



## **AGENCY INFORMATION MEETING SUMMARY**

**LOCATION:** Lake Havasu Aquatic Center, Room 155/156  
100 Park Avenue  
Lake Havasu City, Arizona

**DATE:** July 9, 2008, 2:00 pm to 3:30 pm

**SUBJECT:** SR 95 Realignment, Lake Havasu Area  
Corridor Location Study & Environmental Overview  
ADOT Project No. 095 MO 175 H7163 01L  
Federal Project No. STP-095-D(AWF)

**ATTENDEES:** George Shannon, BLM Lake Havasu Field Office  
Jim Priest, BLM Lake Havasu Field Office  
Mike Gibelyou, UNS Electric  
Laura Nordan, Jacobs  
Coralie Cole, Jacobs  
Brian Cary, AGFD  
Roxanne Turner, ADOT Right-of-Way  
Bill Knowles, AGFD  
Stuart Schmeling, Lake Havasu City Development Services  
Michele Beggs, ADOT Communications & Community Partnerships  
Steve Latoski, Mohave County  
Melanie Headstream, ASLD  
Jim Gross, ASLD  
Mark Clark, Lake Havasu City Public Works  
Charles Hux, Lake Havasu City Public Works  
Shahid Bhuiyan, ADOT Predesign  
Larry Didion, Lake Havasu City Planning  
Elijah Williams, EPS Group  
Darrell Truitt, EPS Group  
Mick Hont, ADOT Kingman District  
Ray Schweinsburg, AGFD

The Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT), Mohave County, and Lake Havasu City (LHC), in coordination with the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the Bureau of Land Management (BLM), are conducting a study of potential corridors in which to realign the portion of State Route (SR) 95 that passes through Lake Havasu City. SR 95 would potentially be realigned between Milepost (MP) 175 and MP 191 to a new corridor east of Lake Havasu City. The study will identify a preferred corridor in which SR 95 could be realigned in order to improve regional and local traffic flow. It is anticipated that the findings of this study will be carried forward for further detailed study.

An agency information meeting was held to present and get agency feedback on the corridor alternatives that have been developed to date. The meeting began with opening remarks and an introduction to the project by Elijah Williams (EPS Group). Mr. Williams reported on the



previous discussions of the Interdisciplinary Team that led to development of the various corridor alternatives. He then presented the study update with a slide presentation. After the presentation, Mr. Williams reviewed issues and discussions that had been brought forth at the previous meetings. The meeting was then opened to agency stakeholders to offer comments regarding the study and corridor alternatives.

The following is a summary of agency comments communicated during the open discussion portion of the meeting.

### BLM

- Impacts to the Area of Critical Environmental Concern (ACEC) at the northern end are not acceptable, may be a fatal flaw for the N3 and N4 corridors
- Current BLM planning documents do not allow for a transportation corridor through the ACEC; the Resource Management Plan would need to be amended to allow it

### Lake Havasu City

- This study is a high priority because it will form the basis for long-range transportation planning and development in the LHC area
- Estimate a project footprint to guide development and preserve a roadway corridor for future use
- For the northern end, LHC prefers N2; there is adequate room for a roadway in this corridor
- Corridor B is most consistent with LHC planning documents and General Plan
- Roadway may wind up with fewer access points than shown; will not be popular with residents to have access through their area
- Prefer six or fewer access points within corridors and prioritize access points at existing boulevard locations

### ADOT Kingman District

- Concerned about funding from TIME initiative relative to ADOT's critical needs list and investment strategy
- Possibility of public/private partnership for construction
- Need to acquire access rights at outset of acquisition process

### Mohave County

- TIME initiative is a possible source of funding but is not the sole possibility for roadway construction
- Corridor decision must be weighed with regards to effects on both regional and local roadway users
- Access impacts to local community traffic circulation must be considered in corridor selection
- Decision criteria must be measurable in order to convert to a normalized score for meaningful evaluation of impacts
- Costs with respect to ease of development, community impacts, traffic circulation, and environment will all have to be weighed in the selection process



UNS Electric

- Suggested looking at a loop that crosses SR 95 south of the airport, coming up the west side of SR 95 to tie in at the northern end; this avoids the tight area between the airport and power lines with N1 and N2, and avoids the ACEC with N3 and N4

ASLD

- Discussion took place on utilizing London Bridge Road which crosses ASLD land. ASLD felt that while there may be merit to the alignment, ASLD is too far along in the planning and disposition of lands along London Bridge Road to support its utilization at this point in time. Necessary planning and coordination would have had to occur at least two years ago.
- TI/access points and spacing are important to development potential; approve of the 1 to 1.5 mile spacing shown
- Frontage roads may be needed to access State Lands
- Uncertain what the immediate benefits Corridor C would offer State Lands because Corridor C is located farther from existing development and may isolate ASLD holdings to the east of the roadway, creating a growth boundary

AGFD

- Will need to take into account current research on bighorn sheep (US 93), desert tortoise (SR 95 Bullhead City), and swift fox
- Include language in the planning documents to address and revisit wildlife connectivity issues after research has been completed, to determine appropriate mitigation
- ACEC is important habitat and should be avoided
- Provide wildlife crossing mitigation
- Impacts to ACEC may increase the mitigation requirements
- Address wild burro crossing needs
- Will likely need to include fencing for effective wildlife crossing
- Wider pavement creates higher difficulty for wildlife movement
- Include wildlife mitigation costs in estimates to avoid surprises during design

At the close of the meeting, Mr. Williams stated that another agency meeting would be held later in the year, once the corridor alternatives evaluation has been completed and a recommendation can be made.

**ATTACHMENTS:**

1. Sign-In Sheets
2. Slides