinances. The Traditional Concept actually reflects a fairly modern xeriscape tradition developed over the past two decades. This concept is considered a landscape baseline against which all other Concepts are measured. Plant sizes and densities are based on a 1991 study by HNTB and are typical of MAG landscape projects from 1989 to 1994.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coverage</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Plants</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Granite</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irrigation</td>
<td>permanent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plant Densities</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15 gal. Trees/acre</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 gal. Shrubs/acre</td>
<td>156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 gal. Shrubs/acre</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitigation Effectiveness of Concept 1</td>
<td>Less (less effective than concept 1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aesthetic/visual benefits</td>
<td>Same</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air quality benefits</td>
<td>Same</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heat island benefits</td>
<td>Same</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stormwater runoff mitigation</td>
<td>Same</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic benefits and impacts to tourism</td>
<td>Same</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban avian, wildlife and recreational benefits</td>
<td>Same</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance efficiency</td>
<td>Same</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consistent with adjacent codes</td>
<td>Same</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controlling landscape installation costs</td>
<td>Same</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controlling irrigation installation costs</td>
<td>Same</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controlling water use and costs</td>
<td>Same</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life cycle (longevity of project)</td>
<td>Same</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire hazard mitigation</td>
<td>Same</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total cost per acre installed (estimate) $34,000

Traditional Landscape

SR 202 Red Mountain Freeway at 24th Street
CONCEPT 2
Decomposed Granite only

A two inch thick layer of decomposed granite is spread and compacted over the entire landscape area. This type of application of decomposed granite has been shown to effectively control erosion from stormwater runoff. Other environmental effects are expected to be negative: increase in urban heat island and stormwater runoff volume, decrease in air quality. The Decomposed Granite Only concept does not conform to the landscape ordinance requirements of any of the jurisdictions within the MAG area. Litter control costs are expected to increase, however total maintenance costs would be reduced because of the lack of plants and irrigation. This type of treatment is appropriate only in low visibility areas.

Coverage
- Plants: 0%
- Granite: 100%
- Irrigation: none

Plant Densities
n/a
### Mitigation Effectiveness of Concept 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Less (less effective than concept 1)</th>
<th>Same (same effectiveness as concept 1)</th>
<th>More (more effective than concept 1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aesthetics/visual benefits</td>
<td>Less</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air quality benefits</td>
<td>Less</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heat island benefits</td>
<td>Less</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stormwater runoff mitigation</td>
<td>Less</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic benefits and impacts to tourism</td>
<td>Less</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban amenities, wildlife and recreational benefits</td>
<td>Less</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance efficiency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>More</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consistent with adjacent codes</td>
<td>Less</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controlling landscape installation costs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>More</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controlling irrigation installation costs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>More</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controlling water use and costs</td>
<td>More</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life cycle (longevity of project)</td>
<td>More</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire hazard mitigation</td>
<td>More</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total cost per acre installed (estimate) $14,600

Decomposed Granite Only

I-10 at 107th Avenue

Landscaping Concepts 3-7
**Concept 3**

**Landscape Graphics**

A variety of inert materials is placed to create a two-dimensional design that can be viewed from the highway. In this example, the design reinforces the Southwestern motif that contributes to the overall character of the freeway. Desert plantings can be added but are not included in the cost estimate. This is a good potential treatment for interchanges which have a large number of acres combined with high visibility.

**Coverage**
- Plants: 0%
- Granite: 100%
- Irrigation: none

**Plant Densities**
- n/a

---

3-8 Value Analysis Report
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mitigation Effectiveness of Concept 3</th>
<th>Less (less effective than concept 1)</th>
<th>Same (same effectiveness as concept 1)</th>
<th>More (more effective than concept 1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>aesthetic/visual benefits</td>
<td></td>
<td>Same</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>air quality benefits</td>
<td>Less</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>heat island benefits</td>
<td>Less</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stormwater runoff mitigation</td>
<td>Less</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>economic benefits and impacts to tourism</td>
<td></td>
<td>Some</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>urban aviary, wildlife and recreational benefits</td>
<td>Less</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>maintenance efficiency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>consistent with adjacent codes</td>
<td>Less</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>controlling landscape installation costs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>controlling irrigation installation costs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>controlling water use and costs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>life cycle (longevity of project)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fire hazard mitigation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total cost per acre installed (estimate) $25,000

Land Graphics

Hohokam/Red Mountain Traffic Interchange
CONCEPT 4
SEED MIX ONLY

A seed mix containing native and drought tolerant species is applied to the right-of-way. The appearance of the seeded area changes dramatically with the seasons, especially if no irrigation is included - temporary irrigation is also an option. Many of the native species are drought deciduous, resulting in a brown appearance during the summer months. Maintenance is a challenge, as it is sometimes difficult to distinguish the desired plants and grasses from weedy species, until they become larger plants. Fire danger is increased in seeded areas. Seed mixes are typically used adjacent to natural or rural areas. Existing trees and shrubs can be left in the landscape with seed mix applied around them. Seasonal color is a potential benefit.

