

**ARIZONA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
MULTIMODAL PLANNING DIVISION**

REVIEW COMMENTS

SUBMITTAL:	DRAFT ADOT Pedestrian Safety Action Plan, Working Paper No. 4	PROJECT NAME:	ADOT Pedestrian Safety Action Plan
REPORT DATE:	January 22, 2009	PROJECT NO:	Task Assignment TPD 01-08 Contract # T0449P001 PGKG 3120 KHA 09137020
REVIEWED BY:	Michael Sanders	CONSULTANT:	Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc.
AGENCY / DISCIPLINE / OFFICE:	ADOT MPD		

ITEM NO.	PAGE NO.	COMMENT	CONSULTANT RESPONSE
	7	Add mile post for “from” and “to” columns in Exhibit 2-3	Added in WP3 and WP4
	9	Correct mile post “beginning” and “ending” in Exhibit 2-5	Updated
	11	In Exhibit 4-1 does “Agency” refer to entity that is to implement, e.g. under Segment 6 is it Coconino <i>County</i> that will rebuild intersection, even though it is an ADOT roadway?	“Agency” refers to the agency responsible for providing funds for the project. “Agency” has been changed to “Funds” as in the STIP.
	11	Identify pavement preservation jobs as potential pedestrian safety opportunities, e.g. under Segment 1	Added
	12	If “Agency” refers to entity that is to implement, then who is to implement projects under Segment 7 and Segment 11? TEA and NH are sources of funding.	“Agency” has been changed to “Funds” as in the STIP.
	11 – 13	In Exhibit 4-1, “Programmed Projects on High Pedestrian Crash Segments,” is there any significance to the red font?	Removed. Red font was for internal review purposes only.
	14 – 34	Need to make sure that each funding source allows for pedestrian safety improvements <i>on the State Highway System</i> (SHS) and include <i>how</i> the funding source does benefit pedestrian safety along the SHS in the funding description; thus, delete all references to the FHWA Recreational Trails Program (RTP) since it funds off-road trails only and not relevant to pedestrian safety on SHS	Deleted. FHWA Recreational Trails program is removed.
	14	Delete reference to the FHWA RTP	Deleted
	16	Delete “ <i>Highway Enhancements for Safety (HES) Program</i> ” but “beef-up” HSIP, per my email, in response to Sarath Joshua and Kohinoor Kar comments	Deleted HES
	19	Delete RTP	Deleted
	20	Like FHWA RTP, delete reference to Heritage Fund since it is off-road trails and not relevant to discussion	Deleted

WORKING PAPER 4 REVIEW COMMENTS
(CONTINUED)
DRAFT ADOT Pedestrian Safety Action Plan, Working Paper No. 4

ITEM NO.	PAGE NO.	COMMENT	CONSULTANT RESPONSE
	20	Can HURF be used for pedestrian facilities? Is so, then so state.	Added further explanation of the HURF in relation to pedestrian facilities
	22	MAG ½ cent sales tax: delete per TAC meeting discussion	Deleted
	28	Delete “Highway Enhancements for Safety (HES) Program”	Deleted
	29	Delete FHWA RTP	Deleted
	29	Delete Heritage Fund Grants	Deleted
	30	MAG ½ cent sales tax: delete per TAC meeting discussion	Deleted
	30	Be more specific on the “Source” of funding for “Local Revenues” and “Private Revenues,” e.g. A.R.S. citation	Updated

**ARIZONA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
MULTIMODAL PLANNING DIVISION**

REVIEW COMMENTS

SUBMITTAL:	DRAFT ADOT Pedestrian Safety Action Plan, Working Paper No. 4	PROJECT NAME:	ADOT Pedestrian Safety Action Plan
REPORT DATE:	January 22, 2009	PROJECT NO:	Task Assignment TPD 01-08 Contract # T0449P001 PGKG 3120 KHA 09137020
REVIEWED BY:	Karen King	CONSULTANT:	Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc.
AGENCY / DISCIPLINE / OFFICE:			

