Citizens Advisory Team Meeting
Draft EIS Review Meeting

South Mountain Community College
Student Union
June 11, 2013
6 - 8 PM
Agenda

- Welcome and Introductions (5)
- SMCAT Operating Agreement Review (5)
- Draft EIS Review (40)
- Draft EIS Open Discussion (40)
- SMCAT Recommendation Process (5)
- Questions from Public (15)
- Closing Remarks (10)
- Adjourn

Duration (minutes)
Welcome and Introductions

- Facilitators
- Arizona Department of Transportation
- Federal Highway Administration
- Study team members
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization Name</th>
<th>Representative Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ahwatukee Foothills Chamber of Commerce</td>
<td>Karen Starbowski</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ahwatukee Village Planning Committee</td>
<td>Melanie Beauchamp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arlington Estates HOA</td>
<td>Camilo Acosta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AZ Forward</td>
<td>Charles Horvath</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AZ Public Health Association</td>
<td>Al Brown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calabrea HOA</td>
<td>Mike Buzinski</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Avondale</td>
<td>Bryan Kilgore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cottonfields / Bougainvillea Community HOA</td>
<td>Timothy Stone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estrella Village Planning Committee</td>
<td>Peggy Eastburn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foothills Club West HOA</td>
<td>Michael Hinz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foothills Reserve HOA</td>
<td>Derrick Denis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gila River Indian Community - District 4</td>
<td>LaQuinta Allison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lakewood HOA</td>
<td>Chris Boettcher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laveen Citizens for Responsible Development</td>
<td>Laurie Prendergast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laveen Village Planning Committee</td>
<td>Wes Lines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maricopa County Farm Bureau</td>
<td>Clayton Danzeisen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mountain Park Ranch HOA</td>
<td>Jim Welch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pecos Road/I-10 Landowners Association</td>
<td>Nathaniel Percharo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phoenix Mountains Preservation Council</td>
<td>Michael Goodman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sierra Club</td>
<td>Sandy Bahr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silverado Ranch</td>
<td>Eric Baim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Mountain Village Planning Committee</td>
<td>Tamala Daniels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwest Valley Chamber of Commerce</td>
<td>Woody Thomas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Foothills HOA</td>
<td>Chad Blostone</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SMCAT Purpose Statement

The South Mountain Citizens Advisory Team (SMCAT) will provide a forum for communication between the Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT), Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the local community regarding the proposed South Mountain Freeway.

The SMCAT is a voluntary advisory team, not a decision-making body, and it will not be responsible for decisions made by the State of Arizona or the FHWA. The SMCAT will meet regularly to review project status and provide input on issues that are relevant to the project.

The single purpose of the SMCAT is to provide a Build or No-Build recommendation for the South Mountain Freeway.
SMCAT Meeting Protocol

- Welcome and introductions
- Establish a quorum
- Agenda
- Timekeeping process
- Standards for behavior notification
- “Discussion, debate, recommend” process
- Welcome visitors
- Parking lot issues
- Breaks
SMCAT Behavior

- SMCAT members are expected to treat each other with mutual courtesy, respect and dignity.
- Since the SMCAT is a voluntary advisory team, it is important that individual SMCAT members abide by accepted standards of behavior.
- Unacceptable or disruptive behavior will not be tolerated and will be grounds for exclusion from further participation in SMCAT activities.
- Any SMCAT member who acts disrespectfully toward other members, disrupts the SMCAT process or is unable to attend meetings on a consistent basis may be required by the third party facilitator, the ADOT public involvement team or a majority of the other SMCAT members, to leave or resign from the SMCAT.
Session Feedback Forms

SMCAT Members: Please complete both sides of the Session Feedback forms and return them before you leave.

Thank You
Draft EIS Review

Ben Spargo and Scott Stapp, HDR Engineering
Draft EIS Review

- Detailed answers to the questions submitted in advance are provided as a handout.
- All answers in the handout and those provided tonight verbally should be considered draft.
- Responses are not considered final until they are presented in the Final EIS.
- All questions and comments provided during this meeting will be included in the Final EIS.
Draft EIS Review

- Representation of information in the Draft EIS
- Touch on topics identified by CAT members in pre-submitted questions

www.azdot.gov/southmountainfreeway
Chapter 1, Purpose and Need

- An early step in preparing an EIS is to determine whether there is a **purpose and need** for the proposed project.
- If the lead agency concludes there is **NO NEED**, an EIS would not be prepared.
- If the lead agency concludes there is **A NEED**, the EIS process would continue with an evaluation of a range of reasonable alternatives in the Study Area.
Purpose and Need (Chapter 1)

