

Appendix A
Public and Agency Comments
on Draft Environmental Assessment and ADOT's Responses

Public and Agency Comments on Draft Environmental Assessment and ADOT's Responses

No.	Name and organization	Type and date	Topics	Comment	Response
1	Kristen Terpening Arizona Game and Fish Department	Telephone 6/4/2012	Public meeting	Is an agency scoping meeting being planned in conjunction with the I-10: Ina to Ruthrauff public hearing? Sometimes such meetings were announced at the last minute, and they often provide better information for her purposes than the general public hearing. She was just checking.	Party was informed that there is no separate agency hearing. Agencies are equally welcome at the hearing. An agency scoping meeting was held on October 28, 2009, Arizona Game and Fish Department was invited to the meeting, and provided scoping comments on the project.
2	Luisa Renteria	Telephone 6/4/2012	Meeting invitation; impacts to property	Does not speak English and lives near the Interstate 10 and Ruthrauff Road traffic interchange. She had received a copy of the invitation postcard to the June 21 public hearing on the I-10: Ina Road to Ruthrauff Road TI Study. She wanted to know if she was going to have to move due to the proximity of her home to the intersection.	Party was told (in Spanish) that the invitation was a notice about a hearing to review the Draft EA and gather input into the design alternatives being considered on the project. She was told it was very unlikely her property would be acquired. It was suggested she attend the hearing to learn more about the alternatives that would be presented and to express her opinion and provide feedback. She said she would be certain to attend. No residential displacements have been identified near Ruthrauff Road.
3	Dyna Michel	E-mail 6/12/2012	Construction and noise impacts	Does the document below really say that the residences north of Ina will not be affected by construction or traffic noise and do not qualify for noise abatement?	Residences near Ina Road would be affected by project construction as described in the Draft EA. In particular, Chapter IV of the Draft EA (pp. 31-97) describes the anticipated impacts; noise impacts are described in Part IV, Section H, <i>Noise Levels</i> . According to the noise analysis, noise levels in this area (receiver 2a at 4575 Calle Marco) would increase to 65 decibels (dBA), compared to 62 dBA under the no action alternative. Based on this increase, provision of a noise barrier was evaluated for this location and found to be not reasonable or feasible based on ADOT standard criteria.
4	William Sterader	Telephone 6/5/2012	Transportation to public hearing	Requested transportation to the June 21, 2012 public hearing.	Party was informed that ADOT does not provide transportation to meetings as part of Americans with Disabilities Act requirements, but we were willing to discuss other options.
5	Bill Leto Denny's at Ina Road and Interstate 10 (I-10)	E-mail 6/7/2012	Project information	Can you tell me where I can see what everything will look like?	Maps were available at the hearing, appear in the Draft Environmental Assessment (EA), and are available on the project website at www.azdot.gov/ina2rr .

No.	Name and organization	Type and date	Topics	Comment	Response
6	Steve Schweska	Telephone call 6/8/2012	General information	Lives near Ruthrauff Road and La Cholla Boulevard (residential multiuse area). He supports the project and thinks it's needed because of the double-tracking. Was approached to be bought out by Circle K; however, they've recently broken off talks, he thinks because of this project. Wanted to know how far out the improvements to Ruthrauff Road would be. Said he didn't know if he'd attend the hearing. Wanted to know if we'd have a map of the proposed improvements at the hearing. Wanted to know what was in the EA and if there was a map.	Maps and information regarding timing of the interchange improvements were available at the hearing, appear in the Draft EA, and are available on the project website at www.azdot.gov/ina2rr . Funding for improvements to the Ruthrauff Road Traffic Interchange (TI) is programmed over the next 5 years.
7	Unidentified	Court reporter 6/21/12	Evaluation	They should treat the existing residential neighborhoods the same way they would if those neighborhoods were where the highest paid project officials live. Basically, treat the neighborhoods the same way they would if those neighborhoods were the ones where the highest paid project officials actually lived, where they themselves reside.	The Federal-aid process and the National Environmental Policy Act require that all neighborhoods be treated equally. Standards and uniform criteria have been developed and are applied to ensure that treatment is uniform and objective.
8	Unidentified	Court reporter 6/21/12	Request for wall	Along the loop road, which is located east of the highway and north of Ina Road, there should be a wall along the north edge of the loop road as a buffer between the road and the existing residential neighborhood.	Walls are normally constructed to serve as either retaining walls and/or noise barriers. The traffic noise analysis conducted for the proposed project (see Part IV, Section H, <i>Noise Levels</i> , in the Draft EA), which used uniform and objective criteria, did not recommend noise barriers in any locations within the Study Area. The EA includes a mitigation measure to provide a buffer between residential and commercial land uses near Maryvale Avenue and North Camino de la Cruz as part of the landscape plans as follows: "Landscape plans will include areas of available right-of-way along North Camino de la Cruz and Maryvale Avenue to provide a buffer between residential and commercial land uses."
9	Gregor Blackburn Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) Region IX	Letter 6/21/2012	Flood Insurance Rate Maps and regulatory floodways	This is in response to your request for comments regarding the Notice of Public Hearing on the Interstate 10 Ina Road Traffic Interchange (TI) to Ruthrauff Road TI Study project-Draft Environmental Assessment. Please review the current effective countywide Flood Insurance Rate Maps (FIRMs) for the County of Pima (Community Number 040073) and City of Pima (Community Number 040076), Maps revised June 16, 2011. Please note that the City of Tucson, Pima County, Arizona is a	A hydraulic and floodplain evaluation was prepared and included in the <i>Preliminary Bridge Hydraulics Report</i> for this project. Although the hydraulics report predates the latest map revisions, the revised maps still support the indicated FEMA designations in the report. The study identified the channels of the Rillito Creek and Cañada del Oro Wash as FEMA-designated floodways within zone AE. I-10 and accompanying one-way eastbound and westbound frontage roads have existing bridges across both of these washes. Soil