Concept 4 - Landscape and Grading Plan

Coverage
- Plants: up to 100% (depends on germination)
- Granite: 0%
- Irrigation: none or temporary

Plant Densities
- Seed Mix: 100%
## Mitigation Effectiveness of Concept 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Less (less effective than concept 1)</th>
<th>Same (same effectiveness as concept 1)</th>
<th>More (more effective than concept 1)</th>
<th>Note</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aesthetic/visual benefits</td>
<td>Less</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air quality benefits</td>
<td>Same</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heat island benefits</td>
<td>Same</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stormwater runoff mitigation</td>
<td>Same</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic benefits and impacts to tourism</td>
<td>Less</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>depends on location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban area, wildlife and recreational benefits</td>
<td>Less</td>
<td>Same</td>
<td>More</td>
<td>depends on species</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance efficiency</td>
<td>Less</td>
<td></td>
<td>More</td>
<td>Initially/long term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consistent with adjacent codes</td>
<td>Less</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controlling landscape installation costs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>More</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controlling irrigation installation costs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>More</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controlling water use and costs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>More</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life cycle (longevity of project)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>More</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire hazard mitigation</td>
<td>Less</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total cost per acre installed (estimated) | $7,000 (non-irrigated) |
| Total cost per acre installed (estimated) | $15,000 (temporary irrigation) |

US 60
Superstition Freeway
at Apache Junction

Seed Mix Only
**Concept 5**

**Native Shrubs only**

This concept can be used as an alternative to inert covers to stabilize slopes or as part of a revegetation concept emphasizing shrubs. In this example, native creosote bush were planted to blend with surrounding vegetation. Irrigation would typically be required for establishment. With native plants, irrigation can be greatly reduced or eliminated after approximately two years. Plant sizes are assumed to be smaller than the Traditional Landscape Concept 1. Plants native to other arid climates may also be appropriate.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coverage</th>
<th>Plants</th>
<th>80%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Granite</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Irrigation</td>
<td>temporary or permanent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Plant Densities**

1 gal. Shrubs/Acre | 440

Note: Decomposed granite and irrigation may be required depending on slope conditions.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mitigation Effectiveness of Concept 5</th>
<th>Less (less effective than concept 1)</th>
<th>Same (same effectiveness as concept 1)</th>
<th>More (more effective than concept 1)</th>
<th>Note</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>aesthetics/visual benefits</td>
<td>Less</td>
<td>Same</td>
<td>More</td>
<td>depends on location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>air quality benefits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>heat island benefits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stormwater runoff mitigation</td>
<td>Less</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>economic benefits and impacts to tourism</td>
<td>Less</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>urban amenity, wildlife and recreational benefits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>More</td>
<td>depends on species</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>maintenance efficiency</td>
<td></td>
<td>Same</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>consistent with adjacent codes</td>
<td>Less</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>controlling landscape installation costs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>More</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>controlling irrigation installation costs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>More</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>controlling water use and costs</td>
<td></td>
<td>Some</td>
<td>More</td>
<td>depends on species</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>life cycle (longevity of project)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tree hazard mitigation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total cost per acre installed (estimated) $20,500.00 (Irrigated)
Total cost per acre installed (estimated) $8,200.00 (non-Irrigated*)

*The non-irrigated cost is based on planting seedlings, and watering them only at the time of planting. The survival rate would be largely dependent upon weather conditions. Effective mitigation time would be longer, as the shrubs would grow more slowly without irrigation.

Native Shrubs Only

1-10 at Ajo Way
**Concept 6**

**Shrub and Ground Cover Emphasis**

This concept has traditionally been used to visually mitigate noise and retaining walls. It emphasizes a use of shrubs and ground covers, with fewer trees than average. Overall plant cover is reduced as compared to the Traditional Landscape Concept 1. Plant sizes are assumed to be smaller than the Traditional Landscape Concept 1. Concept 6 is most effective for narrow rights of way without space for trees. Additional decomposed granite may be required for dust or erosion control.

**Coverage**
- Plants: 40%
- Granite: 60%
- Irrigation: permanent

**Plant Densities**
- 1 gal. Shrubs/Acre: 160
- 1 gal. Shrubs/Acre: 140
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Mitigation Effectiveness of Concept 6</strong></th>
<th><strong>Less</strong></th>
<th><strong>Same</strong></th>
<th><strong>More</strong></th>
<th><strong>Note</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>aesthetically/visual benefits</td>
<td>Less</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>in long term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>air quality benefits</td>
<td>Less</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>heat island benefits</td>
<td>Less</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stormwater run off mitigation</td>
<td></td>
<td>Same</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>economic benefits and impacts to tourism</td>
<td>Less</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>in long term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>urban safety, wildlife and recreational benefits</td>
<td>Less</td>
<td></td>
<td>depends on species</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>maintenance efficiency</td>
<td>Less</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>consistent with adjacent codes</td>
<td>Less</td>
<td></td>
<td>More</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>controlling landscape installation costs</td>
<td></td>
<td>Same</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>controlling irrigation installation costs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Same</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>controlling water use and costs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Same</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>life cycle (longevity of project)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Less</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fire hazard mitigation</td>
<td>Less</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total cost per acre installed (estimate) $21,700

Shrub and Ground Cover Emphasis with fewer trees

I-10, Pearl Harbor Memorial Freeway between Deck Park & Squaw Peak (north side)
Concept 7
Tree emphasis with shrubs

This concept emphasizes trees in combination with large shrubs to provide a similar amount of plant cover as Concept 1, using fewer plants. Plants need to be spaced to allow adequate room to grow with minimal pruning required. Plant sizes are assumed to be smaller than the Traditional Landscape Concept (1). Water harvesting can be used to supplement water from an irrigation system (see Appendix E). Due to the use of smaller and fewer plants, this type of treatment would take longer to establish than the traditional landscape. Additional plants would typically be required in order to provide screening for adjacent residential areas. More decomposed granite may be required for dust or erosion control.