ITEM NO.	PAGE NO.	COMMENT	CONSULTANT RESPONSE
1	4	“No Right Turn on Red” Signs to improve pedestrian safety – Need to include other considerations for this applications. In urban, low pedestrian usage interchanges, likely to have low vehicle compliance unless there are sight restrictions for right-turning vehicle.	Included statement in Exhibit 2-1 “Install “No Right Turn on Red” signs to provide a safe crossing for pedestrians, when conditions meet engineering warrants per MUTCD Section 2B.45 Assumptions were modified to assume that only 1/3 of intersections along a segment where countermeasures should be considered will require NTOR signs.
2	4	“Decision based on MUTCD and industry standards of practice”.	Sentence has been added as a recommendation for all countermeasures.
3	4	Estimate of probable costs for signal timing – may want to change wording since traffic engineers may see adjusting signal timing as a “low cost and requires some staff time to accomplish”.	Updated
4	5	Improve Pedestrian Crossings – why not include two-stage crossing? City of Phoenix has a good cost estimate	No action required. PELICANs are examples of two-stage crossing.
5	5	Countermeasure Category – Moderately Complex and/or moderate cost – Complex Countermeasure and/or high cost	Updated in WP3 and WP4
6	5	Evaluate or Extend Paved Shoulder Widths – As discussed at the TAC meeting do we want to include consideration for unpaved-structural shoulders and a width between 4 to 8 feet	No changes required. ADOT Roadway Design Guidelines states that on a rural 2-lane roadway shall have a minimum paved shoulder width of 6 or 8 feet depending on volume.
7	5	Raised Median – Construct a continuous raised median...and improve overall safety and access management ...	Updated
8	9	SR 86 – Change MP 55 so it represents the entire 90 mile corridor	Updated
9	10	Verify with ADOT HES that the Traffic Crash Societal Costs is up to date. They may be using the updated value of life values	Values have been updated with societal costs from HES, which are not consistent with PGP 231. HES has requested an update to PGP 231.
10	10	Exhibit 3-2 – Societal Cost for Segments and Interchanges	Updated

11	14-27	Suggest condensing the information provided and highlight in each funding source how pedestrian improvements can be funded and how programs are carried out in Arizona. E.g. HSIP – provide background on HSIP, type of pedestrian improvements available, information on ADOT HES program.	Expanded HSIP write-up to reflect eligible improvements in HSIP.
12	16	The HSIP and HES program are the same funding source, but the HES section describes how HES was carried out through TEA-21 (10% STP set-aside)	HES section has been deleted.
13	22	For Regional Revenues explain how the regional planning process considers pedestrian improvements and not focus so much on the funding mechanisms per Kiran’s request at the TAC meeting.	Regional Funding sources descriptions are limited to the MAG Pedestrian Design Assistance Program, and the PAG RTA ½ cent sales tax.
14	28-30	Exhibit 5-2 – Make necessary changes based on recommendations for this section. Include Arizona – specific sources when available.	
15	34	Tohono O’odham Nation – Need clarification on the HES 2.6% funds? HES funds are not currently distributed regionally through MPO’s.	HES should read “PAG:.” “HES” has been changed to “PAG”.
16	35	Make all references to Arizona Statewide Transportation Plan (STIP) consistent. Once it’s spelled out the acronym will suffice.	Updated
17	35	“Estimate cost for tribal communities is \$100 Million” Will there be a range on this total once variations are considered for the 100-mile shoulder widening corridor?	Additional input was received from Tohono O’odham. Segments were updated to reflect three specific segments identified by the Tohono O’odham.
19	37	Re-name to “Conceptual Cost of Proposed Improvement by Location”	Updated. Appendix was renamed, as was title of each location in Appendix A.
18	Appendix	Per TAC’s request, include a statement/disclaimer on each page explaining costs are conceptual and based on all countermeasures being implemented. An engineer’s study for each location would still be required.	Updated. The following was added to each location “The following is a list of potential countermeasures that could be implemented at this location. The list is not intended to be a final list of countermeasures. Engineering analysis is required for countermeasures selection. The list is provided to estimate the magnitude of costs that may be required to improve pedestrian safety at this location.

**ARIZONA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
MULTIMODAL PLANNING DIVISION**

REVIEW COMMENTS

SUBMITTAL:	DRAFT ADOT Pedestrian Safety Action Plan, Working Paper No. 4	PROJECT NAME:	ADOT Pedestrian Safety Action Plan
REPORT DATE:	January 22, 2009	PROJECT NO:	Task Assignment TPD 01-08 Contract # T0449P001 PGKG 3120 KHA 09137020
REVIEWED BY:	Robert LaJeunesse	CONSULTANT:	Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc.
AGENCY / DISCIPLINE / OFFICE:	Western Region Traffic		