No.	Name and organization	Type and date	Topics	Comment	Response
				<p>participant in the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP). The minimum, basic NFIP floodplain management building requirements are described in Vol. 44 Code of Federal Regulations (44 CFR), Sections 59 through 65.</p> <p>A summary of these NFIP floodplain management building requirements are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> All buildings constructed within a riverine floodplain, (i.e., Flood Zones A, AO,AH, AE, and A1 through A30 as delineated on the FIRM), must be elevated so that the lowest floor is at or above the Base Flood Elevation level in accordance with the effective Flood Insurance Rate Map. If the area of construction is located within a Regulatory Floodway as delineated on the FIRM, any <i>development</i> must not increase base flood elevation levels. The term <i>development</i> means any man-made change to improve or unimproved real estate, including but not limited to buildings, other structures, mining, dredging, filling, grading, paving, excavation or drilling operations, and storage of equipment or materials. A hydrologic and hydraulic analysis must be performed <i>prior</i> to the start of development, and must demonstrate that the development would not cause any rise in base flood levels. No rise is permitted within regulatory floodways. Upon completion of any development that changes existing Special Flood Hazard Areas, the NFIP directs all participating communities to submit the appropriate hydrologic and hydraulic data to FEMA for a FIRM revision. In accordance with 44 CFR, section 65.3, as soon as practicable, but not later than six months after such data becomes available, a community shall notify FEMA of the changes by submitting technical data for a flood map revision. To obtain copies of FEMA's Flood Map Revision Application Packages, please refer to the FEMA website at http://www.fema.gov/business/nfip/forms.shtm. <p>Please Note: Many NFIP participating communities have adopted floodplain management building requirements which are</p>	<p>cement banks along each wash contain the 100-year flood. During a 100-year flood, there will be approximately 4.7 feet between the water surface elevation and the bottom of the existing I-10 main line bridge at the Cañada del Oro Wash, and 0.4 feet at the Rillito Creek.</p> <p>New I-10 main line bridges at the Rillito Creek and Cañada del Oro Wash will be constructed to accommodate the freeway widening and profile changes. The design of the new bridges will be similar to existing frontage road bridges, and the new piers will be aligned with existing piers to minimize debris loading and friction losses upstream of the bridges. Water surface elevation modeling indicates that no upstream increases in water surface elevations will occur with pier construction.</p> <p>The Cañada del Oro Wash modeling indicates that the water surface elevation will decrease by 0.27 feet with installation of the new bridge. At the Rillito Creek, modeling indicates the water surface elevation will decrease 0.14 feet at the upstream side of the bridge, but increase by 0.55 feet at the downstream end of the bridge. Review of the FEMA model indicates that a lower elevation is being used than is actual for the soil cement bottom at the downstream end of the bridge, resulting in a higher modeled water surface elevation than will actually result from the project. Irrespective, the channel will sufficiently contain the 100-year flow, and the improvements will not adversely affect floodplain elevations.</p> <p>The new bridges will have a greater distance between the water surface elevation and the bottom of the bridge during a 100-year flood. At the Cañada del Oro Wash, the new elevation difference will be 6.51 feet, an increase of 1.86 feet; at the Rillito Creek, the difference will be 1.45 feet, an increase of 1.05 feet. The bridge hydraulics report also evaluated the potential impacts on I-10 structures during the 100-year flood resulting from Santa Cruz River flood water rise, with the result being that impacts from the Santa Cruz River were negligible.</p>

No.	Name and organization	Type and date	Topics	Comment	Response
				<p>more restrictive than the minimum federal standards described in 44 CFR. Please contact the local community's floodplain manager for more information on local floodplain management building requirements. The Tucson floodplain manager can be reached by calling Jim Vogelsberg, Floodplain Administrator, PDSO, at (520) 837-4926. The Pima County floodplain manager can be reached by calling Eric Shepp, Floodplain Manager, at (520) 243-1800.</p> <p>If you have any questions or concerns, please do not hesitate to call Patricia Rippe of the Mitigation staff at (510) 627-7235.</p>	
10	Dianna Swansy	Comment form 6/21/2012	Additional vegetation	<p>I suggest planting a thick area of cactus among all surfaces prone to graffiti including walls and sign post.</p> <p>Thank you for fewer train horns in our area once the overpass is completed.</p>	<p>Landscaping with native vegetation will be a part of the proposed improvements.</p> <p>Your comment regarding train horns is noted.</p>
11	Delores Tellez	Comment form 6/21/2012	Bike paths, pecan trees, and detours	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1 What impact is there going to be on the bike paths at Orange Grove and down the west side of I-10? 2 What is going to happen [to] the historical pecan trees just north of Sunset on west side of I-10? 3 Will there be better communication between city, county, agencies of construction of the proposed detours? 	<p>Some segments of the Regional Optimization Master Plan trail are located within existing ADOT ROW. The project will not have permanent effects on the trail; however, construction activities may require temporary closure of trail segments within ADOT ROW to provide for the safety of trail users. Cañada del Oro Wash Park/Trail and Rillito Creek Park/Trail follow the Cañada del Oro Wash and Rillito Creek, respectively, and cross under I-10. Within the project limits, the Cañada del Oro Wash Park/Trail does not have any developed trail features, while the Rillito Creek Park/Trail has a paved trail above the southern bank. During construction, these trails may be detoured within the washes. In addition, some construction activities (i.e., bridge demolition) may require short-term closures or trail detours outside the washes to provide for the safety of trail users. Any negative effects to trail features during construction will be addressed and the trails will be returned to preconstruction conditions. Most of the trees will be avoided by the Selected Alternative. Removal of some of trees will be required for reconstruction of the Sunset Road TI.</p> <p>ADOT, Pima County, the City of Tucson, and the Town of Marana have been a part of the project team throughout the project. That coordination will continue throughout project construction.</p>