Coverage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Coverage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Plants</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Granite</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irrigation</td>
<td>temporary or permanent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Plant Densities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plant Densities</th>
<th>5 gal. Trees/acre 50</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 gal. Shrubs/acre</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Concept 7 - Landscape and Grading Plan

3-16 Value Analysis Report
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mitigation Effectiveness of Concept 7</th>
<th>Less (less effective than concept 1)</th>
<th>Same (same effectiveness as concept 1)</th>
<th>More (more effective than concept 1)</th>
<th>Note</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>aesthetics/visual benefits</td>
<td>Same</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>air quality benefits</td>
<td>Same</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>heat island benefits</td>
<td>Same</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stormwater runoff mitigation</td>
<td>Same</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>economic benefits and impacts to tourism</td>
<td>Same</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>urban aviation, wildlife and recreational benefits</td>
<td>Same</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>maintenance efficiency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>More</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>consistent with adjacent codes</td>
<td></td>
<td>Some</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>controlling landscape installation costs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>More</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>controlling irrigation installation costs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>More</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>controlling water use and costs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>More</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>life cycle (longevity of project)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Some</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fire hazard mitigation</td>
<td></td>
<td>Some</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total cost per acre installed $21,700

Tree Emphasis with Shrubs

US 60 Superstition Freeway
East of Gilbert Road
Concept 8
Trees with Turf

This concept can be applied to detention basins and excess right of way areas in order to incorporate a multiuse recreational facility within ADOT right of way. The area is planted with turf with tree groupings located near the perimeter of the basin. The adjacent community provides maintenance in exchange for the use of the facility as a recreational area. In order to receive a waiver for the use of turf from the Arizona Department of Water Resources, it must be demonstrated that it is in the public interest to do so. Noise walls may be necessary at additional cost to create a usable recreation area. This would need to be done in partnership with local jurisdictions.

Coverage
- Plants: 100%
- Granite: 0%
- Irrigation: permanent

Plant Densities
- 15 gal. Trees/acre: 25
- Turf: 100%

Concept 8 - Landscape and Grading Plan

Freeway

Freeway On-Ramp

Fence (typ.)

Grass

Basin

Light Standard (typ.)

City Street with Parking
## Mitigation Effectiveness of Concept 8

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Less (less effective than concept 1)</th>
<th>Same (same effectiveness as concept 1)</th>
<th>More (more effective than concept 1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aesthetics/visual benefits</td>
<td></td>
<td>Some</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air quality benefits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>More</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waste disposal benefits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>More</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stormwater runoff mitigation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>More</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic benefits and impacts to tourism</td>
<td></td>
<td>Some</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban avery, wildlife and recreational benefits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>More</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance efficiency</td>
<td>Less</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consistent with adjacent codes</td>
<td></td>
<td>Some</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controlling landscape installation costs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Less</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controlling irrigation installation costs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Less</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controlling water use and costs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Less</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life cycle (longevity of project)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Less</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire hazard mitigation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>More</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total cost per acre installed (estimate) $33,400

Trees with Turf

US 60 Superstition Freeway
West of Mesa Drive, Heritage Park
C. SUMMARY

The eight landscape concepts range in cost from approximately $7,000 per acre to $34,000 per acre. Some of these examples include portions of the planting area left in a raked earth condition. Many different appearances can be achieved depending on plant choices and how these concepts are combined.

Several variables effect the final landscape cost and overall effectiveness in the community. These variables include: size of the plant at the time of planting, time frame to achieve visual mitigation, density of the plants, seasonal appearance, maintenance availability, water availability, environmental conditions, and proportion of plants, decomposed granite and raked earth within the project limits.

Typically, several would be combined to achieve the environmental, aesthetic and economic goals of the project, and stay within the project budget.

1. Traditional Landscape $34,000/acre
2. Decomposed Granite Only $14,600/acre
3. Land Graphics $25,000/acre
4. Seed Mix Only $7,000/acre (non-irrigated) $15,000/acre (temporary irrigation)
5. Native Shrubs Only $20,500/acre (irrigated)
   $8,200/acre (non-irrigated)

US 60 Superstition Freeway, East of Gilbert Road

6. Shrub and Ground Cover Emphasis $21,700/acre

US 60 Superstition Freeway, West of Mesa Drive

7. Tree Emphasis with Shrubs $21,700/acre

8. Trees with Turf $33,400/acre
PART 4
APPLICATIONS - SKY HARBOR EXPRESSWAY

ADOT staff recently had the opportunity to apply several of the Value Analysis Committee's preliminary concepts to a new project, the Sky Harbor Expressway. This design demonstrates the principles of the Visual Prioritization Process, and the following landscape concepts, as described in Part 3:

1. Traditional Landscape, for accent and color plantings
2. Decomposed Granite Only
3. Land Graphics
4. Seed Mix Only
5. Shrub & Ground Cover Emphasis, for retaining and noise wall mitigation
6. Tree Emphasis with Shrubs, densely planted where screening is needed and in limited groupings in other areas.

This project, which began construction in 1996, will be the first application of many of the Committee's concepts along the MAG freeway system. The landscape cost for this project was approximately $485,000 per mile. ADOT funded $350,000 per mile per the Governor's Plan, with the additional landscape funding provided by ISTEA Enhancement Funds and the City of Phoenix.

