



**Salt River Pima-Maricopa  
Indian Community  
2010 Long Range Transportation  
Planning Study**

**Stakeholder Interview Summary Report**

Prepared for:  
**Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community and the  
Arizona Department of Transportation**

Prepared by:  
**HDR Engineering, Inc. and PSA, Inc.**  
November 20, 2009

# Executive Summary

## Background

The Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community 2010 Long Range Transportation Planning Study is being funded by the Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) Multimodal Planning Division's Planning Assistance for Rural Areas (PARA) program. The PARA program is funded through the Federal Highway Administration's State Planning and Research program to non-metropolitan communities for the purpose of conducting transportation planning studies. PARA funds may be applied to address a broad range of planning issues related to road and non-motorized transportation modes.

From July to November, 2009, the HDR team initiated an issue identification and data collection effort regarding Long Range Transportation Planning Study. As part of this effort, interviews were conducted with stakeholders and a series of outreach efforts held. The purpose of this report is to summarize the findings from the stakeholder interviews conducted.

In all, 18 individuals were interviewed. Two individuals were contacted but the team was unable to establish an interview – Roger Smith, Jr., President Salt River Materials Group, and Jim Alevras, Public Works Manager, Fort McDowell Yavapai Nation. Mr. Smith attended the Community Meeting on October 22, 2009 and spoke with the project team.

### Stakeholder Interviews Conducted

<b>Stakeholder</b>	<b>Organization</b>
Greg Bacome, Public Works	SRPMIC Public Works-Roads Maintenance
Dave Bunce, Fire Chief	SRPMIC Fire Department
Stephanie Hinson	Salt River Landfill
John Aker	Saddlebrook Communications
Tim Pickering, CEO	Salt River DEVCO
Larry Schurz, Facilities & Transportation	SRPMIC Schools
Ramon Martinez, Public Information Officer and Bruce Tunnicliff, Director Safety & Security	Casino Arizona
Dr. Gerrick Monroe, Superintendent and Ron Latko, Transportation	Mesa Unified School District
Carl Couch, VP of Administrative Services	Scottsdale Community College
Ed Stillings, Engineering Development Coordinator	Federal Highway Administration
Ken Hall, Transit and Planning	City of Mesa
Stuart Boggs, Executive Director	Regional Public Transportation Authority/Valley Metro
Sharon Wallace, Acting Ranger	Tonto National Forest
Shelly Seyler, Traffic Engineering	City of Tempe
Gregg Czajkowski, SRP Designer	Salt River Project
Tom Ward and Randy Harrell, Public Works	Town of Fountain Hills
Shane Anton, Program Manager	SRPMIC Cultural Preservation Program
Stan Kephart, SRPMIC Chief of Police	Salt River Police Department

## Issues

Overall, it was clear that individuals were very pleased to be asked to participate in the stakeholder interview process and thought it was an important planning effort that the Community was embarking upon.

The following summarizes the key issues identified in terms of parking, truck traffic, bicycle/pedestrian movements, roadway network, and public transportation.

**Road Improvements** It was mentioned that better road maintenance was needed, especially on the half and quarter mile roadway section lines. Many stakeholders felt that fixing existing capacity problems and addressing safety issues were highest priority improvements that should be made. However, maximizing economic development opportunities should be considered when prioritizing roadway improvements.

**Cut Through Traffic** The responses varied depending on if the stakeholder was a Community member or worked for the Community versus a stakeholder from outside of SRPMIC. Many stakeholders from outside of the Community did not understand that cutting through SRPMIC to get from Mesa to Scottsdale is trespassing. Scottsdale Community College mentioned that 10-15% of students and employees come from north Mesa through SRPMIC to the college. The street system is not designed to handle that high traffic volume. Extreme traffic calming measures could affect students' school choice.

It was mentioned that one of the reasons for the cut through traffic is the inadequacy of the regional road system. It was suggested that instead of reducing options, consider designated routes for drivers to use (e.g., limited access boulevard to guide drivers).

Cut through traffic is a major concern for most Community members due to the speed in which people travel causing safety issues or individuals not obeying signs. The excessive speeds endanger pedestrians who have to walk on roads with no sidewalks. A particular concern mentioned was that the children walking along Alma School Road have no refuge from traffic.

**Safety** The priorities for safety improvements vary depending on the roadway segment as well as the type of problem. Safety concerns for school children were raised more often. Some said that if you fix the capacity of the roadway it may allow you to fix the safety issues and help with economic development. Concern was raised about the feral horses and the safety issues they cause which should be considered in planning any new roadway.

Roadway lighting needs to be improved at intersections for safety reasons. Dusk-to-dawn lighting should be added at major intersections. The lack of signage is also a safety concern. It was suggested that the Community follow the same standards for signs as the rest of the region (MUTCD-Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices).

**River Crossings** The Forest Service raised concerns about new river crossings near the forest service boundaries and the impact a new crossing might have along the Salt River recreational areas. The lower Salt River Corridor (roughly Bush Highway to Saguaro Lake) is heavily visited with 4 million people annually. Any new connection on Bush Highway would have a major impact.

It was stressed that it was important to build the bridge on Gilbert Road where the bridge was washed out. Also, there was a need to provide another connection across the Salt River to link the Community near the Central Arizona Project (CAP) canal crossing.

**Public Transit** Increasing Community members' access to public transit was viewed positively. The need to better advertise schedules, routes and times of operation were mentioned as important to address. Valley Metro plans to begin regular bus service in 2015 along Shea

Boulevard to the east end of Fountain Hills. The Mesa Public Schools District felt that it would be beneficial for SRPMIC members to be able to get to the light rail system. The study could consider public transit connections to downtown Mesa where Community Members can catch the light rail to get all over the Valley. There is a park-and-ride lot being developed along Gilbert Road in Mesa. Another consideration might be to connect ASU-Tempe and North Scottsdale via SRPMIC as well as providing better connections to the airport. This would allow public transportation for the many employees in the 101 Corridor. Consider transit improvements that would connect activity centers within the Community and to regional activity centers. These connections would benefit Community members as well as others working in the area, making such routes more viable.

Other potential transit routes include:

- ✓ North-south route on Alma School Road
- ✓ East-west route on Chaparral
- ✓ Extend beyond the Scottsdale Community College, continuing into the Community along Chaparral to Longmore and to the government complex
- ✓ Valley Metro McDowell Route should provide a through-route, making stops and connections within the Community to Salt River Transit
- ✓ East-west connections on Thomas
- ✓ Mesa connections on Dobson Road, Country Club and Mesa Drive
- ✓ Improve transit service to serve the casinos
- ✓ Increase transit service from 30 minute to 15 minute intervals

**Trails, Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities** The Forest Service mentioned that they would want to be involved in considering non-motorized trails. There are no trails connecting from the SRPMIC into the Forest Service lands. Such a trail system along the northeast boundary would seasonally impact the bald eagle nesting areas in the winter when the area is closed. Providing trail access would cause an enforcement problem; canoes on the river do not seem to bother the eagles but pedestrians and vehicles are a major concern.

Consider designating the Arizona Canal as part of the regional trail system. Pedestrian paths are important for safety reasons. Additional trails, especially in the Peoples' Village, would be nice. Insufficient rights-of-way are a challenge for establishing more trails. It was suggested that McKellips would be a prime candidate for a trail and McDowell Road for a bike lane.

It was mentioned that the City of Mesa has a Multi-Use Path Master Plan and the Community might want to consider making those pathway connections. The City of Mesa and Forest Service would like the opportunity to coordinate with SRPMIC on trail connectivity.

**Regional Cooperation** All stakeholders felt it was beneficial for regional cooperation to occur and that SRPMIC continue to be engaged in regional discussions particularly as it relates to transportation. It appeared that current regional cooperation and relationships were working well. The Forest Service mentioned that the formal consultation process is the one that Forest Service is required to use with Tribal entities. Typically, the District Ranger and Forest Service Project Manager coordinate with the Tribal Cultural or Preservation Officer through their Tribal Liaison. Typically, the LRTP would not require formal consultation.