No.	Name and organization	Type and date	Topics	Comment	Response
12	Charles T. Black	Comment form 6/21/2012	Compliment	Very good. Good answers to all questions.	Your comment is noted.
13	Remo DiCenso, MD	Comment form 6/21/2012	High speed train	I suggest that plenty of room be allowed for a rapid train from Tucson to Phoenix which could decrease traffic to some extent.	UPRR has ROW that is parallel to and east of I-10, and is intended to accommodate up to four lines of tracks. The construction will cross the entire UPRR ROW at the design height required by UPRR and will not impede future UPRR expansion. ROW acquisition is limited to that needed for the described improvements, and does not include a rapid train component.
14	Brad Shattuck Saguaro National Park	Comment form 6/21/2012	Saguaro National Park signs	Signage within the project area that directs the public to Saguaro National Park is contradictory. Near the I-10 and Avra Valley Rd, one sign says 23 miles to Saguaro West and one says 16 miles, and they are within a half mile of one another. Please change the signs so they accurately depict the distance consistently. Photos can be provided. Please include the National Park Service as this ADOT project and others like it continue. Saguaro NP receives over 700,000 annual visits, constituting a significant tourism economic driver for the city of Tucson. Signage on the Interstate plays a critical role in helping direct the public to the park, and we ask your help in retaining and improving directional signs to the park as part of this and other ADOT projects.	Comment was provided to ADOT Tucson District.
15	Bonny Bass	Comment form 6/21/2012	Compliment	You are doing a great job. Traffic continues to move and this long overdue work will be appreciated for years to come. We are so happy that Sunset [Road] will be completed and will really help disperse traffic off heavily used Orange Grove and Ruthrauff roads. Once again thank you for your hard work.	Your comment is noted.
16	Gary Brostek	Comment form 6/21/2012	Noise mitigation and construction lighting	Project should include lots and lots of noise mitigation: walls, trees, shrubs, earthen mounds or ridges, more trees, more shrubs. Block noise from pre-existing residential occupancies. ADOT executives should first reside in the nearby pre-existing residential neighborhoods before concluding that noise mitigation is not required. Point construction lighting and illumination away from residential neighborhoods during construction phase.	Standards and uniform criteria have been developed and are applied to ensure that treatment is uniform and objective. Walls are normally constructed to serve as either retaining walls and/or noise barriers. Vegetation is not used to mitigate noise because it is not effective. The traffic noise analysis conducted for the proposed project (see Part IV, Section H, <i>Noise Levels</i> , in the Draft EA), which used uniform and objective criteria, did not recommend noise barriers in any locations within the project area. ADOT has standard specifications relating to construction

No.	Name and organization	Type and date	Topics	Comment	Response
					lighting in residential areas. These standard specifications will be a part of the final design plans.
17	Cheryl Glover	E-mail 6/24/2012	Recommend underpass alternative	<p>Surely it is more cost efficient to construct an underpass under the railroad at Ina/I-10 and Ruthrauff/I-10? Similar "underpass" intersections work well at Congress Road, Speedway Blvd, Grant Rd, Orange Grove Rd, and 22nd Street.</p> <p>If a tunnel of 20 - 30 miles can be constructed under the English Channel/ La Mache, an underpass of a few hundred feet can be constructed at Ina and Ruthrauff.</p> <p>The proposed cost would be less than a 'spaghetti junction' intersection.</p> <p>Since flooding is only occasional, pump maintenance in the underpass will NOT be a great expense.</p>	<p>In the Draft EA, Part III, <i>Alternatives</i>, the assessment of various designs for grade separating the crossroads from I-10 and Union Pacific Railroad (UPRR) is summarized. The team examined constructing overpasses over I-10 and the railroad, constructing underpasses under I-10 and the railroad, or leaving the crossroads at-grade and reconstructing the railroad to pass over or under the crossroads. Criteria used for this comparison included ROW requirements, ease of construction, construction and design cost, traffic operations, utility impacts, cost of future expansion, maintenance concerns, preferences of local governments, preferences of and coordination required with UPRR and the Arizona Corporation Commission, and environmental impacts.</p> <p>For this analysis, costs were developed to a planning level—a relative basis of comparison. Development of more detailed cost estimates are performed only for alternative(s) advanced for further study because of the design effort required. Nonetheless, a review of Table 6 (Draft EA, p. 14) shows that the Selected Alternative has the least overall impacts and, with respect to costs, has the least construction and design costs and least amount of ROW requirements.</p> <p>It is also important to note that simply boring under the railroad is not an acceptable engineering approach. A bridge to carry the railroad over the crossroad would be required. A railroad bridge over the crossroad is estimated to cost approximately 30 percent more than a motor vehicle bridge that would cross over the railroad and I-10. In addition, a temporary railroad detour would be required during bridge construction.</p> <p>Maintenance costs of the new structure would be the responsibility of the local jurisdiction; therefore, the Town of Marana would incur maintenance costs, not the Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT). For this reason, Marana expressed opposition to additional underpasses like the existing underpass at Orange Grove Road.</p>
18	Danny Dobbs Owner of former gas	Telephone call 6/26/2012	Ingress and egress	Unable to make it to the hearing. Visited the project website and viewed the hearing documents. He noticed a map that did not include an entrance/driveway on the west side of his property. He said he currently has two entrances	The business outreach team for this project has discussed your question about property ingress and egress with ADOT's technical team. The team is aware that you have two entrances along your northern property line onto Ina Road.

No.	Name and organization	Type and date	Topics	Comment	Response
	station at 4479 W. Ina Road (101-05-008D)			<p>off of Ina Road (east and west), but he will be losing an entrance because of the project. He previously attended a Property Owner Briefing where he was told by a project engineer that they would make him an entrance off of the west side of his property.</p> <p>Requests clarification on whether a driveway will be built.</p>	<p>As part of the Selected Alternative, the western-most driveway will be eliminated. The possibility exists to provide an alternative entrance into your site from the southern loop road located along your western property line. Should this alternative entrance be feasible, the final location and details will be a component of this project's final design effort and will be coordinated with you and the Town of Marana for compliance with current site plans, policies, and standards.</p> <p>To view your property, please go to www.azdot.gov/ina2rr and click on "Meeting Presentation and Graphics Library" (under "Public Meeting" and "June 21, 2012"), then click on "Presentation." Scroll to page 12 of 27 of the PowerPoint titled "Local Access Improvements (cont'd)/East of I-10 at Ina Road."</p>
19	Jennifer O'Brien	E-mail 6/28/2012	Recommend underpass alternative	<p>I am not a politician but I'd like my voice to be heard on the Prince/Ruthrauff Widening Project. I have an interest in this particular advancement and I am concerned that the widening between Prince and Ruthrauff would be better solved by constructing an underpass under the railroad tracks rather than an overpass. I prefer to live in Tucson because I hate the Interstate "loop-de loops" that California's Interstate system has developed. I also decided to settle down in Tucson, rather than Phoenix, because I despise the cement. I believe the correct answer to this widening project is to develop an underpass under the railroad, which would be more cost efficient and portray the less intrusive city characteristics of bigger cities. Similar underpasses such as at Congress Rd, Speedway Blvd, Grant, Orange Grove, and 22nd St. are my idea of what I'd like the city of Tucson to see implemented in this "Area Project".</p>	<p>In the Draft EA, Part III, <i>Alternatives</i>, the assessment of various designs for grade separating the crossroads from I-10 and the UPRR is summarized. The team examined constructing overpasses over I-10 and the railroad, constructing underpasses under I-10 and the railroad, or leaving the crossroads at-grade and reconstructing the railroad to pass over or under the crossroads. Criteria used for this comparison included ROW requirements, ease of construction, construction and design cost, traffic operation, utility impacts, cost of future expansion, maintenance concerns, preferences of local governments, preferences of and coordination required with the railroad and the Arizona Corporation Commission, and environmental impacts.</p> <p>For this analysis, costs were developed to a planning level—a relative basis of comparison. Development of more detailed cost estimates are performed only for alternative(s) advanced for further study because of the design effort required. Nonetheless, a review of Table 6 (Draft EA, p. 14) shows that the Selected Alternative has the least overall impacts and, with respect to costs, has the least construction and design costs, and least amount of ROW requirements. Visual impacts would be less with an underpass alternative; however, the Selected Alternative will include architectural and landscape treatments to minimize visual impacts (see Draft EA, p. 72).</p>