The project is located on ADOT right-of-way within the City of Phoenix. Zoning and land uses in the project area are: Industrial, Recreational/Open Space, and Public Facility.

The City of Phoenix landscape code is very brief for major streets and different land uses. It includes requirements for landscape and buffering along major streets. The ADOT landscape concepts are consistent with the City's code requirements.

Following are examples of areas which demonstrate the application of visual analysis methodology in combination with selected landscape concepts.

The result is an environmentally and aesthetically pleasing landscape approach that reduces traditional costs but remains within the recommended budget.
SAMPLE 1- HIGH VISUAL PRIORITY LEVEL

This area is on an interchange ramp, where traffic is slowed and traveling in a curved pattern. Consequently, the driver’s and passengers’ views will be focused directly at the planting area on the outside of the ramp. The inside of the ramp is also highly visible from traffic entering the ramp and passing by the interchange.

The landscape concepts selected for these areas are:

1. Traditional Landscape (33%) in order to screen adjacent areas.
2. Land Graphics (67%)

The combined, estimated cost per acre of the landscape concepts in this area is: $28,000/acre.
SAMPLE 2 - MEDIUM VISUAL PRIORITY LEVEL

This area is a gently curved transition, where the driver’s and passengers’ views of the planting areas are at an angle. This area is viewed for a shorter duration of time than the interchange area, due to the higher design speed.

The landscape concepts selected for these areas are:

6. Shrub & Ground Cover Emphasis (20%) closest to travel lanes.
7. Tree Emphasis with Shrubs (60%) planted in moderate densities.
2. Decomposed Granite mulch (64%) to control dust and erosion.

The combined, estimated cost per acre of the landscape concepts in this area is: $21,700/acre.
SAMPLE 3 - LOW VISUAL PRIORITY LEVEL

This is a peripheral landscape area with minimal views from the freeway or adjacent land uses.

The landscape concepts applied in this area include:
4. Seed Mix Only (70%) in peripheral areas.
7. Tree Emphasis with Shrubs, (80%) with decomposed granite near the freeway mainline and combined with seed mix in peripheral areas. Trees are widely spaced for viewing at higher speeds and are located near travel lanes.

The combined, estimated cost per acre of the landscape concepts in this area is: $ 19,000/acre.
SUMMARY

The Sky Harbor Expressway project applies a varied mitigation budget which corresponds to the visibility of the different areas along the corridor. This freeway design demonstrates the combined use of several landscape concepts to achieve a cohesive design; meet the environmental, aesthetic and economic goals of the MAG freeway system; and address the reduced budget goals as set forth by the Value Analysis Committee.
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PART 5
RECOMMENDATIONS AND CONCLUSION

RECOMMENDATIONS

The beneficial effects of plants are widely known. They filter pollutants, add oxygen to the atmosphere, help control erosion, increase the value of residential properties and provide psychological benefits. As an example, people tend to shop longer in vegetated surroundings, and Arizona is a state which relies heavily on its tourism industry. Landscaped streets and freeways add to Arizona’s image as a scenic state with a high quality of life. Freeway plantings provide a positive community image, attract visitors and businesses and encourage appropriate plantings by others. Municipalities require private developments to include landscape plans, as one way to compensate the community for the increased noise, traffic, heat and runoff associated with urban development. Unplanted freeways may not meet public expectations and development standards.

There are a variety of beneficial landscape concepts appropriate to the MAG Freeway System that conform to current budgets. The effective application of these concepts can mitigate many of the negative impacts of freeway development, and result in long-term environmental, aesthetic and economic benefits.

The Value Analysis Committee recommends the following:

1. Incorporate plant materials as a part of the construction of all segments of the MAG Urban Freeway System.
   Based on the Value Analysis Study, the Committee finds that the continued use of plants along the freeway system is an important component of the MAG freeway system program. While accurate benefit-cost studies have not been performed at this time, research in other urban areas indicate a positive ratio for urban freeway trees. **Because the metropolitan area is in an air quality nonattainment situation, the removal of plants, which improve air quality, is not appropriate.** Other, non-quantitative benefits of vegetation reinforce the positive return on investment for landscape along the system.

2. Adopt a construction budget of $650,000 per mile for landscape, irrigation and granite.
   This budget is based on 30 acres/mile average and 1996 dollars. It does not include design, engineering administration, or contingency costs. The Committee respects the efforts to reduce landscaping costs to build
more miles of freeway, while reducing development costs. In light of the need for cost reduction, the Committee recommends a landscape budget cost per mile figure of $650,000. While it is expected that costs will vary from segment to segment within a given project, this range accommodates a variety of conditions, treatments and mitigation measures.

These recommended budget figures are substantially less than the traditional budget adjusted to today's dollars, however they are greater than the allowance in the Plan. The recommended budget represents approximately 13 percent in reductions from the previous budget of $750,000 per mile, and approximately 20 percent in reductions from recent projects.

As landscape treatments over the length of the system will vary depending on adjacent land use, design requirements and mitigation measures, so will the actual cost. The recommended construction budget of $650,000 per project mile is an overall average. Actual costs are expected to range from less than $450,000 to more than $900,000 per mile, depending on the local conditions and actual acreage of the project.

3. **Adopt future landscape budgets based on a per acre amount at the project level.**

On a project-to-project basis, it is more appropriate to create budgets using per acre rather than per mile figures, particularly where major traffic interchanges are involved. While an average cost per acre for landscape construction expenditures would be $21,700 using the above recommendations, a more accurate budget would be created for each project, which would reflect the site specific environmental, visual and mitigation requirements.