ITEM NO.	PAGE NO.	COMMENT	CONSULTANT RESPONSE
1	12	Segment 12 - This route will be turned over to the City of Yuma in September.	Added to WP3
2	12	Segment 13 - This route will be turned over to the City of Yuma in September. The City of Yuma has a widening project scheduled after the turnback. Design is nearly done.	Added to WP3
3	38	Installing 52 Pedestrian Warning signs will not help. Motorists will become desensitized with that many signs. The idea is to locate the signs where pedestrians would not normally be expected.	We agree that signs should be located where pedestrians would not normally be expected. Engineering analysis is required at each location to determine appropriate location and the number of signs. The value of "52 signs" was provided only for cost estimating purposes; and is based on the number of intersections in the segment. Signs should not be installed at every intersection location. A note has been added stating that the quantities are for magnitude of costs purposes only, and that engineering analysis is required.
4	52, 57	Reducing the curb radii could have a detrimental effect. With the large percentage of RVs in Yuma, tighter radii results in curbs getting run over often.	We agree that consideration of RVs turning radii is an engineering consideration. Similar to comment above, the recommendation is not intended to be final, but a concept that should be considered at appropriate locations. The quantity is provided for magnitude of costs estimating purposes only.

**ARIZONA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
MULTIMODAL PLANNING DIVISION**

REVIEW COMMENTS

SUBMITTAL:	DRAFT ADOT Pedestrian Safety Action Plan, Working Paper No. 4	PROJECT NAME:	ADOT Pedestrian Safety Action Plan
REPORT DATE:	January 22, 2009	PROJECT NO:	Task Assignment TPD 01-08 Contract # T0449P001 PGKG 3120 KHA 09137020
REVIEWED BY:	Walter (Kent) Link	CONSULTANT:	Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc.
AGENCY / DISCIPLINE / OFFICE:	ADOT, Northern Traffic Region		

ITEM NO.	PAGE NO.	COMMENT	CONSULTANT RESPONSE
1	11	Segment 6. The Townsend-Winona intersection project is complete; there were no pedestrian or bicycle enhancements with this project. Also, the Railhead to Snowflake multi-use trail is a project on a non-ADOT facility. This section of US 89 is under the jurisdiction of the City of Flagstaff.	Project removed.
2	41	Segment 4A, 4B, 4C, and 5 list countermeasures that are impractical, and possibly not supported by the Flagstaff District. Examples are hybrid signals and raised medians. Hybrid signals have been considered for several locations in these segments – there is little pedestrian crossing concentration to assist in warranting. Highway “Hawk” warrants have been looked at – the pedestrian volumes were not there. Raised medians have also been considered, snow removal concerns and business access have stalled those efforts. My recommendation if these countermeasures are kept is to include language (possibly on page 35, under Summary) that these countermeasures will require extensive scoping, collaboration with the district, consideration of operational issues, and possibly route transfers to happen. Don’t put these forth without acknowledging the issues to implement. The construct bicycle lane/shoulder cost seems very low given the very limited ROW and storm drain relocations involved.	Recommended language added. The team recognizes that significant discussion and scoping will be required. Language has been added to each location summary sheet in Appendix A emphasizing that additional scoping and engineering analysis is required.
3	75	Location 5. Sidewalk has been considered for several previous projects in the area. There has never been a willingness on the part of either the Navajo or Hopi Tribal agencies to accept maintenance responsibilities for this construction. A large project was just completed in the past 6 months at this location. Once again, during development, there was no success in negotiating the maintenance of sidewalk.	Acknowledged. No action required.
4	76	Location 6,7,8,9. The construction of pedestrian overpasses is opposed by the Holbrook District. The overpasses built in past years at Ganado and Tuba City (Flagstaff District) has not worked. The Tuba City overpass was removed last year at the request of Navajo Tribal authorities. The locations being proposed are very similar to those where this application has failed. Suggest better coordination/communication with the Holbrook District and possible removal of these features as a countermeasure.	Overpass recommendations have been removed as a countermeasure and replaced with evaluating the need for a signalized pedestrian crossing.