No.	Name and organization	Type and date	Topics	Comment	Response
20	Phil Abromowitz	Telephone 6/29/2012	Mailing list, request for maps.	Requested to be added to project mailing list. Visited project website but couldn't view the maps in the PowerPoint presentation and was unable to print them. Was interested in the four aerial photos showing the changes at Ina and Ruthrauff TIs. Is an attorney but does not represent any properties in the area. He has received some inquiries however, and wanted to have something clear to refer to in case he receives additional inquiries.	Party was added to the project mailing list. Maps were mailed on 7/3/2012 to the address provided.
21	Judy Green Pepper-Viner	Voicemail 7/3/2012	Public hearing minutes request	She and her colleagues were unable to attend the June 21 public hearing and would like the hearing minutes.	A transcript of the public hearing is appended to the Final EA prepared for this project. The Final EA is available on the project website at www.azdot.gov/highways/projects/I10_Ina2Ruthrauff or may be viewed at the ADOT Tucson District Office at 1221 S. 2nd Avenue, Tucson.
22	Julian Hadland	Facsimile 7/4/2012	Recommend alternative, Silverbell Road	<p>Why are ADOT and HDR aggressively pursuing the alternative that is most costly to the taxpayer, and which will result in an eyesore?</p> <p>Mick Hont's asserted reasons (June 21, 2012) for not constructing a short tunnel under the Union Pacific Railroad were insubstantial: 1) the high cost of pump maintenance during occasional flooding; 2) UPRR detours would be necessary.</p> <p>Could ADOT please inform us of the annual cost to maintain pumps at Orange Grove Rd/I-10 intersection, since the year 2000?</p> <p>Could ADOT please also inform us of the projected cost of constructing a short tunnel under UPRR, compared with the cost of constructing the proposed bridges over UPRR and I-10?</p> <p>Surely advanced modern engineering techniques enable the construction of a short tunnel under UPRR without causing major disruption to UPRR trains?</p> <p>Conclusion: Surely it is more cost-efficient to construct a short tunnel under UPRR at each intersection, than to erect twisting "flyover" roads, thirty feet above UPRR.</p> <p>Mick Hont's assertion (June 21, 2012) regarding Silverbell Rd was inaccurate: "Silverbell Rd is a vital North-South link" It is rare that a vehicle travels from Cortaro Farms Rd. in</p>	<p>In the Draft EA, Part III, <i>Alternatives</i>, the assessment of various designs for grade separating the crossroads from I-10 and Union Pacific Railroad (UPRR) is summarized. The team examined constructing overpasses over I-10 and the railroad, constructing underpasses under I-10 and the railroad, or leaving the crossroads at-grade and reconstructing the railroad to pass over or under the crossroads. Criteria used for this comparison included right-of-way (ROW) requirements, ease of construction, construction and design cost, traffic operations, utility impacts, cost of future expansion, maintenance concerns, preferences of local governments, preferences of and coordination required with UPRR and the Arizona Corporation Commission, and environmental impacts.</p> <p>For this analysis, costs were developed to a planning level—a relative basis of comparison. Development of more detailed cost estimates are performed only for alternative(s) advanced for further study because of the design effort required. Nonetheless, a review of Table 6 (Draft EA, p. 14) shows that the Selected Alternative has the least overall impacts and, with respect to costs, has the least construction and design costs and least amount of ROW requirements. Visual impacts would be less with an underpass alternative; however, the Selected Alternative will include architectural and landscape treatments to minimize visual impacts (see Draft EA, p. 72).</p>

No.	Name and organization	Type and date	Topics	Comment	Response
				<p>Marana to Congress Rd in Tucson via Silverbell Rd Almost all vehicles travel along I-10 for such a trip. Over 90% of the vehicles that use Silverbell Rd, are owned by residents, their licensees and invitees, of the Silverbell Rd corridor. Why should these residents, many of whom are elderly, be subjected to the inconveniences and dangers of maneuvering around a curbed, vegetated median? A curbed, vegetated median will also increase maintenance costs which Mick Hont said (June 21, 2012) he wanted to minimize. Surely it is more cost-efficient to improve Silverbell Rd with a central turning lane, and not a curbed, vegetated median. Question 1: Since Orange Grove Road is one of the most popular vehicle crossing points of the railroad, why is it <u>not</u> possible, with modern advanced technology, to construct the Ina and Ruthrauff crossings similar to Orange Grove? Question 8: Will it be possible to maximize the widening of I-10 and prevent the <u>over</u>development of Silverbell Rd, so that Silverbell Rd, which runs parallel to I-10, a few hundred to the west, retains its scenic, rural, and archeological character, without a curbed median that would cause inconvenience to local residents?</p>	<p>It is also important to note that simply boring under the railroad is not an acceptable engineering approach. A bridge to carry the railroad over the crossroad would be required. A railroad bridge over the crossroad is estimated to cost approximately 30 percent more than a motor vehicle bridge that would cross over the railroad and I-10. In addition, a temporary railroad detour would be required during bridge construction. Maintenance costs of the new structure would be the responsibility of the local jurisdiction; therefore, the Town of Marana would incur maintenance costs, not the Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT). For this reason, Marana expressed opposition to additional underpasses like the existing underpass at Orange Grove Road. Proposed improvements to Silverbell Road are under the authority of the City of Tucson and Pima County. Improvements to Silverbell Road are not a part of the proposed I-10 (Ina Road TI to Ruthrauff Road TI) improvements. Ultimately, under the Selected Alternative, I-10 will provide sufficient capacity for 2040 traffic volumes, with frontage roads providing supplemental capacity.</p>
23	Paul Sanchez	E-mail 7/6/12	Recommend alternative, Silverbell Road	<p>I second Mr. Julian Hadland's comments (see attachment) which were faxed to your office yesterday. Thank you for giving these comments careful consideration. <i>Comments from the attachment: See comment 5.</i></p>	See response to comment 5.
24	James Raney	E-mail 7/6/12	Construction sequencing suggestion, access from west of I-10	<p>I have lived off El Camino Del Cerro west of Silverbell Road since 2005. During the multi-year reconstruction of I-10 between Prince and I-19, the Ruthrauff/El Camino Del Cerro interchange was the first entrance for eastbound I-10 traffic on the west end of the construction zone. The considerable additional traffic volume, along with the numerous train crossing delays, was a daily burden on those of us who lived directly west of the interchange. The only option to avoid the congestion and long waits at the traffic interchange was to drive on an often busy two lane road which is so filled with curves and sight-robbing elevation changes, that it is almost a continuous no passing zone for the approximately eight miles from Ina Road to</p>	<p>Regardless of the construction sequencing plan (Implementation Plan), total peak period travel time on the roadway network will increase substantially during the closure of each traffic interchange during construction, and will thereby affect the travel time of all individuals using the network, including those who live west of I-10. Formulation of the implementation plan for the project considered the entire regional network. Specifically, future traffic conditions and capacity requirements, availability of funding from both ADOT and the Regional Transportation Authority (RTA), the scheduling of projects within the RTA transportation improvement plan, the potential impacts of delaying interchange improvements, and the potential impacts of the</p>