Question 1

- Purpose and need presented in the Draft EIS is developed following FHWA Guidance.
- As presented in the Draft EIS, the need is supported by:
  - Socioeconomic factors
  - Regional transportation demand
  - Existing and projected transportation system capacity deficiencies
- An additional benefit of the proposed freeway includes east-west mobility as an alternative route to I-10.
Socioeconomic Data (1-11)

Question 2

- Socioeconomic data covers the period from 2005 to 2035
  - Most recent data available
  - MAG is in the process of adopting new traffic and socioeconomic projections
  - These new projections will be incorporated into the Final EIS
Traffic Modeling (1-13 and 3-27)

Question 3

- MAG travel demand model:
  - Certified by FHWA and reviewed by the EPA for air quality conformity
  - Provided level of demand for multimodal travel including automobiles, buses, and light rail

- Draft EIS presents results of technical analysis of MAG model output

- 2035 conditions with or without the proposed freeway assume other RTP facilities are complete
Chapter 2, Gila River Indian Community Coordination

- Based on the status of the coordination, in addition to decisions made by the Community, ADOT and FHWA have determined that an alternative alignment on Community land is not feasible.
Chapter 3, Alternatives

- Presents the alternatives development and screening process

Identifies the W59 and E1 Alternatives as the Preferred Alternative
Nonfreeway Alternatives (3-4, Table 3-2)

Question 4, 5

- These alternatives alone would have limited effectiveness in reducing overall traffic congestion in the Study Area and, therefore, would not meet the purpose and need for the proposed action.

- The proposed freeway would incorporate aspects of nonfreeway alternatives, where appropriate, to optimize traffic operational characteristics.

  - For example, the proposed freeway would support regional freeway-dependent transit services such as Express and Rapid bus routes.
Eastern Section Alternatives (3-12)

Question 6

- Alternates to the E1 Alternative would not meet the purpose and need or result in substantial impacts on residences and businesses.
- No alternatives on Community land are studied in detail in the DEIS.
- To date, the Community has not permitted ADOT to study alternatives in detail on Community land.
**Depressed Freeway (3-15)**

**Question 7**

- **Drainage** – Served as the primary design constraint for depressing the Pecos Road segment of the E1 Alternative.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>At-grade rolling profile</th>
<th>Depressed profile</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Area of right-of-way (acres)</td>
<td>883</td>
<td>1033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single-family residential displacements</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>264 to 438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total cost (right-of-way, design, and construction)</td>
<td>$761 million</td>
<td>$1.23 to $1.26 billion</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Depressing the E1 Alternative profile would result in:
  - 150 additional acres of land needed
  - 152 to 326 additional homes acquired
  - $469 to $472 million more in total cost
No-Action Alternative (3-40)

Question 8

- Increased difficulty in gaining access to adjacent land uses and the Interstate and regional freeway systems from the local arterial street network
- Increased levels of congestion-related impacts
- Continued degradation in performance of regional freeway-dependent transit services
- Increased trip times
- Higher user costs

**IMPACTS OF THE NO-BUILD ALTERNATIVE WHEN COMPARED TO THE BUILD ALTERNATIVE**

- Adds travel time: $200 million/year in personal time
- Adds traffic on arterial streets: 277K vehicles/day
- Increases fuel consumption: 40 million gallons/year
Right-of-way Area (3-52)

Question 9 (10 – not in DEIS)

- The typical right-of-way width would vary throughout the Study Area, but would normally be less than 500 feet, except at interchange locations.

- For comparison, at the Union Pacific Railroad crossing, the right-of-way width would be 525 feet for the W59 Alternative. At a similar location, the W55 Alternative right-of-way width would have been 740 feet.

- The right-of-way width for other freeways such as Loop 101 range from 350 to 500 feet.
Projected Traffic Volumes (3-61 to 3-62)

Question 11

- All of the action alternative would provide similar traffic operational benefits when compared to the No-Action Alternative.

- Future daily traffic volumes on the action alternatives would be similar to those of other freeways in the region.
CANAMEX (3-64)

Question 12

The 1995 Congressional definition states:

“In the State of Arizona, the CANAMEX Corridor shall generally follow—
(i) I-19 from Nogales to Tucson; (ii) I-10 from Tucson to Phoenix; and (iii) United States Route 93 in the vicinity of Phoenix to the Nevada Border.”

The definition allows for broad interpretation so that local, regional, and state agencies could further define the specific routes for the corridor.

- In April 2001, MAG Regional Council formally adopted the route depicted in the map.
- On July 6, 2012, passage of the MAP-21, formally added the segment of the CANAMEX corridor through Maricopa County to the Interstate Highway system as Interstate 11
Truck Routing (3-64)

Question 13

- The designated truck bypass for the Phoenix metropolitan area is SR 85 and Interstate 8 (similar to the CANAMEX route)

- As with all other freeways in the MAG region, trucks would use the proposed freeway for the through-transport of freight, for transport to and from distribution centers, and for transport to support local commerce.