## Suggested Road Improvements

1. SR 87 (Beeline Highway) – maintain the highway’s capacity; there is a concern that the capacity of the roadway be maintained if SRPMIC allows development along SR 87
2. Provide an alternative route when accidents or an emergency occurs that shuts down Shea Boulevard or SR 87 (Beeline Highway)
3. Pima Road improvements – five lanes to handle the spring training traffic and future development
4. Gilbert Road river crossing
5. Sidewalks in residential areas including along bus routes
6. Pave Mesa Drive
7. Pave Montebello
8. Traffic signals on Alma School Road at Indian Bend Road
9. Consider public utility easement corridors on new road right-of-ways
10. Pave and extend Earll Drive between Extension and Longmore
11. Pave dirt roads and add sidewalks
12. New road to serve homes along Indian School Road east of 126<sup>th</sup> Street, which is east of SR 87
13. Shoulder widening – irrigation ditches are a problem
14. Gateway treatment along Longmore Street and Osborn Road (e.g. medians, landscaping, etc.)
15. McDowell Road in Lehi
16. McKellips Road through Salt River into Mesa Drive
17. Traffic lights at Thomas Road and Loop 101
18. Direct connection between McDowell Road and SR 87
19. Provide access between the Community and the Casino Arizona so that Community members do not have to access from the highway
20. McDowell Road to Oak Street, low flow crossing
21. Dobson, from Indian Bend Road to Chaparral Road (canal crossing)
22. Widen Chaparral Road and seal coat
23. Pave Mesa Drive north of Camelback Road
24. Improve Alma School Road north of the canal
25. Greater connectivity between Chaparral Road and Osborn Road
26. Connection from East Mesa to Shea Boulevard

## Other Opportunities

Consider the development of a SRPMIC Rio Salado project (Note: there is a SRPMIC Papago Project, see <http://www.srpmic-nsn.gov/community/papago.asp>)

# Interview Summaries

To: Jennifer Jack, Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community

Compiled by: Michael Gorton

**Stakeholder Interview Notes**

**Interviewee:**

Tim Pickering  
SRPMIC - DEVCO  
Phone: (480) 850-5705 (direct)

Date: October 20, 2009

**Conducted:** Monday, September 28

**Stakeholder Questions**

**Summarized Response**

<p>1) Should the focus be on the overall growth and its impact on the Community, or should it be on the type of growth? Please discuss each.</p>	<p>As drivers typically do not recognize political boundaries, SRPMIC might consider taking a regional view of traffic.</p>
<p>2) What concerns do you have regarding cut-through traffic?</p>	<p>Instead of reducing options, SRPMIC might consider designated routes for drivers. One example could be a boulevard to guide drivers. Mesa Drive is a natural boulevard to guide drivers toward the middle of Scottsdale.</p>
<p>3) How important is it for the Community to cooperate in regional planning and development efforts or is it acceptable for each to "go their own way" with regard to issues like growth, development and transportation?</p>	<p>A different way to think of this other than traffic as a negative is that the Community could try to harness it. SRPMIC has traffic other communities and businesses would love to have.</p>
<p>4) If future cooperation from the community is important to you, what are the best forums or methods to seek this cooperation?</p>	<p>I have found open houses to be an effective forum for communities to garner input. SRPMIC could also participate in MAG. Other forums might be joint council meetings with neighbors with traffic as a potential topic</p>
<p>5) To what extent should the following factors be considered when prioritizing new transportation improvements? a. Fixing existing capacity problems (High, Medium, Low) b. Improving safety problems (High, Medium, Low) c. Promoting economic development in the Community (High, Medium, Low) d. Other</p>	<p>a. Medium b. High c. High</p>
<p>6) Where are your three highest roadway improvement priorities that impact the Community and why?</p>	<p>1) Pima Road a. Scottsdale could donate the right-of-way to SRPMIC to make public safety responses consistent b. SRPMIC could accept the right-of-way to control their own destiny.</p>

- c. ADOT could step back.
- d. Resolves emergency response issues.

- 2) Gilbert Road
  - a. Build a bridge where road is washed out
  - b. Provide additional access to Lehi across the Salt River
- 3) Another connection across the Salt River could be considered to link the Community near the CAP canal crossing.

7) Where are your three highest public transit priorities that impact the Community and why? (examples include routes, capital improvements, etc.)

- 1) Valley Metro service connecting ASU-Tempe and North Scottsdale via SRPMIC. This would allow public transportation of employees to the corridor.
- 2) Ensuring Pima Road is five lanes throughout to handle spring training facility and future development
- 3) Airport access, either to Sky Harbor, Scottsdale, or potentially a small SRPMIC airport

8) What should be done to improve pedestrian and non-motorized trails within the Community?

- 1) Designate Arizona Canal as part of the regional trail system and connect it.
- 2) Paths need to be designated to improve safety for pedestrians.
- 3) Pedestrian trails could improve property values.

4) Do you think new road corridors are needed within the Community? If so where and why? How would it benefit your customers and the Community?

A new boulevard may be needed to route travelers through the Community. Way finding is difficult – there, may be a need to designate a route to channel cut-through traffic.

5) Do you have any other issues or topics relating to the LRTP you would like to discuss?

Additional Comments:

Thank you for your time!

To: Jennifer Jack, Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community

Compiled by: Michael LaBianca

**Stakeholder Interview Notes**

**Interviewee:**

Greg Bacome,  
Public Works – Roads Maintenance  
Salt River Pima-  
Maricopa Indian Community  
Phone: (480) 362-5608 (direct)

Date: October 1, 2009

**Conducted:** Wednesday, September 23

**Introduction** (to be read at the start of each)

**Stakeholder Questions**

**Summarized Response**

1) Should the focus be on the overall growth and its impact on the Community, or should it be on the type of growth? Please discuss each.

The focus of the Community should be on overall growth, the community has a wide variety of land uses; agricultural, residential and commercial – each with its own need and affected differently by regional development.

2) What concerns do you have regarding cut-through traffic?

- The greatest concern regarding cut-through traffic is in regards to safety – people view the Community as a different environment, traffic laws are largely disregarded (by those outside the community) and people behave as if they should be held to a different standard when on community land.
- Signage is a concern; it would be beneficial if the community followed the same standards as the region for signs (MUTCD-Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices).
  - One challenge (faced by community) is the difficulty posting signs because of location of irrigation ditches; in many instances shoulders are only two feet wide.

3) How important is it for the Community to cooperate in regional planning and development efforts or is it acceptable for each to “go their own way” with regard to issues like growth, development and transportation?

The Community should be an active participant in regional planning. The actions of those outside the Community will affect it regardless, so it is in the Community’s interest to actively engage in the process.

4) If future cooperation from the community is important to you, what are the best forums or methods to seek this cooperation?

Establish meetings and meet with people face-to-face; direct, persistent communication is most effective.

(Gregg) Was with Scottsdale for 13 years, establishing relationships with people there that makes communication with the City that much easier. The contact with the City of Mesa and Maricopa County has been less frequent and therefore communication with these communities and the office is not as well established.

A ongoing challenge that faces the Community in working with jurisdictions is the fact that SRPMIC is a sovereign nation.

- 5) To what extent should the following factors be considered when prioritizing new transportation improvements?
- a. Fixing existing capacity problems (High, Medium, Low)
  - b. Improving safety problems (High, Medium, Low)
  - c. Promoting economic development in the Community (High, Medium, Low)
  - d. Other
- a. Fixing existing capacity problems (**Very High**)
  - b. Improving safety problems (**Medium**)  
- overall accidents are on the low side
  - c. Promoting economic development in the Community (**Low**)
  - d. Other Issues:
    1. Bring roadways up to par, currently many are in need of maintenance
    2. Signage
    3. Shoulder widening - irrigation ditches (over time their have been a handful of deaths from drowning, need to be covered)

- 6) Where are your three highest roadway improvement priorities that impact the Community and why?
- 1) Longmore, from McDowell to the Community  
Make roadway improvements that create more of a 'gateway statement' (medians, landscaping, etc.)
  - 2) Osborn  
Make roadway improvements that create more of a 'gateway statement' (medians, landscaping, etc.)
  - 3) McDowell Road in Lehi  
Bring up to par and then maintain; challenge is that the roadway is maintained by the County and the Community

- 7) Where are your three highest public transit priorities that impact the Community and why? (examples include routes, capital improvements, etc.)
- 1) Currently, there is limited public transit access to the community. It would be useful to have buses that extend beyond the Scottsdale Community College, continuing along Chaparral to Longmore and the government complex.
  - 2) The Valley Metro McDowell Route should be a through-route, making stops and connections within the Community to Salt River Transit.