4. **Maintain a flexible approach to landscaping.**

This approach would allow adjacent communities and/or developers to fund higher levels of landscaping, such as increased plant size and density. This type of approach would allow a municipality to highlight a gateway or provide additional screening for a neighborhood. It would allow developers to insure an upgrade along individual developments. ADOT would take responsibility for maintaining continuity and appropriateness of landscape treatments.

5. **Apply a visual prioritization process to future MAG freeway segments.**

The VPP has been shown to be a cost effective approach to preparing visual mitigation plans. With the VPP, plant materials designed for visual mitigation purposes are concentrated according to their visibility to increase the overall effectiveness of the design.

6. **Consider long term maintenance and life cycle costs in the design and budgeting process.**

7. **Select landscape design concepts that maximize environmental, economic and aesthetic benefits of plants, while meeting cost reduction goals.**

8. **Update the Landscape Design Guidelines for Urban Highways publication.**

This document has provided excellent direction for landscape treatments along urban freeways in Arizona, and has also been used by many other state Departments of Transportation. The recent emphasis on cost
effective design and cost reduction measures needs to be incorporated into the manual. New, innovative ideas generated by this Value Analysis Committee (such as greater use of seeded plants, harvesting stormwater runoff and increased reliance on plants suitable to project soil conditions) in combination with successful, field tested requirements set forth in the original guidelines, could contribute additional savings in construction and maintenance.

9. Maximize the effectiveness of landscape and mitigation funds (first) within each jurisdiction, and (second) on each project.
The Committee recognizes that funding for projects will cross jurisdictional lines. Each jurisdiction will want their proportional amount of landscape budget, to achieve the maximum benefits locally.

10. Continue to include topsoil and irrigation sleeving in the roadway construction budget.
The alternatives in this report do not include the cost of topsoil, but some do require topsoil, or using some of the topsoil budget for other landscape items. The latter makes these alternatives more feasible and their overall cost per acre less than traditional landscape scenarios.

11. Adopt a budget on a per mile, per year basis, for landscape maintenance.
There is a need to increase the landscape maintenance budget as roadway miles are added. Even decomposed granite requires weed and litter control.

With the regional freeway plan, an additional 108 miles of landscaping will be placed on an already struggling system. Maintenance funding has been held to a minimum in order to fund more construction. Without performing the required regular maintenance the landscape will deteriorate and require additional costly repairs.

The Committee urges that freeway landscape maintenance be adequately funded. Landscape maintenance costs have been estimated to be $35,000 per mile per year. More study is needed in order to determine an exact budget.
CONCLUSION

It is true that, with or without plants, additional freeway miles will make life easier for commuters and travelers. Easier commutes are not without a price, however. Traditionally, adjacent neighborhoods have born the brunt of urban freeways, through higher noise and pollution levels, intrusion of traffic and incompatible land uses, and severed connections from schools and neighborhoods. In response to this, ADOT’s urban freeway investments of the past decade have included attractively designed noise walls, grade separated pedestrian and bicycle crossings, traffic intrusion controls and desert adapted plantings. These features help mitigate the impacts of the freeway on those who live nearby, as well as providing community-wide environmental, aesthetic and economic benefits.

The Value Analysis Committee recognized that the metropolitan area would be best served by effective landscape treatments along all of its freeways, even if it meant delaying construction of a few miles of freeway. The community echoed these concerns, and in December 1996 the Citizens Transportation Oversight Committee (CTOC) recommended restoring funding for freeway landscaping, with a budget of $650,000 per mile. This budget represents enough money to plant and irrigate a modest quantity of trees and shrubs (from small containers) and to cover 60 to 70 percent of the landscape area with decomposed granite. It also allows varied treatments to be applied within a given jurisdiction or project (based on a visual prioritization process) in order to respond to varying land uses, views and screening needs. Additional funds may be contributed by municipalities and/or private sources in order to increase plant densities, add specimen plants or otherwise upgrade what can be accomplished within the base level budget.

In this way, landscape costs will be reduced from what has been spent in the past decade, while maintaining vegetative cover, cohesive design themes and meeting varying environmental, aesthetic and economic goals.
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APPENDIX C
ADOT ROADSIDE DEVELOPMENT
REPORT ON COSTS

I-10 Papago Inner Loop Landscape
Planting Density and Cost Summary
Development.

Average Planting Density for all Landscape Projects.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Density</th>
<th>Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>24.30</td>
<td>Trees Per Acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.00056</td>
<td>Trees Per Sq. Ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>156.43</td>
<td>Shrubs Per Acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.00359</td>
<td>Shrubs Per Sq. Ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87.80</td>
<td>Ground cover Per Acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.00201</td>
<td>Ground cover Per Sq. Ft.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average Planting Cost for all Landscape Projects.