- Using the proposed freeway for through-transport would require trucks to enter congested areas; therefore, choosing to travel on the proposed freeway versus using the designated truck bypass route would not translate to substantial travel time benefits.
Chapter 4, Affected Environment, Environmental Consequences, and Mitigation

- Presents potential impacts on the social, economic, and environmental setting from the action alternatives and the No-Build Alternative.

- Presents proposed mitigation or actions taken to reduce or eliminate an adverse impact from construction, operation, or maintenance of the proposed freeway.

- Sections of Chapter 4
Displacements Mitigation (4-45)

Question 14

- Complying with the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970 and Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964.
- Providing, where possible, alternative access to properties losing access to the local road network
- Negotiated with individual land owners

Table 4-12 Potential Displacements, Action Alternatives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Alternative/Option</th>
<th>Businesses</th>
<th>Residential</th>
<th>Community Facilities</th>
<th>Utilities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>Lots</td>
<td>MH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Section</td>
<td></td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>Lots</td>
<td>MH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W59</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W71</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>705</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W101 Western Option</td>
<td>14-30°</td>
<td>598-599</td>
<td>326-327</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W101 Central Option</td>
<td>14-29°</td>
<td>760</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W101 Eastern Option</td>
<td>14-28°</td>
<td>857</td>
<td>447</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Section</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Air Quality (4-58)

- Regulatory overview
- Criteria pollutants
- Mobile Source Air Toxics (MSATs)
- Environmental Consequences (impacts)
- Conclusions

Comparison of National Economic and Demographic Growth Indicators

- Over the past 35 years, major indicators of economic or demographic growth have increased, while emissions of 6 principal air pollutants have been reduced by 47%.
Mobile Source Air Toxics (4-74)
Questions 15, 16

- A discussion of the National Near Roadway MSAT study is presented on page 4-74 as a summary of the study as recommended by NEPA, not as a complete duplication of the paper and its findings. FHWA finds the summary of this report as presented in the Draft EIS to be inclusive and satisfactory, as demonstrated by its Interim Guidance Update on Mobile Source Air Toxic Analysis in NEPA.

- On page S-14 in Table S-3 the statement regarding MSAT emissions will be changed to “For all action alternatives, increased traffic volumes could will produce elevated MSATs emissions near the proposed action”
Mobile Source Air Toxics (4-69)

Question 17

- As noted on page 4-69 of the Draft EIS, it is FHWA’s view that information to credibly predict project-specific health impacts attributable to changes in MSAT emissions associated with a proposed set of freeway alternatives is incomplete or unavailable for several reasons:
  
  1. Total exposure to MSAT pollutants is a function of exposures from all sources,
  2. Uncertainties are associated with emissions and dispersion models,
  3. There is lack of national agreement on air dose-response values,
  4. It is unclear how to determine lifetime exposures, and
  5. There is no national consensus on acceptable risk.
Monitoring Sites
Questions 18, 19, 20, (21 – not in DEIS)

- Emission trends - average emission rates per vehicle based on all vehicle types in the Maricopa County area.
- The closest monitoring site to Ahwatukee is the Maricopa County Air Quality Department’s West Chandler monitor (Ellis Street and Frye Road), which collects information on meteorological conditions, ozone, carbon monoxide, and particulate matter less than or equal to 10 microns in aerodynamic diameter (PM$_{10}$).
- Gila River Indian Community maintains a monitoring site at the St. Johns School. Data on meteorological conditions and ozone are collected there.
Noise (4-45)
Questions 22, 23

- The noise impact of the proposed freeway on noise-sensitive land uses (residences) was evaluated to determine if noise reduction was needed according to ADOT’s Noise Abatement Policy - refined during design.

- Modeled with existing barriers – I-10/W59.
- South Mountain Park/Preserve – direct use under Section 4(f)
Water Resources (4-45)

Question 24

- Water resource issues examined in the Draft EIS considered effects on surface water quality, irrigation canals, and access to groundwater supply.

- In regards to the Foothills well:
  - After reviewing Arizona Department of Water Resources and U.S. Geological Survey well records in the general area, ADOT and FHWA were unable to find a reason that a replacement well location could not be found that would produce water comparable in quality and quantity to the acquired well; however, the discussion on page 4-100 of the Draft EIS concludes that in the event that well replacement were not possible, ADOT would replace the well through alternative sources of water that are described in detail.
Wildlife and plant species in Arizona are regulated and protected through state and federal laws and regulations.

The Western Section action alternatives:
- May affect foraging behavior of the Sonoran Desert population of bald eagles along the Salt River.
- Would not affect threatened and endangered species or their critical habitat.