- 8) What should be done to improve pedestrian and non-motorized trails within the Community?
- Additional trails, especially in the Peoples' Village would be nice for the Community.
  - One challenge in establishing pedestrian and non-motorized trails is that there is insufficient ROW.

- 9) Do you think new road corridors are needed within the Community? If so where and why? How would it benefit your customers and the Community?
- Don't believe there is a need for additional road corridors. The Community would like to keep it as a rural community.
  - Divided streets are aesthetically pleasing and provide an opportunity to create more of an entry statement; however, don't believe Community members are interested in them.

10) Do you have any other issues or topics relating to the LRTP you would like to discuss? (See Additional Comments below)

Additional Comments:

- There are issues with existing ROW, especially pertaining to unimproved dirt roads.

- Don't have sufficient ROW in some cases to make improvements.
- The fact that the community has different rules than those which govern municipalities in Arizona can sometimes be a hindrance to businesses establishing services in the Community.
- Generally, grading is done for serviceability only (school bus safety and access)
  - Dirt roads generate a lot of dust.

Thank you for your time!



To: Jennifer Jack, Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community	
Compiled by: CC: Peggy Fiandaca Participant – Misty Dayzie, ADOT Project Manager	<b>Stakeholder Interview Notes</b> <b>Interviewee:</b> Sharon Wallace, Acting Ranger Mesa District Tonto National Forest
Date: October 1, 2009	<b>Conducted:</b> Monday, September 28

**Introduction** (to be read at the start of each)

**Stakeholder Questions**

**Summarized Response**

1) Should the focus be on the overall growth and its impact on the Community, or should it be on the type of growth? Please discuss each.

Mesa District is not currently interacting with SRPMIC on transportation issues. At this point we are no coordinating on any planning projects. Forest Service is required to do formal consultation and we do that with the Community when appropriate. The District is working on a Travel Management Plan which is focused on dispersed recreation areas on the forest.

Don't really have a position on this issue specifically. From our perspective, regional growth impacts all of us and should be addressed collaboratively. Where the Forest Service and the community interface, we will have concerns or issues. If there are plans to implement changes along the river we would want to be notified and involved. Or any changes along the Salt River we would want to be a part of the dialogue.

2) What concerns do you have regarding cut-through traffic?

Where the boundary turns north (SR 87, along the river and up to Bush Highway area) is a concern for cut-through traffic. It is a joint issue for both the Forest Service and SRPMIC. There are roads in this area that people have found that they can get to the back side of the river. There is a lot of trespassing of ATV and 4-wheel drive vehicles that take these back roads to get to the river. There is no motorized traffic crossing the river.

3) How important is it for the Community to cooperate in regional planning and development efforts or is it acceptable for each to "go their own way" with regard to issues like growth, development and transportation?

It is extremely important for cooperation to occur. Traffic flows better if there is a continual direction for the traffic to move. If SRPMIC proposes a new road across the Salt River, the Forest Service would be very concerned and want to be involved in the dialogue. It would be better for this cooperation to occur at the local level than pushing it to



the federal level.

The Forest Service has heard about the rumors about the new crossing of the river and would want to be involved in the conversation. There are some pluses/minuses for the Forest Service. The lower Salt River Corridor (roughly Bush Highway to Saguaro Lake) is heavily visited with 4 million people annually. Any new connection on Bush Highway would have a major impact. It could work well if it was well coordinated or it could be a nightmare for everyone.

This area is grid locked on holiday weekends and is often closed. This might cause increased cut-through traffic through SRPMIC. Every Memorial Day (3 day weekend) the area closes due to meeting its limit and July 4<sup>th</sup> sometimes the area closes.

<p>4) If future cooperation from the community is important to you, what are the best forums or methods to seek this cooperation?</p>	<p>The formal consultation process is the one that Forest Service is required to use with Tribal entities. Typically the Forest Service Project Manager works with the Tribal Cultural or Preservation Officer. The Forest Service has a Tribal Liaison. The District Ranger would be involved. This type of project would not require formal consultation.</p> <p>On transportation projects with impact to the Forest Service face to face meetings should be held first and after that email updates are appropriate.</p>
<p>5) To what extent should the following factors be considered when prioritizing new transportation improvements?</p> <p>a. Fixing existing capacity problems (High, Medium, Low)</p> <p>b. Improving safety problems (High, Medium, Low)</p> <p>c. Promoting economic development in the Community (High, Medium, Low)</p> <p>d. Other</p>	<p>a. Medium</p> <p>b. High</p> <p>c. High (if promoting economic development, revenues would be generated for the budget so that the other issues can be addressed. Need to balance capacity with economic development.)</p>
<p>6) Where are your three highest roadway improvement priorities that impact the Community and why?</p>	<p>1) Closing down the remote unpaved roads along the border between SRPMIC and the Forest Service would be a priority for us because of the problems they cause the Forest Service.</p>
<p>7) Where are your three highest public transit priorities that impact the Community and why? (Examples include routes, capital improvements, etc.)</p>	<p>If there was direct road access from SRPMIC onto the forest lands, our answer might be different. But now there is no direct link so public transit is not a concern.</p> <p>If a bridge or new road was developed than public transit should be explored along Bush Highway.</p>

8) What should be done to improve pedestrian and non-motorized trails within the Community?

We would want to be involved in considering non-motorized trails. There is nothing that crosses from the SRPMIC into the Forest Service lands. Such a trail system along the N/E boundary would impact seasonally the bald eagle nesting areas in the winter. The area is closed. Providing trail access would cause an enforcement problem. Eagles are not concerned with the canoes on the river but pedestrians or vehicles are a major concern.

There is not bridge across the river so no way for foot traffic to cross.

South and west of the Granite Reef area there is a mountain bike area in the Utery Mountain area. There is an unofficial parking lot right at the SRP pumping station where the CAP Canal goes under the road. SRPMIC could get access to the mountain bike area if there was a way to cross the canal.

If there would be a connection to the Phon-D-Sutton and Coon Bluff area the Forest Service would have concerns and want to be involved. There are dead end roads now and any connections to make the area a through road would be a concern. Foot bridge would be okay but motorized vehicles would be a concern.

There are trails along the river; basically just fisherman trying to get access.

9) Do you think new road corridors are needed within the Community? If so where and why? How would it benefit your customers and the Community?

Pluses and minuses. If the Forest Service could get the "through traffic" off Bush Highway the traffic focus can be on recreation only.

If there was some connection to the Beeline with no off ramps to the SRPMIC, maybe it could work to the benefit of both agencies. Now Power and Gilbert Road are the only two crossings. The new road could potentially impact the eagles and impact the overall recreational use would be a large public concern.

10) Do you have any other issues or topics relating to the LRTP you would like to discuss?

(See Additional Comments below)

Additional Comments:

- Our major issue is that if there is any proposal to connect Mesa area to the Beeline Highway the Forest Service would want to be involved.
- Feral horses need to be considered in planning any new roadways.

Thank you for your time!



To: Jennifer Jack, Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community	
Compiled by:: CC:	<b>Stakeholder Interview Notes</b> <b>Interviewee:</b> Tom Ward, Director Randy Harrell Public Works Town of Fountain Hills
Date: October 1, 2009	<b>Conducted:</b> Monday, September 28

**Introduction** (to be read at the start of each)

**Stakeholder Questions**

**Summarized Response**

1) Should the focus be on the overall growth and its impact on the Community, or should it be on the type of growth? Please discuss each.	Difficult to choose. Both are important and should be addressed. Regional growth all around the Community will impact the Community. Some of what Fountain Hills will be doing may impact SRPMIC. There is going to be increased traffic on 87 and Shea Boulevard that the Town will be trying to attract into the downtown area for economic development purposes. Working on a 6-lane divided roadway for Shea Boulevard as the ultimate design. It will be done incrementally.
2) What concerns do you have regarding cut-through traffic?	The regional road system is inadequate causing the cut-through traffic issue. There are highways and local streets but no regional roads. There is no good link (regional road) between the Mesa/Chandler/Gilbert area and Scottsdale or North Phoenix.  Candidate Access Report for Usery Pass Road, Stantec for MCDOT – looked at extending Power Road across the Salt River to SR 87. Fort McDowell Tribe was very interested in the study and the possible extension. Having another route would take the pressure off Gilbert Road and provide another important connection. It also provides another evacuation route for the Community.
3) How important is it for the Community to cooperate in regional planning and development efforts or is it acceptable for each to “go their own way” with regard to issues like growth, development and transportation?	Because Fountain Hills do not have any roads that go directly into SRPMIC, we don’t have a regular coordination approach with the Community. The Town would like to improve this communication effort.  SRPMIC should be an active player in regional planning issues like transportation. Regionally there are some missing links and some can impact the Community.
4) If future cooperation from the	When ADOT widened the Beeline, a partnering meeting was held with