Low Bid:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$7,492.00</td>
<td>Per Acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$0.17</td>
<td>Per Sq. Ft.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average of all Bids:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$8,733.00</td>
<td>Per Acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$0.19</td>
<td>Per Sq. Ft.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average Irrigation Cost for all Landscape Projects

Low Bid:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$9,689.00</td>
<td>Per Acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$0.23</td>
<td>Per Sq. Ft.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average of all Bids:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$10,906.00</td>
<td>Per Acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$0.25</td>
<td>Per Sq. Ft.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average Landscape Establishment Cost for all Landscape Projects

Low Bid:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$1,442.00</td>
<td>Per Acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$0.03</td>
<td>Per Sq. Ft.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average of all Bids:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$1,338.00</td>
<td>Per Acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$0.03</td>
<td>Per Sq. Ft.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average Granite Cost for all Landscape Projects

Low Bid:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$8,852.00</td>
<td>Per Acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$0.20</td>
<td>Per Sq. Ft.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average of all Bids:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$9,539.00</td>
<td>Per Acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$0.22</td>
<td>Per Sq. Ft.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average Miscellaneous Costs for all Landscape Projects

Low Bid:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$11,703.00</td>
<td>Per Acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$0.27</td>
<td>Per Sq. Ft.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average of all Bids:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$13,307.00</td>
<td>Per Acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$0.27</td>
<td>Per Sq. Ft.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX D
TOPSOIL PLATING AND IRRIGATION SLEEVING

The Committee had side discussions regarding topsoil and irrigation sleeving. The costs of topsoil and irrigation sleeving were not a part of the reduction in the landscape budget proposed in the Plan. (In this case, topsoil means friable, native soil compacted to the density of undisturbed conditions and assumes a depth of two feet. Engineered fill material is not considered topsoil.) ADOT administration had tentatively decided to eliminate topsoil also, presumably because of the assumption that it would not be needed in a rock mulch-only format. There are a number of issues here:

- The lack of topsoil adds to the difficulty of attracting alternate funding from municipalities or others for planting and irrigation.

- Should priorities change in coming years, adding topsoil and irrigation sleeving would require either removing or wasting the existing mulch and soil, and boring under the existing pavement.

- Slopes without topsoil might require more rock, due to inherent roughness, or considerably more preparation to receive the rock mulch.

- Topsoil provides a more cohesive surface material, subject to less erosion by wind and water.

Given these concerns, the Committee recommends that topsoil and irrigation sleeving be included in the construction budget for the roadway. The alternatives in this report do not include the cost of topsoil, but some do require topsoil, or using some of the topsoil budget for other landscape items. The latter makes these alternatives more feasible and their overall cost per acre less than traditional landscape scenarios.
APPENDIX E
WATER HARVESTING TECHNIQUES AND EROSION CONTROL

A subcommittee of the Value Analysis Committee developed the following preliminary concepts regarding water harvesting and erosion control.

Supplementing irrigation with stormwater harvesting. There was consensus that water harvesting alone will not be enough to support significant landscaping. While supplemental irrigation water will be required to maintain most of the proposed landscape concepts, total irrigation water requirements can be minimized through a partial use of stormwater drainage. The use of harvesting stormwater for landscape purposes should be secondary to the stormwater drainage system. Failures of the system should not drain onto the roadway or onto private property. Downdrains to a rock basin, at catch basin locations, are recommended. Cost savings may be available by reducing the requirements of the drainage system design.
Clear zone requirements. Clear zone requirements should be checked regarding limits of undulating slopes and plant size limitations. Clear zone areas should not include fixed obstacles.

Design considerations.

- Groupings of plantings and the oasis concept, in intermittent locations, is preferred to consistent plantings.
- Use pocket areas with variable slopes.
- Water harvesting clusters should be restricted to areas close to a water source.
- The minimum depth of decomposed granite, for erosion control, is 2". A mixture of various sizes of granite is important for it to interlock effectively.
- Slopes should be covered with seeding or granite if steeper than 1:4. Slopes at 1:4 and flatter may be left in a raked earth (bare soil) condition. A variety of conditions is desirable on a project. Selective seeding is an option.
- The use of soil cement was questioned due to the change in color.
- Chemical stabilizers have a 3 year life span, and currently cost $2.50 to $2.75 per square yard. The current cost of decomposed granite is $1.50 per square yard.
- Retention basins must be fail safe. The design must insure that failure of any temporary ponding will result in water flowing to where it was originally intended to go, and not on the roadway.
- Close coordination is required between the landscape designer and the roadway designer in the development of a water harvesting plan, so that runoff is not concentrated in undesirable places.
- Retaining walls should be used to flatten slopes where possible. Decomposed granite should not be used between walls. Seeding and plant materials are desirable between walls.
- Use "living" walls to retain water and to lessen the slope in landscaped areas.
- Use rough cut slopes to slow erosion.
### Appendix F - Basis for Acres/Mile and Unit Costs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Acres/Mile</th>
<th>Length (miles)</th>
<th>Inflation</th>
<th>15 Gal. Tree</th>
<th>5 Gal. Tree</th>
<th>5 Gal. Shrub</th>
<th>1 Gal. Shrub</th>
<th>DG/Acre</th>
<th>Seed M/Acre</th>
<th>LS Grading/Acre</th>
<th>LS Fertilizer/Acre</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>East Papago Freeway (SR 2023) 115-40th St.</td>
<td>Phoenix</td>
<td>1992</td>
<td>72.3</td>
<td>2.31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.W. Outer Loop (SL 101) (Phx. Urban Area)</td>
<td>Phoenix Motorway</td>
<td>1989</td>
<td>90.0</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red Mtn. Freeway (40th-51st)</td>
<td>Phoenix</td>
<td>1994</td>
<td>67.1</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8.100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Squaw Peak Highway (SR 187) (Northern Ave.-Shos Bin)</td>
<td>Phoenix</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mohawk (University Dr.-Washington St.) (Phx. Urban Area)</td>
<td>Phoenix</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>48.0</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northeast Outer Loop (Phx. Urban Area) (University Dr.-Southern Ave.)</td>
<td>Tampa</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>66.4</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superstition Freeway (US 60) (Power Rd.-Elavard Rd.)</td>
<td>Phoenix</td>
<td>1991</td>
<td>146.0</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priest - Just 191</td>
<td>Phoenix</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>76.0</td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red Mtn. Freeway (SR 2023) (Priest-Jct. 191)</td>
<td>Phoenix Motorway</td>
<td>1994</td>
<td>76.0</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sky Harbor</td>
<td>Phoenix</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Overall Avg**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Acres/Mile</th>
<th>Length (miles)</th>
<th>Inflation</th>
<th>15 Gal. Tree</th>
<th>5 Gal. Tree</th>
<th>5 Gal. Shrub</th>
<th>1 Gal. Shrub</th>
<th>DG/Acre</th>
<th>Seed M/Acre</th>
<th>LS Grading/Acre</th>
<th>LS Fertilizer/Acre</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>748.9</td>
<td>26.43</td>
<td>115.0</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10.000</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>1.200</td>
<td>0.500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