**ARIZONA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
MULTIMODAL PLANNING DIVISION**

REVIEW COMMENTS

SUBMITTAL:	DRAFT ADOT Pedestrian Safety Action Plan, Working Paper No. 4 & 5	PROJECT NAME:	ADOT Pedestrian Safety Action Plan
REPORT DATE:	January 22, 2009	PROJECT NO:	Task Assignment TPD 01-08 Contract # T0449P001 PGKG 3120 KHA 09137020
REVIEWED BY:	Lynn Johnson	CONSULTANT:	Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc.
AGENCY / DISCIPLINE / OFFICE:	Holbrook District Engineer		

ITEM NO.	PAGE NO.	COMMENT	CONSULTANT RESPONSE
		Have you looked at Alcohol as a contributing factor in pedestrian accidents?	Yes, alcohol is a contributing factor in a significant percentage of crashes
		Throughout both documents I see no mention of Maintenance costs or issues associated with the proposed improvements. There should be a life cycle maintenance costs included with each of the proposed improvements.	As stated in AASHTO Green Book, "Pedestrians are part of every roadway environment, and attention must be paid to their presence in rural as well as urban areas. Recommendations have been updated to emphasize that maintenance issues are of significant concern.
		If the ADOT policy is changed to allow ADOT to build and maintain sidewalks when local jurisdictions will not, then local agencies will quickly realize that if they refuse to participate in funding or maintenance, ADOT will build and maintain them anyway. ADOT can't afford this.	The team agrees that this is a major concern. A key recommendation of the PSAP is for ADOT to develop a policy regarding provision of sidewalks.
		Are bicyclists considered pedestrians? This document is labeled "ADOT pedestrian safety action plan" but contains numerous references to, and proposals for bicycle facilities.	Shoulder improvements in rural areas improve conditions for both cyclists and pedestrians. Language modified to read "construct shoulder"
		When extremely limited funds for highway improvement projects are tapped by mandatory pedestrian and bicyclist facilities, then the larger, bigger safety issues for the motoring public get shortchanged and will lead to exponentially more liability. Potential liability and overall use by the motoring public is exponentially higher than it is for pedestrians.	A key recommendation of the PSAP is for ADOT to develop a policy regarding provision of sidewalk; the policy should address this issue.
		Pedestrian overpasses have been constructed in rural Arizona. History has proven that they do not work as constructed. Very careful consideration of a pedestrian overpass should take place before scarce dollars are spent on ped overpasses.	Recommendations for pedestrian overpasses have been removed from the list of potential countermeasures
		Currently the ADOT maintenance funds are not sufficient to properly maintain the existing highway features. Adding sidewalk on practically all new projects, without new maintenance funding will only exacerbate the situation.	The team agrees that this is a major concern. A key recommendation of the PSAP is for ADOT to develop a policy regarding provision of sidewalks.

		Please give all of the ADOT Regional traffic engineers an opportunity to comment on these two drafts.	The Working Paper has been distributed to all Regional Traffic Engineers
--	--	---	--

**ARIZONA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
MULTIMODAL PLANNING DIVISION**

REVIEW COMMENTS

<i>SUBMITTAL:</i>	DRAFT ADOT Pedestrian Safety Action Plan, Working Paper No. 4	<i>PROJECT NAME:</i>	ADOT Pedestrian Safety Action Plan
<i>REPORT DATE:</i>	January 22, 2009	<i>PROJECT NO:</i>	Task Assignment TPD 01-08 Contract # T0449P001 PGKG 3120 KHA 09137020
<i>REVIEWED BY:</i>	Hilel Bar-Gera	<i>CONSULTANT:</i>	Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc.
<i>AGENCY / DISCIPLINE / OFFICE:</i>			

ITEM NO.	PAGE NO.	COMMENT	CONSULTANT RESPONSE
1		The presentation of societal costs should be accompanied by the expected reduction in societal costs as a result of the proposed project. It may also be better to present the societal costs and the expected reduction for each type of crash location (segments, interchanges, tribal communities) in the same way that the implementation costs are presented.	The decision was made not to estimate the anticipated reduction in societal costs as a result of the countermeasures; this calculation will be more meaningful once specific countermeasures have been identified, and the appropriate crash reduction factors can be identified.