<p>community is important to you, what are the best forums or methods to seek this cooperation?</p>	<p>the Town, SRPMIC, and other stakeholders. It was a good coordination approach.</p> <p>The Town of Fountain Hills should have more periodic meeting with SRPMIC. It should occur at the Council to Council and at Senior Management to Senior Management levels. However, we don't know how to institutionalize this approach.</p>
<p>5) To what extent should the following factors be considered when prioritizing new transportation improvements?</p> <p>a. Fixing existing capacity problems (High, Medium, Low)</p> <p>b. Improving safety problems (High, Medium, Low)</p> <p>c. Promoting economic development in the Community (High, Medium, Low)</p> <p>d. Other</p>	<p>a. High</p> <p>b. High</p> <p>c. High</p> <p>They are so inter-related. When you fix one thing you need to examine if you create a larger problem other places.</p> <p>The priorities also vary depending on the roadway segment as well as the issue. If you fix the capacity of the roadway it may allow you to fix the safety issues and helps with economic development. SRPMIC has done a good job of attracting economic development.</p>
<p>6) Where are your three highest roadway improvement priorities that impact the Community and why?</p>	<p>1) East Mesa to Shea Boulevard connection</p> <p>2) Beeline Highway – maintain the highway's capacity; concerned that if SRPMIC allows development along SR 87 the capacity of the roadway be maintained</p> <p>3) Alternative route when accidents or emergency occurs that shuts down Shea Boulevard or the Beeline Highway.</p>
<p>7) Where are your three highest public transit priorities that impact the Community and why? (Examples include routes, capital improvements, etc.)</p>	<p>Valley Metro plans to begin regular bus service (2015) on Shea Boulevard out to the east end of Fountain Hills.</p>
<p>8) What should be done to improve pedestrian and non-motorized trails within the Community?</p>	<p>There is nothing leading out of Fountain Hills to the south. Fountain Hills trail focus is to the north to McDowell Mountain Park.</p> <p>No comments</p>
<p>9) Do you think new road corridors are needed within the Community? If so where and why? How would it benefit your customers and the Community?</p>	<p>East/west connections through the Community; but we recognize that it might be in the best interest of SRPMIC. However, it could be designed to limit the access so it would remove cut-through traffic and provide that important regional link.</p>
<p>10) Do you have any other issues or topics relating to the LRTP you would like to discuss?</p>	<p>(See Additional Comments below)</p>



Additional Comments:

- Any new development along SR 87 should be sensitive to ensure that the highway continues to operate effectively.
- Appreciate the opportunity to participate in the Study and to provide input.

Thank you for your time!

To: Jennifer Jack, Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community

Compiled by: Michael LaBianca

**Stakeholder Interview Notes**

**Interviewee:**  
Stephanie Hinson  
Salt River Landfill

Date: October 1, 2009

**Conducted:** Monday, September 21

**Introduction** (to be read at the start of each)

**Stakeholder Questions**

**Summarized Response**

1) Should the focus be on the overall growth and its impact on the Community, or should it be on the type of growth? Please discuss each.	Both; in particular the focus should be on the type of growth along the Pima Corridor where much of the development is occurring.
2) What concerns do you have regarding cut-through traffic?	Not an issue with regard to the Salt River Landfill; due to location, trucks are accessing the landfill via major routes such as McDowell, McKellips, Gilbert Road and the Beeline Highway.
3) How important is it for the Community to cooperate in regional planning and development efforts or is it acceptable for each to "go their own way" with regard to issues like growth, development and transportation?	Makes sense to coordinate regionally. Key issue is the main roads and their continued operation and maintenance.
4) If future cooperation from the community is important to you, what are the best forums or methods to seek this cooperation?	No comment.
5) To what extent should the following factors be considered when prioritizing new transportation improvements? a. Fixing existing capacity problems (High, Medium, Low) b. Improving safety problems (High, Medium, Low) c. Promoting economic development in the Community (High, Medium, Low) d. Other	a. Fixing existing capacity problems ( <b>Low</b> ) b. Improving safety problems ( <b>Medium</b> ) c. Promoting economic development in the Community ( <b>High</b> ) d. Other <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Driving within the community is much improved (through Ms. Hinson's 4 yr tenure)</li> <li>• Insufficient lighting is a concern, more is currently found in Salt River than the Lehi area</li> <li>• Lack of adequate street signs</li> </ul>
6) Where are your three highest roadway improvement priorities that impact the Community and why?	Gilbert Road (river crossing) is a priority; has been over 1 ½ years waiting for bridge improvements.
7) Where are your three highest public transit priorities that impact the Community and why? (examples include routes, capital	n/a

improvements, etc.)

8) What should be done to improve pedestrian and non-motorized trails within the Community?

Community would certainly benefit from additional trails, equestrian facilities, and general recreation trails.

There are currently little to no sidewalks, people walk in the street.

There has been discussion regarding turning the landfill into a park at future date, would be nice to see connections to larger (regional) trail system.

9) Do you think new road corridors are needed within the Community? If so where and why?  
How would it benefit your customers and the Community?

Would like to see a (direct) connection between McDowell and Bee Line Highway.

Provide access between community and the Casino Arizona so that Community members do not have to access the highway in order to travel there.

10) Do you have any other issues or topics relating to the LRTP you would like to discuss?

(See Additional Comments below)

Additional Comments:

- Salt River Landfill employs approximately 33 people; an additional 20-40 contractors are located at the Material Transfer facility; and about five are employed at the green waste facility.

Thank you for your time!



To: Jennifer Jack, Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community	
Compiled by:: CC:	<b>Stakeholder Interview Notes</b> <b>Interviewee:</b> Dr. Gerrick Monroe Assistant Superintendent Ron Latko Director of Transportation Mesa Unified School District
Date: October 1, 2009	<b>Conducted:</b> Monday, September 28

**Introduction** (to be read at the start of each)

Stakeholder Questions	Summarized Response
1) Should the focus be on the overall growth and its impact on the Community, or should it be on the type of growth? Please discuss each.	<p>Difficult to answer. Our interaction is transporting many SRPMIC children to Mesa Public Schools. Besides transporting about 100 students, there is a partnership between SRPMIC and the Mesa District to provide additional support to students (e.g. counseling, tutoring, etc.).</p> <p>Mesa School District is not seeing an increase in students from SRPMIC attending Mesa schools since the Community is building their own schools. We anticipate always have some Community Members continuing to send their children to Mesa schools because of the commitment they have to those schools (i.e. several generation of family members attended the school).</p>
2) What concerns do you have regarding cut-through traffic?	No comment – the average person does not understand that when they cut through the Community they are trespassing
3) How important is it for the Community to cooperate in regional planning and development efforts or is it acceptable for each to “go their own way” with regard to issues like growth, development and transportation?	The relationship with the Mesa School District has been excellent. The School District has a Tribal Liaison responsible for addressing any concerns and ensuring good communication occurs. Annually all Superintendents meet to strengthen the ties and it has been key to the long term success of the relationship. The Community shares with the District their changing needs.
4) If future cooperation from the community is important to you, what are the best forums or methods to seek this cooperation?	The current system works very well for us and no changes are needed.
5) To what extent should the following factors be considered when prioritizing	a. High