 Does Not Include:
- Street
- Electric service
- Traffic control
- Right-of-way & traffic control
- Median strip, sidewalks, landscaped areas
- Storm drainage
- Storm drain
- Mailbox
- Surveying

---

### APPENDIX F

**BASIS FOR ACRES/MILE AND UNIT COSTS**
## Appendix G - Basis for Landscape Concepts - Estimated Costs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Trees (1)</th>
<th>Shrubs (1)</th>
<th>Shrubs (1)</th>
<th>GC (1)</th>
<th>Sod (2)</th>
<th>DG (1)</th>
<th>Seed Mix (1)</th>
<th>LS Grading (3)</th>
<th>Irrigation (4)</th>
<th>Establish (1)</th>
<th>Mobilization (1)</th>
<th>Trafic Control</th>
<th>Survey</th>
<th>Total Cost per Acre</th>
<th>Cover/ Acre</th>
<th>% VEG Cover</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Area</td>
<td>491</td>
<td>491</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unhards</td>
<td>Est. 15 gal</td>
<td>Est. 5 gal</td>
<td>Est. 5 gal</td>
<td>Est. 1 gal</td>
<td>Est. 1 gal</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>Acres</td>
<td>Acres</td>
<td>Acres</td>
<td>Acres</td>
<td>Acres</td>
<td>Acres</td>
<td>L.Sum</td>
<td>L.Sum</td>
<td>L.Sum</td>
<td>Acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit Cost</td>
<td>875</td>
<td>875</td>
<td>517</td>
<td>517</td>
<td>517</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$5.00</td>
<td>$10.50</td>
<td>$2.00</td>
<td>$9.50</td>
<td>$13.30</td>
<td>$1.20</td>
<td>$6.50</td>
<td>$700</td>
<td>$200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Total Landscape (6)</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area covered</td>
<td>11844</td>
<td>12843</td>
<td>3044</td>
<td>3044</td>
<td>3044</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extended Cost</td>
<td>$1,809</td>
<td>$2,052</td>
<td>$528</td>
<td>$528</td>
<td>$528</td>
<td>$10,500</td>
<td>$2,600</td>
<td>$12,300</td>
<td>$1,200</td>
<td>$1,674</td>
<td>$700</td>
<td>$200</td>
<td>$33,954</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Decomposed Granite</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only</td>
<td>$10,500</td>
<td>$2,500</td>
<td>$650</td>
<td>$700</td>
<td>$200</td>
<td>$14,550</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Land Graphics (6)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area covered</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extended Cost</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Seed Mix Only</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area covered</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extended Cost</td>
<td>$81,000</td>
<td>$81,000</td>
<td>$81,000</td>
<td>$81,000</td>
<td>$81,000</td>
<td>$2,100</td>
<td>$2,100</td>
<td>$2,100</td>
<td>$2,100</td>
<td>$2,100</td>
<td>$2,100</td>
<td>$2,100</td>
<td>$2,100</td>
<td>$2,100</td>
<td>$2,100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Native Shrub Only</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area covered</td>
<td>3,760</td>
<td>3,760</td>
<td>3,760</td>
<td>3,760</td>
<td>3,760</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extended Cost</td>
<td>$55,000</td>
<td>$55,000</td>
<td>$55,000</td>
<td>$55,000</td>
<td>$55,000</td>
<td>$2,500</td>
<td>$2,500</td>
<td>$2,500</td>
<td>$2,500</td>
<td>$2,500</td>
<td>$2,500</td>
<td>$2,500</td>
<td>$2,500</td>
<td>$2,500</td>
<td>$2,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Shrubs and Ground Cover Emphasis</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area covered</td>
<td>12,540</td>
<td>12,540</td>
<td>12,540</td>
<td>12,540</td>
<td>12,540</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extended Cost</td>
<td>$3,560</td>
<td>$3,560</td>
<td>$3,560</td>
<td>$3,560</td>
<td>$3,560</td>
<td>$880</td>
<td>$880</td>
<td>$880</td>
<td>$880</td>
<td>$880</td>
<td>$880</td>
<td>$880</td>
<td>$880</td>
<td>$880</td>
<td>$880</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Tree Emphasis with Shrub</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area covered</td>
<td>24,500</td>
<td>24,500</td>
<td>24,500</td>
<td>24,500</td>
<td>24,500</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extended Cost</td>
<td>$1,300</td>
<td>$1,300</td>
<td>$1,300</td>
<td>$1,300</td>
<td>$1,300</td>
<td>$300</td>
<td>$300</td>
<td>$300</td>
<td>$300</td>
<td>$300</td>
<td>$300</td>
<td>$300</td>
<td>$300</td>
<td>$300</td>
<td>$300</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Trees with Turf</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area covered</td>
<td>491</td>
<td>491</td>
<td>491</td>
<td>491</td>
<td>491</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extended Cost</td>
<td>$1,817</td>
<td>$1,817</td>
<td>$1,817</td>
<td>$1,817</td>
<td>$1,817</td>
<td>$2,500</td>
<td>$2,500</td>
<td>$2,500</td>
<td>$2,500</td>
<td>$2,500</td>
<td>$2,500</td>
<td>$2,500</td>
<td>$2,500</td>
<td>$2,500</td>
<td>$2,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTES:**
1. average cost from past, recent, AGDC indications, expressed in 1988 dollars.
3. RS/NGA estimate only.
4. Total costs are based on recent professional experience.
5. Average from list amounts on Market Analysis.
6. Costs are based on average of existing sites.
7. Estimated costs for estimated projects.
8. Costs are based on average of existing sites.
9. Based on average of existing sites.
10. Costs are based on average of existing sites.
11. Do not include:
   - Turf
   - Remodeling and/or salvage of existing vegetation
   - Hardscape
   - Fencing
   - Design
   - Engineering Administration
   - Contingencies
   - 7% based on average of existing sites.