No.	Name and organization	Type and date	Topics	Comment	Response
				<p>Grant Road. Yet, this is the only option you intend to leave to myself and my neighbors during the 18+ months you intend to have Ruthrauff and El Camino Del Cerro Roads blocked while you rebuild the traffic interchange at I-10.</p> <p>This is not (as I was informed at the public meeting) an insignificant minor inconvenience. It is a mostly unnecessary hazardous, mind-numbing, stress-inducing, life-shortening burden on the people who live directly west of traffic interchange you are rebuilding.</p> <p>There is no argument the interchange needs to be rebuilt. It is inadequate for the volume on traffic which uses it today, and will be more so in the future. Further, as was mentioned at the public meeting, and has been reported in the press, Union Pacific intends to double the train traffic crossing Ruthrauff at I-10 causing even more congestion and safety issues. However, the current Phasing and Implementation schedule presented on June 21, is unsuitable to the needs of the people who use El Camino Del Cerro to access I-10 and Ruthrauff to drive east into Tucson.</p> <p>The work at Orange Grove and Sunset should be completed before the interchanges are closed at either Ruthrauff/El Camino Del Cerro or Ina.</p> <p>If Pima County would complete the planned connection between Silverbell and River Road, those of us who live between I-10 and the Tucson Mountains for several miles north or south of El Camino Del Cerro, would have a safe and practical option to use during the long closure of the Ruthrauff/El Camino Del Cerro interchange.</p> <p>Completion of the Orange Grove interchange would increase the ability of that interchange to handle the traffic diverted by the closure of the Ina Road interchange. In fact, if the work scheduled in your Phase III is done first, there is little reason your Phase I and Phase II projects could not be done at the same time, immediately afterwards.</p> <p>Geography has limited the options of people west of I-10 to travel to other parts of Tucson or access to I-10. The services needed to maintain our homes and provide for our families, and the emergency services which may be required, already have few options for access to this area.</p>	<p>ongoing double tracking of the UPRR main line were considered.</p> <p>Constructing either the Ina Road TI or Ruthrauff Road TI first would result in similar traffic diversion patterns, with Orange Grove Road and Silverbell Road being affected the most. While providing the Sunset Road connection with Silverbell Road and River Road would relieve congestion at the Orange Grove Road TI and at the El Camino del Cerro/Silverbell Road intersection, it would attract traffic to Sunset Road and result in a substantial increase in the volume of traffic using Silverbell Road between Sunset Road and Ina Road. While this section of Silverbell Road does have available capacity to carry additional traffic, considering the condition of the roadway, with one lane in each direction, substandard horizontal and vertical geometry, poor pavement condition, no shoulders, and inadequate clear zone, a substantial increase in traffic volume is not desirable over an 18-month construction period. For context, improvements to this section of Silverbell Road are not scheduled until the fourth quarter of the RTA plan which begins in 2021 and ends in 2026.</p> <p>In the RTA plan, funding of the Sunset Road connections is scheduled to occur between 2017 and 2021 and will involve extensive archaeological sites; therefore, advancing this proposed project is problematic.</p> <p>South of El Camino del Cerro, impacts to Silverbell Road will be mitigated by the planned widening of Silverbell Road by the City of Tucson from two lanes to four lanes from Grant Road to El Camino del Cerro. This widening is programmed in the second and fourth quarters of the RTA plan and will be partially in place to accommodate additional traffic between Grant Road and El Camino del Cerro generated by the closure of the Ruthrauff Road TI.</p> <p>Several options for mitigating traffic impacts to Orange Grove Road are proposed. Reconstructing the eastbound and westbound Orange Grove Road exit ramps to two lanes and reconstructing the ramp terminal intersection at Orange Grove Road to provide dual right-turn lanes prior to reconstruction of either the Ruthrauff Road or Ina Road TIs would substantially reduce congestion at the Orange Grove Road TI and would also mitigate impacts to the I-10 main line.</p>