<p>new transportation improvements?</p> <p>a. Fixing existing capacity problems (High, Medium, Low)</p> <p>b. Improving safety problems (High, Medium, Low)</p> <p>c. Promoting economic development in the Community (High, Medium, Low)</p> <p>d. Other</p>	<p>b. Medium</p> <p>c. High</p> <p>Capacity and safety issues go hand in hand. However, key to every Community is economic development.</p>
<p>6) Where are your three highest roadway improvement priorities that impact the Community and why?</p>	<p>1) McKellips Road flooding has been an issue in the past</p> <p>Basically, since all of the roads that the buses travel are all paved now they no longer have a problem. In the past, this was a big issue for the buses.</p>
<p>7) Where are your three highest public transit priorities that impact the Community and why? (Examples include routes, capital improvements, etc.)</p>	<p>The ability for SRPMIC members to be able to get to the light rail system. Maybe a public transit connection to downtown Mesa where Community Members can catch the light rail to get all over the Valley.,</p>
<p>8) What should be done to improve pedestrian and non-motorized trails within the Community?</p>	<p>No comment</p>
<p>9) Do you think new road corridors are needed within the Community? If so where and why? How would it benefit your customers and the Community?</p>	<p>May want to make the regional connection that needs to be developed (i.e. Scottsdale to the Beeline) and then shut off access to all other roads.</p>
<p>10) Do you have any other issues or topics relating to the LRTP you would like to discuss?</p>	<p>(See Additional Comments below)</p>

Additional Comments:

- We have a narrow focus – primarily busing kids to school. Biggest issue in the past has been the dirt roads. The District added different buses because of the dirt roads. However, that has changed. For the most part, all the roads being used are paved and this situation gets better every year.
- They run about 13 buses (84 and 72 passenger buses) and Special Education Buses (24 passengers). Ron Latko will send a routing map. Special education students are picked up at their homes.

Thank you for your time!

To: Jennifer Jack, Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community

Compiled by: Michael LaBianca

**Stakeholder Interview Notes**  
**Interviewee:**  
Kenneth Hall  
Transit and Planning  
City of Mesa

Date: October 12, 2009

**Conducted:** Monday, October 1

**Introduction** (to be read at the start of each)

**Stakeholder Questions**

**Summarized Response**

1) Should the focus be on the overall growth and its impact on the Community, or should it be on the type of growth? Please discuss each.	Not in position to answer, this is really the call of the Community.
2) What concerns do you have regarding cut-through traffic?	No comment. Key corridors like McKellips Road obviously need to be maintained. Obviously, another important through route is the Bee Line Highway (SR 87) - Country Club Road.
3) How important is it for the Community to cooperate in regional planning and development efforts or is it acceptable for each to "go their own way" with regard to issues like growth, development and transportation?	The Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community's active role on the Maricopa Association of Governments is evidence of the Community's interest in being engaged with regional issues and problem solving.
4) If future cooperation from the community is important to you, what are the best forums or methods to seek this cooperation?	Communication between the Community and City of Mesa is well coordinated through the Intergovernmental representative for Mesa.
5) To what extent should the following factors be considered when prioritizing new transportation improvements? a. Fixing existing capacity problems (High, Medium, Low) b. Improving safety problems (High, Medium, Low) c. Promoting economic development in the Community (High, Medium, Low) d. Other	a. Fixing existing capacity problems ( <b>High</b> ) – focusing on linkages between major arterials b. Improving safety problems ( <b>High</b> ) c. Promoting economic development in the Community (n/a) – This should be coordinated through the Community's Comprehensive Development Plan d. Other Key factors in the Community's LRTP should be connectivity, linkages, expanding capacity and keeping key corridors up to par.
6) Where are your three highest roadway improvement priorities that impact the Community and why?	1) Bridges across the Salt River should be a priority, MCDOT currently studying Gilbert Road, McKellips Road, and Dobson Road crossings (in that order); Gilbert Road is already identified in the Maricopa Association of Governments Transportation Improvement Plan.
7) Where are your three highest public transit priorities that impact the Community and why?	1) Park and Ride along Gilbert Road (in City of Mesa). This project is currently in the design phase, some money has been allocated for it next year.

(examples include routes, capital improvements, etc.)

- 
- |  |  |
|--|--|
| 8) What should be done to improve pedestrian and non-motorized trails within the Community?  | Refer to the Multi-Use Path Master Plan (City of Mesa) – connectivity with the Mesa system, Tonto National Forest, would benefit the region as a whole. Specifically the Lehi Trail (Mesa) and paths along the canals, which are important elements of Mesa’s non-motorized plans. There is discussion of a potential trail head at Red Mountain Mining at Granite Reef Dam (part of the restoration of the Va Shly’Ay Akimel Salt River Ecosystem, between the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community and Mesa, Ariz.) |
| 9) Do you think new road corridors are needed within the Community? If so where and why?<br>How would it benefit your customers and the Community? | No comment. Can’t speak to their need for additional network. Their system, like much of the Valley, based on a mile grid serves the area well.  |
| 10) Do you have any other issues or topics relating to the LRTP you would like to discuss?   | Refer to Additional Comments below.  |
- 

Additional Comments:

- An additional concern is the traffic resulting from the Loop 101 spillover traffic when this route is congested.
- Mesa would appreciate the opportunity to collaborate with the SRPMIC on trail connectivity. Refer to #8 above.

Thank you for your time!

To: Jennifer Jack, Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community	
Compiled by: Michael Gorton	<b>Stakeholder Interview Notes</b> <b>Interviewee:</b> Stuart Boggs RPTA Valley Metro Phone: (602) 262-7433 (direct)
Date: October 20, 2009	<b>Conducted:</b> Thursday, September 24

Stakeholder Questions	Summarized Response
1) Should the focus be on the overall growth and its impact on the Community, or should it be on the type of growth? Please discuss each.	SRPMIC should be proactive about the impacts of overall regional growth and its impact on the Community or ignore it at its peril.
2) What concerns do you have regarding cut-through traffic?	There are poor north-south public transit connections through the Community. RPTA has plans to extend service both from the south and the north with connections to Mesa, Scottsdale, and Fountain Hills.  Provides more transit options for residents and provides access for outside workers.  Coordination is needed on PARA transit side. The casino are asking for route extensions. RPTA is coordinating with the casinos and the Community.
3) How important is it for the Community to cooperate in regional planning and development efforts or is it acceptable for each to "go their own way" with regard to issues like growth, development and transportation?	Proponent of regional dialogue, SRPMIC should be at the table because no one exists in a vacuum.
4) If future cooperation from the community is important to you, what are the best forums or methods to seek this cooperation?	SRPMIC is a member of MAG. Encourage SRPMIC to get a seat on the RTPA board either as a voting or non-voting member so their voice is heard.
5) To what extent should the following factors be considered when prioritizing new transportation improvements? a. Fixing existing capacity problems (High, Medium, Low) b. Improving safety problems (High, Medium, Low) c. Promoting economic development in the Community (High, Medium, Low) d. Other	a. b. c. High  Other Issues: 1. Increased travel options increases Community members' access to economic growth opportunities.
6) Where are your three highest transit improvement priorities that impact the Community and why?	1) North-South Connections a. SRPMIC - Mesa

b. SRPMIC - Scottsdale

2) Mesa Connections

a. Dobson Road

b. Country Club

c. Mesa Drive

3) East-West Connection on Thomas

---

7) Where are your three highest public transit priorities that impact the Community and why? (examples include routes, capital improvements, etc.)

1) Improve transit service to serve casinos

2) Extend routes into SRPMIC to provide Community better access to jobs, education, and medical services

3) Increase transit service to 30 minute to 15 minute intervals

---

8) What should be done to improve pedestrian and non-motorized trails within the Community?

1) Better trail systems would increase accessibility. It would contribute trips to transit stops and distribute trips from transit stops

2) Health benefit from increased exercise

---

9) Do you think new road corridors are needed within the Community? If so where and why?  
How would it benefit your customers and the Community?

---

10) Do you have any other issues or topics relating to the LRTP you would like to discuss?

How activity centers are located in relationship to the transportation infrastructure is important. There should be a solid linkage between land use and transportation. As planning continues on SRPMIC there should be a solid conversation between land use and transportation.

Additional Comments:

Thank you for your time!