**ARIZONA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
MULTIMODAL PLANNING DIVISION**

REVIEW COMMENTS

SUBMITTAL:	DRAFT ADOT Pedestrian Safety Action Plan, Working Paper No. 4	PROJECT NAME:	ADOT Pedestrian Safety Action Plan
REPORT DATE:	January 22, 2009	PROJECT NO:	Task Assignment TPD 01-08 Contract # T0449P001 PGKG 3120 KHA 09137020
REVIEWED BY:	Sarath Joshua / Kohinoor Kar / Michael Sanders	CONSULTANT:	Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc.
AGENCY / DISCIPLINE / OFFICE:			

ITEM NO.	PAGE NO.	COMMENT	CONSULTANT RESPONSE
		<p>Sarath: The write-up on HES as a potential funding source is no longer applicable. Our understanding is that the HES program at ADOT has been terminated -- at least for new safety projects. This, as we understand, is being replaced by the Highway Safety Improvement Program with a new approach for distributing safety funds, as presented by ADOT at the Governor's Traffic Safety Advisory Council on August 6, 2008. We have been telling local agencies in our region that the HES program may not accept any new application during the transition period.</p> <p>We are waiting to hear from ADOT on the details of the new HSIP program, the distribution of funds to COGs and MPOs and the project application/review process.</p>	HES section has been deleted.
		<p>Kohinoor: Based on our telephonic discussion yesterday, you might have already taken care of the changes to be made on page 16 of WP #4.</p> <p>We definitely should remove "Highway Enhancements for Safety (HES) Program" section from page 16 (since it is confusing with our HES Section name), and keep some general statements on the Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP). We prefer not to include the old Hazard Elimination Safety (HES) to avoid such confusions. Since we are still in a transition phase from old HES to new HSIP, we won't provide any specifics related to Arizona HSIP. Please let me know if you have any questions.</p>	HES section has been deleted.

WORKING PAPER 4 REVIEW COMMENTS
(CONTINUED)
DRAFT ADOT Pedestrian Safety Action Plan, Working Paper No. 4

ITEM NO.	PAGE NO.	COMMENT	CONSULTANT RESPONSE
		<p>Michael: Refer to Kohinoor's message in reply to my inquiry on Sarath Joshua's comments on WP #4. I feel this is a critical couple of paragraphs, not only for the WP, but for pedestrian safety. Bottom line is that ped (and bike) do not get fair share of safety funding, e.g. "less than 0.5 percent of federal funds that Arizona receives are spent on safety projects and programs for pedestrians and bicyclists, yet pedestrian and bicycle fatalities average nearly 13 percent of total traffic fatalities" http://www.bicyclinginfo.org/library/details.cfm?id=4240. We should include more details from SAFETEA-LU in the section on HSIP.</p> <p>For examples: http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/safetealu/factsheets/hsip.htm Eligible Use of Funds: Starting in FY 2006, States with Strategic Highway Safety Plans (refer to Arizona's at http://www.gtsac.org/GTSAC/Studies_Reports/PDF/AZ_Strategic_Highway_Safety_Plan.pdf) that meet the requirements of 23 USC 148 may obligate HSIP funds for all the purposes listed in section 148. Funds may be used for projects on any public road or publicly owned bicycle and pedestrian pathway or trail. or: http://safety.fhwa.dot.gov/safetealu/siebyside.htm The term "highway safety improvement project" means a project described in the State strategic highway safety plan that corrects or improves a hazardous road location or feature, or addresses a highway safety problem. The term includes a project for one or more of the following: . . . An improvement for pedestrian or bicyclist safety or safety of the disabled. . . . Installation and maintenance of signs (including fluorescent, yellow-green signs) at pedestrian-bicycle crossings and in school zones. or: http://safety.fhwa.dot.gov/safetealu/hsipreporting.htm#a6</p> <p>4. Pedestrian and Bicycle Improvements: Construct improvements that enhance pedestrian or bicyclist safety or safety of the disabled; Construct a traffic calming feature; Install and maintain signs (including fluorescent, yellow-green signs) at pedestrian-bicycle crossings and in school zones; Other</p>	<p>HES section has been deleted.</p> <p>Description in HSIP has been revised and expanded.</p>

MULTIMODAL PLANNING DIVISION

REVIEW COMMENTS

SUBMITTAL:	DRAFT ADOT Pedestrian Safety Action Plan, Working Paper No. 4	PROJECT NAME:	ADOT Pedestrian Safety Action Plan
REPORT DATE:	January 22, 2009	PROJECT NO:	Task Assignment TPD 01-08 Contract # T0449P001 PGKG 3120 KHA 09137020
REVIEWED BY:	Tom Engel	CONSULTANT:	Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc.
AGENCY / DISCIPLINE / OFFICE:			