## Appendix G - Typical Landscape Quantities for $850,000 Landscape Mile

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area (SF)</th>
<th>491</th>
<th>491</th>
<th>78</th>
<th>78</th>
<th>38</th>
<th>n/a</th>
<th>n/a</th>
<th>n/a</th>
<th>n/a</th>
<th>n/a</th>
<th>n/a</th>
<th>n/a</th>
<th>n/a</th>
<th>n/a</th>
<th>n/a</th>
<th>n/a</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unit Size</td>
<td>Est. 15 gal Est. 5 gal Est. 5 gal Est. 1 gal Est. 1 gal SF</td>
<td>Acres</td>
<td>Acres</td>
<td>Acres</td>
<td>Acres</td>
<td>L.Sum</td>
<td>L.Sum</td>
<td>L.Sum</td>
<td>Acres</td>
<td>SF/Acre</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit Cost</td>
<td>875</td>
<td>875</td>
<td>517</td>
<td>517</td>
<td>517</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Typical 850,000 MILE</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area covered</td>
<td>14,730</td>
<td>68,693</td>
<td>3,303</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>$926</td>
<td>$11,777</td>
<td>$1,444</td>
<td>$6,675</td>
<td>$2,500</td>
<td>$6,000</td>
<td>$1,200</td>
<td>$2,089</td>
<td>$700</td>
<td>$200</td>
<td>$31,675</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extended Cost</td>
<td>$926</td>
<td>$11,777</td>
<td>$1,444</td>
<td>$6,675</td>
<td>$2,500</td>
<td>$6,000</td>
<td>$1,200</td>
<td>$2,089</td>
<td>$700</td>
<td>$200</td>
<td>$31,675</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTE:**
The densities shown correspond to those shown in Sample 2 - Medium Value Proctor Level, on page 65.
## APPENDIX H
COMPARISON OF LANDSCAPE COSTS
FOR FREEWAYS TO TYPICAL RESIDENTIAL COSTS

### Appendix H - Comparison of Landscape Costs for MAG Freeways to Typical Residential Costs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Landscape Type</th>
<th>Freeway Landscape Area Cost per sf</th>
<th>Typical Residence Cost per sf</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>decomposed granite</td>
<td>$0.24</td>
<td>$0.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>traditional landscape</td>
<td>$0.21</td>
<td>$0.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>average landscape (per $850,000 budget)</td>
<td>$0.12</td>
<td>$0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irrigation</td>
<td>$0.28</td>
<td>$0.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>annual maintenance (excluding litter pick up)</td>
<td>$0.18</td>
<td>$0.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$1.03</td>
<td>$1.78</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. The residential costs are based on typical residential front and back yards totaling approximately 2,000 square feet in area at a cost of $3,000.
# APPENDIX I

## MAG Landscape Construction Costs

### MAG Landscape Construction & Unit Costs

**Life Cycle Program Summary**  
(In thousands)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mileage and Cost</th>
<th>Unit Costs (per mile)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Length</strong>* (miles)</td>
<td><strong>Total Project Cost</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOLLESON - Route 101</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GLENDALE - Route 101</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHOENIX - Routes 101, 51, 153, 202</td>
<td>27.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCOTTSDALE - Route 101</td>
<td>7.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MESA - Routes 101, 202</td>
<td>14.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEMPE - Route 101</td>
<td>5.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHANDLER - Routes 101, 202</td>
<td>12.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td>73.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SALT RIVER PIMA MARICOPA COMMUNITY - Route 101</strong></td>
<td>0.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Total</strong></td>
<td>82.91</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Includes 21% for Landscape Design (7%) Contingency (8%) and Engineering Admin. (6% for Construction Admin.)
** Landscape partially completed w/ interim frontage road projects
*** adjusted to include miles and acreage associated with interchanges