The E1 Alternative:
- May affect the Sonoran desert tortoise through vehicular conflicts, displacement from construction, loss of food sources and cover habitat, and habitat degradation.
Biological Resources Mitigation (4-126)

Question 25

- Mitigation specific to the Sonoran desert tortoise would include, but would not be limited to:
  - Coordinating with U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) and Arizona Game and Fish Department to determine whether additional species-specific mitigation measures would be required.
  - Designing drainage structures near the South Mountain Park and Preserve to accommodate multifunctional crossings.
  - Educating construction personnel of guidelines for handling Sonoran desert tortoises, if encountered.
Cultural Resources (4-128)

Question 26

- Cultural resource investigations were performed to establish the proposed freeway’s compliance with the National Historic Preservation Act and other laws.
- Cultural resources generally include archaeological sites, historic buildings and structures, artifacts and objects, and places of traditional, religious, and cultural significance.
- Impacts on and mitigation for the Phoenix South Mountain Park/Preserve are discussed in several sections of the Draft EIS (see pages 4-9, 4-15, 4-16, 4-122, 4-123, 4-124, 4-129, 4-130, 4-154, 4-155, and 5-14 to 5-28).
Hazardous Materials Transport (4-154)

Question 27

- The South Mountain Freeway, if implemented, is expected to operate under the same rules and regulations as other similar facilities in the state; transport of hazardous cargo is expected to be permissible.

- Emergency responders would address the construction of the proposed freeway by amending the local emergency response plan to include the facility.

- This would include emergency response on the road and alternative routes for diversion of traffic in the event that a hazardous materials incident occurred along the roadway.

- In addition, drainage facilities along the proposed action would be designed to also function as chemical-spill containment structures.
The Study Area was evaluated in terms of the existing visual conditions and landscape character. The analysis identified distinct features, areas of preservation and disturbance, key landmarks, and major viewpoints.

Impacts on and mitigation for the Phoenix South Mountain Park/Preserve are discussed in several sections of the Draft EIS (see pages 4-9, 4-15, 4-16, 4-122, 4-123, 4-124, 4-129, 4-130, 4-154, 4-155, and 5-14 to 5-28).
Section 4(f) applies to projects that receive funding from or approval by an agency of the U.S. Department of Transportation.

Within or near the Study Area, the following are subject to protection under Section 4(f):
- Recreational trails
- Historic properties
- Recreational facilities associated with public schools
- Public parks

Highway planners and designers must demonstrate there is no prudent and feasible alternative before allowing a highway project to impact a Section 4(f) resource.
South Mountains Mitigation (5-23 to 5-27)

Question 28

- Mitigation specific to the South Mountains would include, but would not be limited to:
  - Establishing a slope treatment plan for cuts through the ridgelines to blend the cuts into the South Mountains’ natural setting.
  - Consulting with the Gila River Indian Community and other agencies regarding design and locations of multiuse crossings.
  - Contracting with the Gila River Indian Community to perform a full TCP evaluation.
  - City of Phoenix would identify potential replacement recreational land.
Chapter 6, Comments and Coordination

- Documents the agency and public involvement process up to publication of the Draft EIS.
- Identifies comments, concerns, and suggestions collected during communications, interviews, and meetings.
Next steps
Draft EIS Open Discussion

Ben Spargo, HDR Engineering and Study Team
Draft EIS Open Discussion

- Technical staff are present and will do their best to provide a complete response.
- Please be as specific as possible with your question.
- If additional details or information are needed to completely answer a question, the question and response will be placed in the “parking lot” and posted to the Website by July 5, 2013.
Draft EIS Open Discussion

- All answers provided tonight verbally should be considered draft.
- Responses are not considered final until they are presented in the Final EIS.
- All questions and comments provided during this meeting will be included in the Final EIS.
SMCAT Recommendation Process

Tom Keller, KCA
June 12, 2013
Online recommendation process begins

Organizations can provide Build or No Build recommendation

July 24, 2013
Online recommendation process ends

Recommendations considered and included in the Final EIS

South Mountain Citizens Advisory Team
Action or No Action Final Recommendation
Due: July 24, 2013

Purpose
The charter of the South Mountain Citizens Advisory Team is to provide an Action (build) or No Action (no build) recommendation for the Loop 202 South Mountain Freeway. The following template is designed to capture the final recommendation of each individual SMCAT organization.

The following is the final recommendation of __________ member organization of the South Mountain Citizens Advisory Team. This recommendation has been reviewed by the organization’s governing board or its equivalent and represents its position regarding the South Mountain Freeway.

☐ Action – Build Alternative
☐ No Action – No Build Alternative

Please provide a brief statement regarding your organization’s recommendation in the space provided below.

☐ Attachments
Questions from the Public

Tom Keller, KCA
Closing Remarks

Tom Keller, KCA