No.	Name and organization	Type and date	Topics	Comment	Response
				<p>The mountains block any access from the west, and the Santa Cruz River limits the number of crossings to and from Tucson to the east. And, north and south is an unsafe drive on a road which is scheduled for rebuilding. The work on Silverbell between Grant Road and El Camino Del Cerro is scheduled to be done sometime during your scheduled Phase I. That will create even more hardship for those forced to drive through yet another construction zone.</p> <p>The work of rebuilding I-10 is necessary, and in the end, will work to the great advantage of myself and my neighbors. However, by changing your schedule as suggested above, the work will can still be completed in a timely manner, but the NOT insignificant inconvenience and danger to the people west of the project area will be lessened considerably.</p> <p>Thank you for the opportunity for public comment.</p>	<p>Closing the westbound Orange Grove Road TI exit ramp would provide greater service capacity at the Orange Grove Road TI by eliminating the ramp/frontage road merge. Traffic exiting at Orange Grove Road would instead exit at Sunset Road and use the two-lane frontage road to access Orange Grove Road. Dual right-turn lanes onto Orange Grove Road would be added.</p> <p>However, regardless of the sequencing of the construction of the Ina Road and Ruthrauff Road TIs, total peak period travel time of traffic on the network will increase substantially during each TI closure. A traffic control plan will be implemented and coordinated with local jurisdictions, emergency responders, and transit providers to provide for traffic movement and minimize impacts during construction.</p>
25	Bill Leto Denny's Ina location	Comment form 7/9/2012	Suggest property acquisition	<p>Attached are my comments. The solution appears to be to just buy me out because either way I will be out of business.</p> <p>Nothing has changed from the first meeting to this! The Freeway construction will put me out of business. My sales will drop at least 30% and I will not be able to pay my bills. Acquiring the property behind me might give me some cash to help during the construction to pay bills and survive, but if that back parcel is not taken and some type of easement is not created I will go under. My recommendation is you buy my business and sell it for a profit once construction is done.</p>	<p>We recognize your suggestion to purchase your property. We note that no acquisition for your property is identified in the EA. ROW needs will be finalized in conjunction with final design, and be negotiated on a case by case basis consistent with the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act.</p> <p>We further recognize your comments on potential business impacts during construction.</p>
26	Kelly Fleenor Southwest Gas Corporation	Letter 7/17/2012	Utilities	<p>The request for comments for I-10 from Ina Road to Ruthrauff Road has been reviewed by Southwest Gas Corporation (SWG). SWG has distribution pipe, transmission pipe, high pressure steel pipe, distribution and high pressure valves and regulator stations within the project limits.</p> <p>SWG anticipates extensive relocation efforts near the Ina Road Traffic Interchange. The planning, design and permitting process will take several years and will require coordination efforts with the Town of Marana's Ina Road: Silverbell Road to Star Commerce Place project. It includes obtaining easements on private property, Union Pacific Railroad crossings and possibly Unisource Energy</p>	Your comment is noted.

No.	Name and organization	Type and date	Topics	Comment	Response
				<p>Corporation property crossing. Due to seasonal demand, the relocation of transmission and high pressure pipe, valves and regulator stations is limited to April through September. Lead times for high pressure steel pipe, fittings, valves and regulator station components are in the order of 4 to 6 months.</p> <p>All information is provided for reference use only. Potholing and Blue Stake are suggested for best accuracy when locating SWG facilities. Please be aware that SWG requires a minimum one-foot separation from distribution facilities and any proposed structures and two-foot separation from high pressure facilities.</p>	
27	Dave Friel Commercial property owner	Comment form 7/30/2012	Impact to business, fire protection	<p>I own a property at 5135 N. Casa Grande Highway Suite 111, Tucson, Arizona 85743. I have over 125 vehicles per day coming in and out to conduct business. The proposed one-lane, one-way, at-grade roadway will greatly impact my business. My other concern is in regards to there not being fire protection within 1,000 feet. I believe this would be a great opportunity to have this done during construction.</p>	<p>A one-lane, one-way, at grade roadway to provide access to Sunset Road is no longer proposed. Rather, if ADOT should elect to reconstruct I-10 prior to the construction of the ultimate Sunset Road TI east and west approaches by Pima County, the following conditions will apply:</p> <p>Closure and removal of the Sunset Road TI crossroad, ramps and structures; reconstruction of I-10 between the existing frontage roads; and maintenance of right-in and right-out access to Sunset Road from the eastbound frontage road at the existing location.</p> <p>Based on your property address, your direct property access currently is, and will continue to be, through the existing eastbound frontage road. However, to get to your property, westbound drivers on I-10 and the westbound frontage road will need to access the eastbound frontage road at Orange Grove Road, rather than Sunset Road.</p> <p>Note that provision or extension of utility infrastructure, such as water supply lines or fire hydrants, is beyond the scope of this project. However, you may want to contact your applicable utility. Emergency access will be maintained.</p>
28	Mike Shchiffler Granite, Kitchen and Bath	Telephone call 7/31/2012	Schedule, access, County project	<p>What is the timetable for the Sunset TI and how sure are we at this point regarding this timeline?</p> <p>His business, which is retail, can only be accessed northbound on the frontage road. Explain how access to his business would work during construction should the County not have other roads in place when the Sunset TI is constructed.</p> <p>Explain in general how the County is ultimately planning to</p>	<p>The Draft EA identifies the planned construction phasing for the project, and indicates work associated with Sunset Road commencing in 2018 (Draft EA, p. 29). Specific timing depends on the completion of design, remaining environmental requirements, and availability of funding for this phase. Improvements are included in the long-range transportation plan, but specific funding is committed at the 5-year horizon. Funding for Pima County's project is committed in the third quarter of RTA's <i>Regional</i></p>

No.	Name and organization	Type and date	Topics	Comment	Response
				<p>put in roadways connecting to the Sunset TI and how access would possibly be enhanced to my property by this roadway construction. Would there be some kind of southbound access?</p>	<p><i>Transportation Plan.</i></p> <p>Your business is adjacent to the westbound frontage road, which you take direct access to. Currently, a driver will access the westbound frontage road at the Ruthrauff Road interchange and travel westbound to connect to your business. During the Ruthrauff Road TI closure, this segment of the westbound frontage road will be accessed from Prince Road to the south.</p> <p>Pima County will construct Sunset Road from Silverbell Road to I-10, and from I-10 to River Road. Thus, Pima County will create a new east-to-west arterial street in this area. This may not be a substantial change for your particular property. Visitors to your property will be able to access I-10 from the east or west at Sunset Road, and access I-10 eastbound.</p>
29	Mike Hennessy Burriss Hennessy and Company	E-mail 7/31/2012	Sunset Road interim condition	<p>My questions concern the Sunset Road traffic intersection. I understand you are thinking about some changes to this intersection. Why? I can follow your logic that you should wait until Pima County is ready to proceed with the bridges and connectors to build your project. What confuses me is why you will take out existing ramps and the underpass at this time. Maybe I misunderstood your recent meeting notice. It seemed to me that your plan as part of the Ina to Ruthrauff Rd. I-10 project would include the closures. But I do not understand the engineering need to do anything at this time. Clearly, Ruthrauff and Ina may need to be addressed. Why Sunset? There are many businesses now operating on both sides of the main line accessible right in/right out. These businesses use the east bound off ramp at Sunset and the underpass at Sunset. For example, a person traveling west bound on I-10 whose destination was Big Tex Trailer sales might get off at the Sunset exit, go under the freeway and then continue on the eastbound frontage road to the business. Similarly, a customer of those businesses on the west bound frontage road who wished to travel eastbound on I-10 would use the underpass and ramps at Sunset. As you know the pumps at Orange Grove have been a problem already this year. Why force more traffic up to that intersection. Why is it necessary to change anything at Sunset at this time?</p>	<p>No immediate changes to Sunset Road TI are proposed. The Draft EA identifies the planned construction phasing for the project, and indicates work associated with Sunset Road commencing in 2018 (Draft EA, p. 29). At that time, if ADOT is prepared to proceed with I-10 improvements, but the County is not, ADOT will close the Sunset Road TI to accommodate the I-10 widening. Reconstruction of the Sunset Road TI will be delayed until the work can be coordinated with the County. Note that this is a contingency measure to allow I-10 widening only if Pima County is delayed.</p>