To: Jennifer Jack, Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community

Compiled by: Michael LaBianca

**Stakeholder Interview Notes**  
**Interviewee:**  
John Aker  
Engineering Manager  
Saddleback Communications

Date: October 1, 2009

**Conducted:** Wednesday, September 23

**Introduction** (to be read at the start of each)

**Stakeholder Questions**

**Summarized Response**

1) Should the focus be on the overall growth and its impact on the Community, or should it be on the type of growth? Please discuss each.	The focus should be on commercial growth in the corridor to enrich/sustain the earned income for allottees and Community members.
2) What concerns do you have regarding cut-through traffic?	No Comment.
3) How important is it for the Community to cooperate in regional planning and development efforts or is it acceptable for each to “go their own way” with regard to issues like growth, development and transportation?	It is very important for the Community to coordinate actions with the region, and likewise, as all surrounding areas affect the Community. The Community may as well participate since they will be affected by regional growth, whether they choose to participate or not.
4) If future cooperation from the community is important to you, what are the best forums or methods to seek this cooperation?	Coordination of communication should be through the Tribal Council; they are the elected body and able to speak for the Community with one voice.
5) To what extent should the following factors be considered when prioritizing new transportation improvements? a. Fixing existing capacity problems (High, Medium, Low) b. Improving safety problems (High, Medium, Low) c. Promoting economic development in the Community (High, Medium, Low) d. Other	a. Fixing existing capacity problems ( <b>Medium</b> ) b. Improving safety problems ( <b>Medium</b> ) c. Promoting economic development in the Community ( <b>High</b> ) d. Other ( <b>LEHI</b> ) only one entry/exit (Gilbert). Should consider making McDowell to Oak a low-flow crossing, at one time (before flooding in the 80’s) McDowell used to go through. There is still a communication ROW along this route (Mountain States Telegraph), although the infrastructure has long since been relocated. The ROW is now owned by Saddleback Communications – an enterprise of the SRPMIC.
6) Where are your three highest roadway improvement priorities that impact the Community and why?	1) McDowell to Oak, low flow crossing 2) Dobson, from Indian Bend to Chaparral (Canal crossing) 3) Additional ideas, not in priority order a. Chaparral – widen lanes a bit and seal coat b. Mesa Drive, above Camelback (may want to pave) c. Alma School – unpaved (dirt) north of the Canal, may want to improve

- 7) Where are your three highest public transit priorities that impact the Community and why? (examples include routes, capital improvements, etc.)
- 1) A priority of public transportation could be bringing employees to work. As an example
    - a. Saddleback Communications has approximately 35 employees. Engineering and Construction Services (ECS) is also located at this location (another 30-40 employees) as well as an ECS warehouse.
    - b. Community trailer parks (2) these contain over 800 spaces with retirees that are in need of transit services.  
Other high density locations that would create good transfer locations,
    - c. Lehi Community Center
    - d. Government Complex (Two Waters)
  - 2) Light Rail along freeway corridor  
Given the amount of current employment in the Pima Corridor, and the anticipated employment and special event facilities (e.g., the convention center and spring training venue), light rail and connections to it would benefit the area.

- 8) What should be done to improve pedestrian and non-motorized trails within the Community?
- Create an off-street bike trail. An example of a successful system can be seen in Denver, CO. Such a trail would comprise eight foot paved/asphalt trails.
    - McKellips would be a prime candidate for a trail (currently only 3' shoulders)  
An annual Ironman competition is held in SRPMIC; improvements to this route would have additional benefit to the community
    - McDowell another candidate for bike trail, or possibly bike lane in roadway
    - SR87, currently bicycle traffic is taking this route from/to Fountain Hills

- 9) Do you think new road corridors are needed within the Community? If so where and why? How would it benefit your customers and the Community?
- McDowell to Oak (as noted previously) to service the Lehi area
  - Dobson canal crossing (as noted previously)
  - Greater connectivity between Chaparral and Osborne (Two Waters) connectivity

- 10) Do you have any other issues or topics relating to the LRTP you would like to discuss? (See Additional Comments below)

Additional Comments:

- Would like to see (the) Salt River developed as a *Rio Salado* like project.
- Roads such as Indian School, McDowell, Chaparral can handle traffic, the focus should be on maintaining them and making them safe.
- Loop 101 and 202 should carry bulk of traffic today and in the future.

Thank you for your time!

To: Jennifer Jack, Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community

Compiled by: Michael Gorton

**Stakeholder Interview Notes**

**Interviewee:**

Carl Couch  
VP of Administrative Services  
Scottsdale Community College  
Phone: (480) 423-6161 (direct)

Date: October 19, 2009

**Conducted:** Thursday, September 24

**Stakeholder Questions**

**Summarized Response**

<p>1) Should the focus be on the overall growth and its impact on the Community, or should it be on the type of growth? Please discuss each.</p>	<p>Close-in housing opportunities are appealing to the Community College. East of campus is a planned apartment development that would bring the possibility of student housing.</p>
<p>2) What concerns do you have regarding cut-through traffic?</p>	<p>Cut-through is a concern for the college. Between 10 and 15 percent of students and employees come from north Mesa through SRPMIC. The street system isn't designed for high traffic volumes.</p> <p>The cut-through traffic is not only from students, but also traffic seeking access to the congested Loop 101.</p> <p>Extreme traffic calming measures could affect students' school choice. Most likely increase the perception of inconvenience.</p>
<p>3) How important is it for the Community to cooperate in regional planning and development efforts or is it acceptable for each to "go their own way" with regard to issues like growth, development and transportation?</p>	<p>Geography makes the community a key player. There should be a thoughtful discussion about transportation and commercial development and its impact on the regional transportation system. The Community would benefit from discussions as broad as possible. MAG is the best forum for most of these discussions.</p>
<p>4) If future cooperation from the community is important to you, what are the best forums or methods to seek this cooperation?</p>	<p>MAG is logical point of coordination. Cooperation should involve key stakeholders and be considered as on-going.</p>
<p>5) To what extent should the following factors be considered when prioritizing new transportation improvements?</p> <p>a. Fixing existing capacity problems (High, Medium, Low)</p> <p>b. Improving safety problems (High, Medium, Low)</p> <p>c. Promoting economic development in the Community (High, Medium, Low)</p> <p>d. Other</p>	<p>a. Medium</p> <p>b. Clearly most important.</p> <p>c. High</p>
<p>6) Where are your three highest roadway improvement priorities that impact the Community and why?</p>	<p>1) Activity on Loop 101 is paramount. Chaparral Road is the only point of access for the Community College. There is a</p>

provision in the lease agreement with the Community for the construction of 92nd Street north to the McDonald Interchange. Internal circulation plans are in place for the eventual extension of 92<sup>nd</sup> Street.

7) Where are your three highest public transit priorities that impact the Community and why? (examples include routes, capital improvements, etc.)	There is some pedestrian and bicycle traffic from Scottsdale. Most students drive to school. Better transit service is needed in Scottsdale provide better access to the Community College.
8) What should be done to improve pedestrian and non-motorized trails within the Community?	Pedestrian and non-motorized trails would be beneficial. However feral dogs are an issue for bicyclists riding to campus. Otherwise it would be wonderful if the Community had bike paths.
9) Do you think new road corridors are needed within the Community? If so where and why? How would it benefit your customers and the Community?	Dedicated arterials within the Community to facilitate north-south access would be a benefit of the college because it would make it more accessible to students in Mesa.
10) Do you have any other issues or topics relating to the LRTP you would like to discuss?	I applaud the Community for engaging in a forward, progressive thinking study like this. The Community College is looking for opportunities to engage with the Community like this.

Thank you for your time!

To: Jennifer Jack, Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community

Compiled by: Michael LaBianca

**Stakeholder Interview Notes**  
**Interviewee:**  
Larry Schurz  
Facilities & Transportation Coordinator  
Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian  
Community Schools

Date: October 1, 2009

**Conducted:** Monday, September 21

**Introduction** (to be read at the start of each)

**Stakeholder Questions**

**Summarized Response**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) Should the focus be on the overall growth and its impact on the Community, or should it be on the type of growth? Please discuss each.  | Both, however, the emphasis should be on the Community's needs.   |
| 2) What concerns do you have regarding cut-through traffic?  | This is a major concern. There are students waiting at bus stops and cut-through traffic presents a safety concern. Regarding cut-through traffic, there is an observed lack of courtesy with regard to school buses; drivers ignore safety signals (such as school stop warnings), and pass busses when stopped and in motion.   |
| 3) How important is it for the Community to cooperate in regional planning and development efforts or is it acceptable for each to "go their own way" with regard to issues like growth, development and transportation? | Cooperation is critical. Increasing congestion throughout the region is a concern as it affects the time students must spend travelling to and from schools, especially in the case of SRPMIC students travelling to Mesa Schools.<br><br>There is an agreement with Mesa City schools that the students in the unorganized territories (those areas outside of the SRPMIC school district boundary areas) are covered by and may attend Mesa schools.  |
| 4) If future cooperation from the community is important to you, what are the best forums or methods to seek this cooperation?   | The Education Board does a good job of communicating with the Community.<br><br>It is important that departments within the Community communicate with each other; for example, a decision made by the Housing Department (with regard to new subdivision for instance) may have a direct impact on school transportation needs and access. When such decisions are considered in an open forum the implications are fully understood and input can be received that will best serve the Community. |
| 5) To what extent should the following factors be considered when prioritizing new transportation improvements?<br>a. Fixing existing capacity problems (High, Medium, Low)<br>b. Improving safety problems (High,       | a. Fixing existing capacity problems (High)<br>b. Improving safety problems (High)<br>Safety of children should be a top priority<br>c. Promoting economic development in the Community (Low)   |