ITEM NO.	PAGE NO.	COMMENT	CONSULTANT RESPONSE
1	5	Sidewalk Improvements should note that this does not include cost of right of way. Many times tight R/W precludes sidewalk.	Updated
2		Construct Bicycle lane or shoulder refers to an on-roadway bicycle lane.	Yes. Language was clarified to read "Construct Shoulder".
3		The Cost estimate assumption that the roadway intersection radii can be reduced is not realistic. This would have to be looked at on a case by case basis. The intersections are designed for operation of a specific design vehicle. The intersection may not function properly with reduced radii.	Agree that engineering analysis is required on a case-by-based basis. Language has been added to clarify that additional analysis an scoping is required at each location.
4		Let's change the title of 5.12 to Federal Programs and 5.2 to State Programs etc as you wish.	Updated
5		The Rural Safety Innovation Program also provides funds for safety improvements.	Our review indicates that the RSIP is more focused on drivers, ITS, and accident response than pedestrian related issues, therefore, the funding source has not been added.

MULTIMODAL PLANNING DIVISION

REVIEW COMMENTS

SUBMITTAL:	DRAFT ADOT Pedestrian Safety Action Plan, Working Paper No. 4	PROJECT NAME:	ADOT Pedestrian Safety Action Plan
REPORT DATE:	January 22, 2009	PROJECT NO:	Task Assignment TPD 01-08 Contract # T0449P001 PGKG 3120 KHA 09137020
REVIEWED BY:	Esther Corbett	CONSULTANT:	Kimley-Horn and Associates, Inc.
AGENCY / DISCIPLINE / OFFICE:			

ITEM NO.	PAGE NO.	COMMENT	CONSULTANT RESPONSE
1	9	GRIC recommends using the same MP on exhibit 2-5 as in the appendices for consistency	Updated
2	13	GRIC recommends adding SR87 to Exhibit 4-2	Updated
3	14	Hasn't HES been incorporated into the HSIP?	HES section has been deleted.
4	17	FLHP funds have been earmarked and usually few funds	Information added.
5	24	Not sure what type of tribal casino revenues is being referenced. Since tribal governments usually don't have the funds to make improvements on SR this section appears to be more meaningful to local governments. However, I'm not sure if road facility projects are eligible. Tribal governments award grants to local agencies, but I think the tribal governments determine priority areas and projects to fund. I'll need clarification from the Arizona Indian Gaming Association and staff are out of town until next week.	No action required.
6		The Indian Reservation Roads program can be used to fund bike and pedestrian facilities on tribal lands, but since there are limited funds, it's unlikely that facilities on SR would be funded.	No action required.
7	35	The \$100 million may have to be adjusted since overpasses are unlikely. In addition, I have asked the tribal transportation representative about curbed sidewalks on both sides of a SR and they think that multipurpose lanes on one side might be sufficient.	Overpass recommendations have been removed and total conceptual cost has been updated.

WORKING PAPER 4 REVIEW COMMENTS
(CONTINUED)
DRAFT ADOT Pedestrian Safety Action Plan, Working Paper No. 4

ITEM NO.	PAGE NO.	COMMENT	CONSULTANT RESPONSE
8	71	Transportation staff of the Gila River Indian Community commented that multipurpose facilities would be appropriate instead of curbed sidewalks.	Further evaluation at each location is required at each location to determine if sidewalks or multipurpose walkways are appropriate. Recommendation has been changed in WP3 to "Evaluate need for sidewalk or walkway improvements". Cost estimates reflect installation of sidewalks to show maximum costs.
9	72	Transportation staff of the Gila River Indian Community commented that multipurpose facilities and bus stop signage would be appropriate. Children cross the SR to board the school bus. NOTE: utility payments would need to be negotiated for the roadway lighting.	Recommendations added to WP3 and WP4.
10	80	Transportation staff of the Tohono O'odham commented that multipurpose facilities along certain sections of SR 86 would be appropriate, but didn't provide MPs.	Additional information was received from Tohono O'odham Nation.
11	81	Transportation contact from the Hopi Tribe recommended including multipurpose facilities on SR 264, MP 267-269.	This location has been added to the list of location. However, the correct milepost is SR-264, MP 367-369. Note was added that multiuse path could be considered as an alternative to sidewalks.
12	83	Transportation staff of the White Mountain Apache Tribe recommended walking lanes, including pedestrian facilities on a large culvert at Canyon Day Community. He also mentioned curbing at the intersection of SR 260 and SR 73 near the Hondah Casino.	Further evaluation needs to be done at each location before countermeasures are implemented. Recommendations show improvements to pedestrian facilities but not at specific locations on the segment since further investigation is needed.