No.	Name and organization	Type and date	Topics	Comment	Response
30	Mike Hennessy Burriss Hennessy and Company	E-mail with letter 7/31/2012	Business impacts, access, property acquisition	<p>At the public meeting we spoke briefly about some thoughts I had concerning my real estate at this intersection. You suggested that I write you a letter with some of my thoughts. Please find it attached.</p> <p>Thank you for your willingness to listen. Please know that my co-owner Tim Burriss who was with us at the meeting is also available for your comments or questions.</p> <p><i>Letter attachment:</i></p> <p>Thank you for your time at the Public Meeting. We are very interested in ADOT'S design and schedule for the I-10/El Camino del Cerro project. The real estate we own or lease is located at the exact northwest corner of the existing frontage road and El Camino del Cerro.</p> <p>Our parcels are: 10120040D Ownership in Grant Road Industrial LLC (currently Jack in Box)</p> <p>10120038C Ownership in Parcel 38 LLC (currently Big Tex Trailer Sales)</p> <p>10120039A Exclusive Easement from the State of Arizona (currently Big Tex)</p> <p>Pete, I believe the two businesses we are involved with will not survive your project, either during or after completion of said project.</p> <p>In the past we have worked with ADOT well and recognize that you have both obligations and restrictions governing what actions you can take. On the previous ADOT project in this area (widening/building the frontage roads north of El Camino del Cerro) we worked with ADOT to reach win/win solutions for your engineering designs and our Big Tex tenant. Another time, on another ADOT project (the I19/I10 interchange) we worked with the local businesses and all the residences on 34th Street to get a workable access deal struck. I think if you check with those involved at that time that they would agree that our expertise helped time-wise and cost-wise with the completion of the projects.</p> <p>On this new project the access to Jack in the Box and Big Tex seems really complicated. One way of understanding our concern was the comment that "This design takes the convenience out of convenience store." The current design</p>	<p>Please see Project Phasing and Implementation in the Draft EA (pp. 28–30) for a discussion of the anticipated schedule for each of the four construction phases. Phase I involves reconstruction of the Ruthrauff Road TI and will commence in 2015. However, ROW negotiations and acquisition will commence during the final design stage.</p> <p>We note that the Jack-in-the-Box property will require a partial acquisition that will affect direct access to El Camino del Cerro from the easternmost driveway. Right-in, right-out access to El Camino del Cerro from the westernmost driveway will be preserved. Additional circulation will be provided by a new connector road that you reference, and will facilitate eastbound, left-turn movements onto El Camino del Cerro. Visitors to your property returning to the TI could either turn right and perform a U-turn at the connector road intersection or perform a southbound to eastbound left-turn at the connector road/El Camino del Cerro intersection. From a traffic standpoint these are considered to be more efficient and safer movements than the current condition, and will provide full and efficient access to your properties.</p> <p>As Big Tex Trailers takes access through the other property, these conditions will apply to that property as well.</p> <p>The design of the new connector road will involve the fill and abandonment of the drainage way. Instead, stormwater will be intercepted and connected with a storm drain located within El Camino del Cerro. This is not a Pima County- or Corps-regulated drainage and does not present regulatory concerns.</p> <p>We agree that the connector road needs to be in place to promote circulation prior to changing your access, that truck movements will need to be accommodated, and that driveway grades need to be accessible.</p> <p>Based on an initial cost evaluation, construction of retaining walls is expected to be more cost-effective than property acquisition.</p> <p>We note your comments about working well with ADOT in the past and recognize your offer of property. Based on the analysis to date, full acquisition of your property does not appear to be warranted. However, more specific negotiations will be appropriate during the final design process.</p>

No.	Name and organization	Type and date	Topics	Comment	Response
				<p>also has some features that might add unnecessary expense to the project. I am referring to running a road up the drainage way. It looks both expensive, ecologically challenging, and disastrous from a business standpoint. Also, this improvement would have to be completed before any ramp work started possibly delaying the other construction. In addition, while the slope of the driveway into the Jack in the Box from the completed raised El Camino del Cerro may be legal show me a semi that will take that turn for a burger! And the drivers of the larger trailers being sold and serviced by Big Tex might decide to find a more convenient business access-wise.</p> <p>As a win/win solution I would like to suggest that you make our properties a total take. I believe that solution will result in fewer arguments from both businesses since they would immediately begin the process of relocation and we might have the funds to find new homes for them. Also, having more right-of-way at the corner would certainly give you the ability to use slope rather than retaining wall on the raised frontage roads which helps with reduced costs and reduced time. Finally, getting all of us working together rather than against each other should be a value to ADOT in reducing delays and potential legal actions.</p> <p>Again, thank you for your time at the meeting. My co-owner and I look forward to working with you in the future.</p>	
31	Steven Nuckolls	Telephone 8/2/2012	Project schedule, noise abatement, flooding, property impacts, project support	<p>When will construction start at Ruthrauff Road? When will it be completed?</p> <p>Will there be noise abatement?</p> <p>He is located near Gilbert Pump [4842 N Shannon Road] and is wondering how his property will be impacted. Will ADOT be acquiring any of his property?</p> <p>How will flood drainage be assessed? Will it meet all standards?</p> <p>Pima County informed him a few years ago that new mobile homes on his lot will need to be put on pillars (flood requirements). He said pillars are very expensive and he has not had any new clients because of that requirement.</p> <p>Since then, the Union Pacific Railroad has made improvements to the area. He's wondering if the improvements made by the railroad and ADOT will help lift</p>	<p>Please see <i>Project Phasing and Implementation</i> in the Draft EA (pp. 28–30) for a discussion of the anticipated schedule for each of the four construction phases. Phase I involves reconstruction of the Ruthrauff Road TI and will commence in 2015 and last approximately 24 months.</p> <p>Based on the noise analysis (Draft EA pp. 62-67), noise abatement is not proposed.</p> <p>Your property has not been identified for acquisition.</p> <p>Drainage studies are being completed, and surface, or cross-drainage, will be designed to produce no appreciable increase in stormwater elevation on existing roads or adjacent properties, as required by ADOT and the local floodplain managers. Also see, Part IV, Section L, <i>Drainage and Floodplains</i>, of the Draft EA. Improvement of existing surface drainage is not part of the project objectives. Although not a project goal, installation of project facilities is</p>