Medium, Low)	d. Other
c. Promoting economic development in the Community (High, Medium, Low)	
d. Other	
6) Where are your three highest roadway improvement priorities that impact the Community and why?	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Gilbert Road Important for community (including bus transportation) – provides one of only several access routes to Lehi</li> <li>2. Cut-through traffic – Student safety is paramount</li> </ol>
7) Where are your three highest public transit priorities that impact the Community and why? (examples include routes, capital improvements, etc.)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Safe bus stops for children – no designated areas providing shelter from rain/sun -due to travel time, Mesa schools are sometimes picking up children in the dark</li> <li>2. Too few crossing zones – few streets (besides directly adjacent to schools) are marked for pedestrians</li> <li>3. Street lighting is insufficient</li> </ol>
8) What should be done to improve pedestrian and non-motorized trails within the Community?	Secure Right-Of-Way to allow trails in the future (trails that are developed should be maintained and developed to look natural)
9) Do you think new road corridors are needed within the Community? If so where and why? How would it benefit your customers and the Community?	Don't believe there should be new road corridors designated through the Community. Greater through roads will result in greater cut-through traffic.
10) Do you have any other issues or topics relating to the LRTP you would like to discuss?	(See additional comments below)

Additional Comments:

- Students from the Community are travelling to Mesa schools, and increased traffic (in general) will result in the students having to spend more time travelling each day. Overall, SRPMIC students attend a total of eight elementary schools, four junior high schools, and two high schools.
- As school enrollment increases there is additional parent drop-off at the schools. Want to ensure student safety as growth occurs. Also, as development occurs the travel time for students and busses will increase.
- An increasing number of parents are choosing to drop their children at school resulting in greater traffic around the schools during those busy pick-up and drop-off times.
- Locating new schools will be a challenge because allotted land being built up by families.
- There are currently plans for the expansion of the elementary school (close proximity to the High School)
- Cars are travelling on canal banks (primarily contractors), results in dust and unsafe conditions along these potential non-motorized routes.
- Schools have bike racks, but they aren't used. Few children ride their bikes to schools. This might be due in part to the fact there are no dedicated bike routes.
- Safe Routes to Schools should be further evaluated.

Thank you for your time!

To: Jennifer Jack, Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community

Compiled by: Michael Gorton

**Stakeholder Interview Notes**

**Interviewee:**

Gregg J. Czajkowski,  
Engineering & Construction Services  
Salt River Project  
Phone: (602) 818-7725 (direct)

Date: October 19, 2009

**Conducted:** Thursday, September 24

**Stakeholder Questions**

**Summarized Response**

1) Should the focus be on the overall growth and its impact on the Community, or should it be on the type of growth? Please discuss each.	Better road maintenance is needed, especially on the ½ mile and ¼ mile road section lines.
2) What concerns do you have regarding cut-through traffic?	Excessive speeds of cut-through drivers endanger pedestrians who have to walk on roads with no sidewalks. There is no place for pedestrians to go. Children walk along Alma School Road with no refuge from traffic.
3) How important is it for the Community to cooperate in regional planning and development efforts or is it acceptable for each to “go their own way” with regard to issues like growth, development and transportation?	Community needs to be included all regional planning and development. There should be knowledge sharing at the local planning level.
4) If future cooperation from the community is important to you, what are the best forums or methods to seek this cooperation?	The best forum is a well-publicized public hearing held in the early stages of a project. These are good tools for gauging the public climate. The newspapers should also be used for disseminating planning information.
5) To what extent should the following factors be considered when prioritizing new transportation improvements? a. Fixing existing capacity problems (High, Medium, Low) b. Improving safety problems (High, Medium, Low) c. Promoting economic development in the Community (High, Medium, Low) d. Other	<p>a. High priority b. High priority; especially sidewalks and lighting c. Medium</p> <p>Other Issues:</p> <p>1. Roadway lighting needs to be improved with lights at intersections. Dusk-to-dawn lighting should be added at major intersections.</p>
6) Where are your three highest roadway improvement priorities that impact the Community and why?	<p>1) Sidewalks in residential areas; school bus stops; bike paths. 2) Pave internal roads. Mesa Drive, Montebello. 3) Traffic signals on Alma School Road at Indian Bend. 4) Consider Public Utility Easements corridors on new road right-</p>

of-way.

- 
- |   |  |
|---|--|
| 7) Where are your three highest public transit priorities that impact the Community and why?<br>(examples include routes, capital improvements, etc.) | 1) Valley Metro route through Community. North-South route on Alma School. East-west Route on Chaparral. |
|---|--|
- 
- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 8) What should be done to improve pedestrian and non-motorized trails within the Community? | 1) Add sidewalks to roadsides.<br>2) Pave and extend Earll Drive between Extension and Longmore.<br>3) Pave dirt roads and add sidewalks. |
|---|---|
- 
- |  |  |
|--|--|
| 4) Do you think new road corridors are needed within the Community? If so where and why?<br>How would it benefit your customers and the Community? | New road needed to serve homes along Indian School Road east of 126 <sup>th</sup> street, which is east of SR 87. There are homes being built here, but there is no established road grid. Utilities are following 'bunny trails.' |
|--|--|
- 
- |   |  |
|---|--|
| 5) Do you have any other issues or topics relating to the LRTP you would like to discuss? |  |
|---|--|

Additional Comments:

Thank you for your time!

To: Jennifer Jack, Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community

Compiled by: Michael LaBianca

**Stakeholder Interview Notes**

**Interviewee:**  
Dave Bunce  
Fire Chief  
Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community

Date: October 12, 2009

**Conducted:** Monday, October 5

**Introduction** (to be read at the start of each)

**Stakeholder Questions**

**Summarized Response**

<p>1) Should the focus be on the overall growth and its impact on the Community, or should it be on the type of growth? Please discuss each.</p>	<p>The focus of the plan should be on the overall growth. The SRPMIC General Plan identified the areas where growth will be focused; with commercial growth along the Pima Corridor, and to a lesser degree McKellips, and the residential growth focused on the People’s Village. Infrastructure improvements, both completed and planned, are driving an interest in Community members returning to the Community to build homesites on their allotments - especially north of the Arizona Canal between Mesa Drive and Alma School Road.</p>
<p>2) What concerns do you have regarding cut-through traffic?</p>	<p>Cut-through traffic has always been a concern (for the ten years the Chief has been around Community). The circulation within the Community is rural, with lots of stop signs that clog traffic and are often ignored. Much of the community is 35 mph speeds and when school buses stop on major streets traffic is blocked.</p>
<p>3) How important is it for the Community to cooperate in regional planning and development efforts or is it acceptable for each to “go their own way” with regard to issues like growth, development and transportation?</p>	<p>No comment.</p>
<p>4) If future cooperation from the community is important to you, what are the best forums or methods to seek this cooperation?</p>	<p>For our department, communication should be through the Administration and then to Council for their buy-in and support. The Community’s intranet site is a great venue for disseminating information.</p>
<p>5) To what extent should the following factors be considered when prioritizing new transportation improvements?  a. Fixing existing capacity problems (High, Medium, Low)  b. Improving safety problems (High, Medium, Low)  c. Promoting economic development in the Community (High, Medium, Low)  d. Other</p>	<p>a. Fixing existing capacity problems (<b>Medium</b>) – look at major arteries heading east-west and ensure they continue to serve capacity.  b. Improving safety problems (<b>High</b>) – on issue are the blind corners, a result of narrow right-of-way and overgrown vegetation.  c. Promoting economic development in the Community (<b>No ranking</b>) – should look at commercial corridors, ensure that as development is planned that these issues are considered. This will be real important as sites for the Stadium are explored.</p>

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| 6) Where are your three highest roadway improvement priorities that impact the Community and why?  | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Widths of roadways, especially on some major arteries are too narrow.</li> <li>2) Maintain surfaces, continue paving additional roads; emergency response vehicles are not designed to travel unpaved roads, this adds wear and tear to these vehicles.</li> <li>3) Additional canal crossings; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Dobson across the canal, and then pave the road from Indian Bend to Jackrabbit</li> <li>• Mesa Drive bridge (canal) helped</li> <li>• Alma School Road (canal) crossing needs to be improved. This is an old bridge, not sure of tonnage capacity, however needs to be widened and brought up to current standards.</li> </ul> </li> <li>4) Access to Lehi<br/>Currently access Lehi by way of Gilbert Road; it is a bit of an island and response times would improve with additional access.</li> <li>5) Continuing Indian Bend Road through to Mesa Drive<br/>This would also assist in improving response times.</li> </ol> |
| 7) Where are your three highest public transit priorities that impact the Community and why? (examples include routes, capital improvements, etc.) | <p>Public transit should be prioritized based on the following needs:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Transit for elders; either don't drive or can't drive</li> <li>2) Disabled</li> <li>3) Community members without a vehicle.</li> </ol>   |
| 8) What should be done to improve pedestrian and non-motorized trails within the Community?  | <p>New development should put in sidewalks. While it would be nice to have pedestrian, bicycle, and equestrian facilities, oftentimes there is insufficient Right-of-Way to accommodate these needs.</p>   |
| 9) Do you think new road corridors are needed within the Community? If so where and why? How would it benefit your customers and the Community?    | <p>It would be beneficial to develop Dobson with paving and a bridge across the Arizona Canal.</p>   |
| 10) Do you have any other issues or topics relating to the LRTP you would like to discuss?   | <p>(See Additional Comments below)</p>   |

**Additional Comments:**

An additional concern is the traffic resulting from the Loop 101 spillover traffic when this route is congested.

Thank you for your time!

To: Jennifer Jack, Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community

Compiled by: Michael LaBianca

**Stakeholder Interview Notes**

**Interviewee:**

Ed Stillings  
Engineering Development Coordinator  
Mobility Planning Engineer  
Federal Highway Administration

Date: October 9, 2009

**Conducted:** Tuesday, October 6

**Introduction** (to be read at the start of each)

**Stakeholder Questions**

**Summarized Response**

1) Should the focus be on the overall growth and its impact on the Community, or should it be on the type of growth? Please discuss each.	It would be difficult to separate the two (overall growth/type of growth), focus must be on both.
2) What concerns do you have regarding cut-through traffic?	No comment. Can understand cut-through traffic being a concern to the Community; however the FHWA is primarily concerned with the larger arterial roadway system.
3) How important is it for the Community to cooperate in regional planning and development efforts or is it acceptable for each to "go their own way" with regard to issues like growth, development and transportation?	It is important for the Community to be a participant in planning so that we can address issues at a regional level.
4) If future cooperation from the community is important to you, what are the best forums or methods to seek this cooperation?	The Community's involvement in the Maricopa Association of Governments is a good venue for participation in regional issues.  Of course, as this study demonstrates, SRPMIC should continue to coordinate with the Arizona Department of Transportation, neighboring communities and Maricopa County.
5) To what extent should the following factors be considered when prioritizing new transportation improvements? a. Fixing existing capacity problems (High, Medium, Low) b. Improving safety problems (High, Medium, Low) c. Promoting economic development in the Community (High, Medium, Low) d. Other	a. Fixing existing capacity problems ( <b>Medium</b> ) b. Improving safety problems ( <b>High</b> ) – this is one of the FHWA's major priorities. c. Promoting economic development in the Community ( <b>High</b> ) – it is important for the Community to have an opportunity for growth.
6) Where are your three highest roadway improvement priorities that impact the Community and why?	No comment, FHWA is generally interested in higher order of roadways.
7) Where are your three highest public	No specific comments. Ideally the focus would be on serving those

transit priorities that impact the Community and why?  
(examples include routes, capital improvements, etc.)

corridors that have the greatest density of population or employment.

---

8) What should be done to improve pedestrian and non-motorized trails within the Community?	It would be beneficial for the Community to develop some kind of a (non-motorized) plan – focusing on addressing those areas where greatest foot traffic is anticipated.
9) Do you think new road corridors are needed within the Community? If so where and why? How would it benefit your customers and the Community?	No comment.
10) Do you have any other issues or topics relating to the LRTP you would like to discuss?	No additional comments.

---

Additional Comments:

Thank you for your time!

To: Jennifer Jack, Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community

Compiled by: Michael LaBianca

**Stakeholder Interview Notes**

**Interviewee:**

Bruce Tunnicliff, Safety & Security Director and  
Ramon Martinez, Public Information Officer  
Casino Arizona

Date: October 9, 2009

**Conducted:** Wednesday, October 7

**Introduction** (to be read at the start of each)

**Stakeholder Questions**

**Summarized Response**

1) Should the focus be on the overall growth and its impact on the Community, or should it be on the type of growth? Please discuss each.

Believe that you must look at the overall growth. Specific issues relating to the Casino Arizona include ingress/egress (access) and the quality of roadways accessing the casino. It is important that the Community continue to require a high standard of development to support and enhance the investment made by the community enterprises such as the casinos, Talking Stick Golf Course and the convention center.

2) What concerns do you have regarding cut-through traffic?

This has been a long-standing concern of the Community. In general, Community members do not want outsiders trespassing in the Community. There is a desire among Community members to preserve the rural, safe feel of the Community.

Ideally, would like to see through traffic channeled to specific routes; McDowell, McKellips, Indian School Road and Thomas.

3) How important is it for the Community to cooperate in regional planning and development efforts or is it acceptable for each to “go their own way” with regard to issues like growth, development and transportation?

It is very important for the Community to stay involved for several reasons; 1) need to be engaged to stay informed and be able to influence growth, and 2) it is a “good neighbor” policy to be engaged.

4) If future cooperation from the community is important to you, what are the best forums or methods to seek this cooperation?

The Council is the appropriate body to communicate both with the Community and the greater region. In addition the Community’s involvement with the Maricopa Association of Governments provides an appropriate forum to communicate with neighboring and regional jurisdictions.

5) To what extent should the following factors be considered when prioritizing new transportation improvements?

- a. Fixing existing capacity problems (High, Medium, Low)
- b. Improving safety problems (High, Medium, Low)

- a. Fixing existing capacity problems **(High)**
- b. Improving safety problems **(High)** – specifically cut through traffic and the overall volume of traffic.
- c. Promoting economic development in the Community **(High)**

- c. Promoting economic development in the Community (High, Medium, Low)
- d. Other

6) Where are your three highest roadway improvement priorities that impact the Community and why?	Continued access to the Community's enterprise operations is critical; Salt River Sand And Gravel, the casinos, and new commercial development along the Pima Corridor.
7) Where are your three highest public transit priorities that impact the Community and why? (examples include routes, capital improvements, etc.)	<p>The top transit priorities should be to develop connections for Salt River Transit users to the Valley Metro system. In addition to the casinos, logical connection points include the Scottsdale Community College, the Pavillions, and Pima Corridor shopping centers.</p> <p>Regarding the casino employees, there have been requests in the past to provide convenient, scheduled service to the casinos. If this were a priority of the Community, Casino Arizona would certainly be interested in working with Transit to facilitate service to the casinos.</p>
8) What should be done to improve pedestrian and non-motorized trails within the Community?	<p>A real challenge with regard to the establishment of trails is the way land is divided up; allotted land does not provide sufficient Right-of-Way for trails.</p> <p>This has always been a challenge. At one time (Mr. Martinez) family was involved in boarding horses on the Community and it was difficult for owners to ride on reservation because they were not able to access areas for that purpose.</p>
9) Do you think new road corridors are needed within the Community? If so where and why? How would it benefit your customers and the Community?	Do not see that there is a need or desire for any additional roadway corridors in the Community.
10) Do you have any other issues or topics relating to the LRTP you would like to discuss?	No other comments.

Additional Comments:

Thank you for your time!