No.	Name and organization	Type and date	Topics	Comment	Response
				<p>that requirement.</p> <p>He is very excited about the project. He thinks it will make things safer and more efficient, as well as ease traffic.</p>	<p>likely to result in some improvement of surface drainage in your area, however, additional drainage design decision will be mad during final design.</p> <p>In addition, we encourage you to contact Pima County Regional Flood Control District on upcoming study and mapping of this area, and current floodplain and building requirements.</p>
32	Steve Hopkins, Cool Breeze Air Solutions LLC	Comment form 8/2/2012	Access and fire protection	<p>I own a property at 5141 N. Casa Grade Hwy. Tucson, Arizona 85743. I have over 40 vehicles per day coming in and out of my property to conduct business. The proposed one-lane, one-way, at-grade roadway will greatly impact my business. Once the roadway is complete will the frontage road still be one way and if so where would you access from to get to our business. My other concern is in regards to there not being fire protection within 1000 feet. I believe it would be a benefit to all the business in this block to have a hydrant installed. This would be a great opportunity to have this done during construction.</p>	<p>A one-lane, one-way, at grade roadway to provide access to Sunset Road is no longer proposed. Rather, if ADOT should elect to reconstruct I-10 prior to the construction of the ultimate Sunset Road TI east and west approaches by Pima County, the following conditions will apply:</p> <p>Closure and removal of the Sunset Road TI crossroad, ramps and structures; reconstruction of I-10 between the existing frontage roads; and maintenance of right-in and right-out access to Sunset Road from the eastbound frontage road at the existing location.</p> <p>Based on your property address, your direct property access currently is, and will continue to be, through the existing eastbound frontage road. However, to get to your property, westbound drivers on I-10 and the westbound frontage road will need to access the eastbound frontage road at Orange Grove Road, rather than Sunset Road.</p> <p>Provision or extension of utility infrastructure, such as water supply lines or fire hydrants, is beyond the scope of this project. However, you may want to contact your applicable utility. Emergency access will be maintained.</p>
33	Patricia Alaniz, Real Estate Property Supervisor, Circle K Stores Inc.	E-mail 8/6/2012	Access and property acquisition	<p>Below are some changes to ADOT's proposed plan outlined in Todd Emery's letter of May 14, 2012. It appears that we can make this work if the following changes are made:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Shift the drive on Ina Road west 25' to bring it as close to our store as possible 2. Add a drive as shown on the attached exhibit. The drive will align with Camino De La Cruz 3. Circle K and ADOT will exchange properties as shown on the attached exhibit. The Circle K property is north of the store and the ADOT parcel will be the land remaining after the taking of Donut Wheel, the parts store and auto repair shop. ADOT to demolish the existing buildings 	<p>We recognize your property-specific comments on access and acquisition, and proposed property exchanges. Your comments will be forwarded to the appropriate parties for consideration during acquisition and final design, including ADOT Right-of-Way Section.</p>

No.	Name and organization	Type and date	Topics	Comment	Response
				<p>4. Donut Wheel, the parts store and the auto repair being a total taking and the buildings demolished</p> <p>Please forward to Todd at your earliest convenience for his review and comments.</p> <p>Attachment provided in Appendix A.</p>	
34	Timothy Fascetta, Group Operations Manager, Enterprise Leasing Company of Phoenix	E-mail 8/9/2012	Project schedule	<p>I attended the public meeting held on June 21st regarding the Ina Road / Interstate 10 Interchange Project. Enterprise Leasing Company of Phoenix, LLC (DBA: Enterprise Rent-A-Car) currently leases a building which is in the proposed "right of way" for the aforementioned project. It is our understanding our entire building / site will be taken for the project. Additionally, from the meeting, it is my understanding the Ina Road phase would commence in 2016 and the right away acquisitions would occur at or just prior to the commence of said phase. I would greatly appreciate it if you would let me know the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Has a final timetable been adopted? If so, when will it be made public information (I know comments were due by 7/6 and then a final FHWA Decision Document was to be drafted). 2. Is the proposed 2016 date still a good guidance date for us to utilize? 3. When will the actual right away acquisitions commence? <p>We are attempting plan our long-term real estate strategy for the Tucson area and the above information is crucial to us formulating an accurate strategy.</p> <p>Thank you in advance for your attention to this matter and I look forward to receiving your response.</p>	<p>The schedule (Draft EA, pp. 28-30) provides an estimate of project implementation based on the proposed phasing, related funding, and the steps needed to complete design, acquisition, and construction. Schedule delays are always a possibility. Additional public involvement will provide the community with updates as the project design progresses. The current schedule indicates that construction of Phase II – I-10/Ina Road TI would begin in 2016. Acquisition is a prerequisite to construction and usually begins following completion of the 60% design plans, approximately 9-12 months prior to construction.</p>
35	Kathy Kubish, Sue Droubie, Pima County Assessor's Office Commercial Property Division	Telephone call 8/10/2012	Project schedule	<p>Where can we obtain a map of the Ina Road TI?</p> <p>When will the project start and how long will it take. The project may adversely affect the values of the properties?</p> <p>Sue would like someone from ADOT to contact her about questions she has about other ADOT projects in the County - she said it would be good for her to have a general contact for those inquiries.</p>	<p>A map of the Ina Road TI is located in the Draft EA (p. 23). A project schedule is provided in the Draft EA (pp. 28-30), and describes the anticipated sequencing and duration for each phase of the project.</p> <p>Your message regarding other projects has been forwarded to ADOT Communications and Community Partnerships Division.</p>

No.	Name and organization	Type and date	Topics	Comment	Response
36	Marty Weber, commercial property owner	Telephone call 8/17/2012	Property acquisition	His property will be impacted by construction of this project and wanted to speak to someone about "advanced property acquisition."	We recognize your interest in advanced property acquisition. Your information has been forwarded to ADOT Right-of-Way Section for further discussion.